

The Parish of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

Waterloo, Ontario
www.stedmund.ca

UPDATE

The Anglican Catholic Church of Canada / The Traditional Anglican Communion

September 9, 2011 - **St. Gorgonius**

OCTOBER SCHEDULE

October 2	Sunday	The Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity
October 9	Sunday	Harvest Thanksgiving
October 16	Sunday	The Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity
October 18	Tuesday	St. Luke the Evangelist
October 23	Sunday	The Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity
October 28	Friday	St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles
October 30	Sunday	The Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity

SERVICE TIMES AND LOCATION

- (1) All Services are held in the Chapel at Luther Village on the Park - 139 Father David Bauer Drive in Waterloo.
- (2) On Sundays, Matins is sung at 10:00 a.m. (The Litany on the first Sunday of the month), and the Holy Eucharist is celebrated (sung) at 10:30 a.m.
- (3) On weekdays - Major Holy Days - the Holy Eucharist is usually celebrated at 7:00 p.m., 10:00 a.m. on Saturday.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

- 1) **THE GENESIS OF ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS** - this page, the second of four parts. another timely article - the first of two parts - page 5.
- 2) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - Sheep and Goats** - the first of two parts - page 4. 4) By the Archbishop of New York - **PRESERVING OUR FAITH** - page 8.
- 3) **WHAT IS THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY?** - 5) **TIME TO PROCLAIM THE PRIMACY OF JESUS CHRIST IN CREATION** - the seventh of seven parts - page 9.

THE GENESIS OF ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS - 2 of 4

Forward-in-Faith/UK (FIF or FIF/UK)

The second story we need to tell concerns the dealings of the Forward-in-Faith/UK organization with Rome. Forward-in-Faith (which in the late 1990s gained two sister or step-sister organizations, Forward-in-Faith/Australia, or FIF/OZ, and Forward-in-Faith/North America, or FIF/NA, the former "Episcopal Synod of America" and before that name-change in 1991, the "Evangelical and Catholic Mission," formed by opponents of the Episcopal Church's approval of the pretended ordination of women in 1977) emerged in 1993, in the aftermath of the Church of England's General Synod vote on November 11, 1992 to approve a measure to allow women purportedly to be ordained to the priesthood. Both proponents and opponents expected the measure to fail to achieve the requisite two-thirds majority in the House of Laity of that synod, but in the event it passed by three votes thanks to a number of "Evangelical" members of that house changing their votes as a result of the emotional rhetoric of the then Archbishop of Canterbury, the "Evangelical" George Carey, pleading for its passage - such are the fruits of "church democracy." In the face of fears that the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament - a committee with membership drawn from both the House of Lords and the House of Commons which must declare any legislation concerning the Church of England to be "expedient" before it can be debated and voted on by the two parliamentary houses - might declare the measure "inexpedient," the General Synod enacted in 1993 the so-called "Act of Synod" which provided guarantees for clergy and parishes declaring their opposition to receiving the ministrations of female clergy and of bishops purporting to ordain such clergy, and also set up a system of Provincial Episcopal Visitors, popularly known as "flying bishops," to minister to such clergy and parishes. (These bishops were given the titles of defunct English Episcopal sees from pre-1066 Anglo-Saxon England, Beverley for the PEV in the Province of

York in the north, and Ebbsfleet and Richborough in the Province of Canterbury in the south; in addition, the Bishop of London later, in 1995, made one of his suffragan or assistant bishops, the Bishop of Fulham, from 1996 John Broadhurst, the equivalent of a "flying bishop" for the London diocese.) By the time that the first women were purportedly ordained to the priesthood in March 1994, FIF was up and running, as were the provisions of the Act of Synod. In the light of the events of recent years connected with the debate over a measure to open the episcopate of the Church of England to women, and which would abolish the provisions of the Act of Synod, it is worth noting that both Archbishop Carey of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York, John Habgood, stated at the time that the intention of the Church of England in enacting the Act of Synod was that its provisions should remain in force "indefinitely" or "as long as needed," whereas in fact it now seems doubtful that it will last more than one or two more years before being repealed as part of the measure allowing for woman bishops.

FIF was cautious in its dealings with Rome in its first decade or more, for its membership was, after all, committed to staying in the Church of England for the time being, so long as it was possible for what was termed "the orthodox integrity" to exist within the Church of England in a manner compatible with the "Catholic principles" embraced by the great preponderance of its membership. There were some low-key contacts, nevertheless, especially Bishop Broadhurst's visit to Rome in 1997, but it was not until the General Synod decided in July 2005 to begin the process of preparing legislation to allow for woman bishops that it began to appear that those Anglicans of a Catholic mind in the Church of England might not have a long-term future there. Between April and July 2008, a period in which the drafting group for the legislation produced its report, the House of Bishops of the Church of England commented on the various options available for the form and specific provisions of the legislation, and

the General Synod voted on July 7 of that year for safeguards falling short of the minimum required to guarantee the position of those of "the orthodox integrity," dramatic events occurred. In late April 2008 - I do not have the exact dates - the then Bishop of Ebbsfleet, now Msgr. Andrew Burnham, was to visit Rome. Before his trip he succeeded in arranging to visit both the PCPCU and the CDF for conversations, and, once that door had been opened, he was joined by the then Bishop of Richborough, now Msgr. Keith Newton, the Ordinary of the English Ordinariate, happily with us at this meeting. I know nothing about the substance of these conversations, but they brought home to the Vatican that there was a definite English Anglican constituency that would be likely to respond affirmatively to a generous initiative on Rome's part.

The "larger picture" of Anglican/Catholic relations at this time gave further impetus to such debates as may have been taking place in Rome about how to deal with the Anglican Communion, the Church of England, and distressed "Catholic-minded" Anglican groups. As far back as June 5, 2006 Cardinal Kasper of the PCPCU had addressed the House of Bishops of the Church of England requesting, almost pleading, with them not to proceed further with legislation to allow for woman bishops, and indicating as well that their decision on this matter would be taken by Rome as a token of whether the Church of England considered itself to be, in whatever sense, a "Catholic church" or, on the contrary, a "church of the Reformation." But on 8 and 10 July of that year the English General Synod voted to proceed with the proposed legislation, and on the 21st there was released to the public a response that two Church of England bishops, the moderate, if theologically eccentric, Evangelical Tom Wright of Durham (now retired) and the liberal "Affirming Catholic" David Stancliffe of Salisbury (also now retired) - we may recall here Archdeacon George Austin's quip about what were the distinctive beliefs of Affirming Catholics, "girls on the altar, boys in bed and 'Mother' on the Throne of God" - which attempted politely to demur at Cardinal Kasper's request, and to rebut his arguments; in effect, they answered tacitly Cardinal Kasper's larger question by affirming that the Church of England is, should be, and always will be a "merely Protestant" church, even if one which merited the rather supercilious 19th Century English Roman Catholic phrase about Anglicanism as "decorated Protestantism." In the Fall of 2008 there took place the decennial Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops. Rome appears to have thought that the issue of woman bishops would loom large on the conference's agenda, although in fact it had been dealt with - that is to say, evaded ("decision by evasion" may well be the distinctive

Liberal Anglican contribution to Modernist Christianity) - at the 1998 conference, and in 2008 there was no will to revisit the issue, and so sent a high-powered delegation to it. The Indian Ivan, Cardinal Dias, Prefect of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples from May 2006 to May 2011, gave a discourse on the "missionary mandate" of Christianity, in the course of which he uttered phrases which appeared to insinuate that churches of the Anglican Communion were risking a "spiritual Alzheimer's" disease and "ecclesial Parkinson's" disease, while Cardinal Kasper, speaking in a more forthright manner than ever before, harshly criticized the Anglican Communion for its actions in regard to woman's ordination and especially woman bishops (and also, although rather more obliquely, on homosexuality), ending by stating that "the ordination of women to the episcopate effectively and definitively blocks a possible recognition of Anglican Orders by the Catholic Church."

At some point in the last months of 2008 an encounter between a Church of England priest under the episcopal oversight of the then Bishop of Fulham, John Broadhurst, with Christoph, Cardinal Schoenborn, the Archbishop of Vienna, led to remarkable results. I have heard various and contradictory details of where this happened and how it happened, but it appears that as a result of that meeting Cardinal Schoenborn conceived an interest in the position and plight of the Catholic-minded "orthodox opposition" within the Church of England, and expressed an interest in making the acquaintance of Bishop Broadhurst. Bishop Broadhurst took up the matter with the Council (governing body) of FIF/UK, and the end result was that Cardinal Schoenborn invited four clerical members of FIF/UK to Vienna for two days of conversation in January 2009. These Anglicans were John Broadhurst, then Bishop of Fulham, Keith Newton, then Bishop of Richborough, Geoffrey Kirk, then, as now, Vicar of Lewisham, Kent, and then also Secretary of FIF/UK, and Jonathan Baker, then Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, and now himself Secretary of FIF/UK as well as the newly-consecrated Bishop of Ebbsfleet. Joachim, Cardinal Meisner, Archbishop of Cologne, was to have been present as well, but had to cancel at the last moment. The conversations are said to have been far-ranging and thorough, and to have given the Catholic side a good understanding of the unique features of English Anglo-Catholicism. After the meeting, Cardinal Schoenborn flew off to Rome, among other purposes to report on it to the pope (who all along, since before being elevated to the apostolic throne, and down to the present, has taken a sustained personal interest in these Anglican matters). Rather unlike the situation of the TAC,

though, it appears that FIF/UK had no ongoing "input" into the process that eventuated in AC. One may contrast the TAC's "making overtures" to Rome with FIF/UK's "seeking contacts" with Rome in these years.

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 - 1 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.

One way to separate sheep from goats - though I'll not say who are sheep and who are goats - is to separate those who regard *Romans* as the best, greatest and most important of St. Paul's letters from those who regard *Ephesians* as the best, greatest and most important of St. Paul's letters.

I am an *Ephesians* man myself but, even so, I take my text from *Romans*, "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us". (5,8)

Christ did not die for us because we repented of our sins, or even when we repented of our sins. Christ did not die for us because we had faith in Him, or even when we had faith in Him. Christ did not die for us because we were totally committed to Him, or even when we were totally committed to Him. Christ died because and when, in the eternal purposes of the Triune Godhead, He elected to do so.

The Gentiles weren't ready for Him. "He was in the world and the world was made by Him and the world knew Him not". (*John* 1,10) The Jews may have longed for Him coming, but they weren't ready for Him either. "He came into His own and His own received Him not". (*John* 1,11)

He came not in response to anybody's faith, but despite everybody's lack of faith. He died, not in response to anybody's faith, but despite everybody's lack of faith. He rose again, not in response to anybody's faith, but despite everybody's lack of faith.

Theology therefore says that grace is prevenient, that God's grace goes before us. Some of us don't much care for speaking of grace as though it were an abstract noun, and prefer to speak in more personal terms. Some of us prefer to put it this way, "God always acts first. Man can only respond. God initiates. Man replies. And the reply itself is only possible because of Personal intervention by God".

Now, of course, nobody can give us a present if we refuse to accept it. Not even God. God gives us Jesus to be our Saviour, but He can't be *our* Saviour if we refuse to accept Him.

And so, as parish priests, or as chaplain to more specialized groups such as prisoners, soldiers or schoolboys, we constantly express the importance of right response. We urge our people to put their trust in Christ. We exhort them to total commitment. We persuade them to repent. We remind them that mere verbiage and emotionalism are not enough. If they repent, they will amend their lives, they will love their neighbours, they will practise prayer, they will frequent the sacraments. "You say you believe in Jesus, then why are you not at mass? You say you believe in Jesus, then why are you a racistist?"

In so preaching we follow the example of the Apostles. When Peter has finished his exhortation on the day of Pentecost, his audience replied, "What shall we *do*?" Peter answered, "Repent and be baptized". (*Acts* 2,37-38)

Currently there are various efforts at returning the church to her first love. (*Rev.* 2,4). There is charismatic renewal, catholic renewal, liturgical renewal. There are the intentions of the Second Vatican Council, one of the ripple effects of which is our joint Quiet Time today.

The danger of such renewal movements, and the danger of our preaching to our people, is that we shall corrupt our people! The world is often corrupted by well intentioned good causes. Unless we are careful we and our people shall end up feeling things like, "Because I repent God loves me. Because I commit myself to Christ He redeems me. Because I have faith God saves me".

+Robert Mercer CR

WHAT IS THE ANGLICAN PATRIMONY? - 1 of 2

The recent meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops featured an eagerly awaited report by the Cardinal Archbishop of Washington, Donald Wuerl, on the steps toward the creation of a Personal Ordinariate in the United States. If nothing more - and there was considerably more - this report had the salutary effect of putting to silence (assuming that is possible) those nay-sayers within the Anglican community who have been suggesting that such a structure would never be erected here. It is evident that it will be, and fairly soon, and that the Vatican means to issue the decree sooner rather than later.

In spite of all the good things about the report, during the subsequent question-and-answer session there was some evident uncertainty amongst the assembled bishops as to just what constitutes the Anglican patrimony (or heritage) for which the soon-to-be established Personal Ordinariate is to serve as the conduit for the further enrichment of the Catholic Church. The Archbishop of Chicago, Francis Cardinal George, articulated this when he said, referring to the ordinariates' mission to preserve elements of the Anglican tradition, "I'm not sure I've ever seen an explanation of what those elements might be."

The Bishops cannot be faulted for not having a clearer grasp of the particular elements of our patrimony, since many self-defined Anglicans do not really follow the classical Anglican way. Moreover, those of us who aspire to do so have not set forth the matter clearly and concisely.

To further complicate the matter, the fact that the majority of those clergy and congregations that so far have entered the first Ordinariate in England - the motherland of the Anglican Way - use the English translation of the Roman Missal instead of any version of The Book of Common Prayer tends for now to obscure the fact that outside England, the classical Prayer Book tradition is very much alive and well. (The reasons for this are complex and beyond the immediate scope of this paper.)

Another reason why there is uncertainty about the content of the Anglican heritage may well have to do with its very pervasiveness - it is a part of the general environment of anglophone European culture, especially its literary culture. The two most influential monuments of English literature are *The Book of Common Prayer* (1549ff.) and the Authorized Version of the Bible (1611), commonly known as the King James Version, which in very real ways have formed not just the cadence but the

content of Western civilization in its Anglo-American form.

In the interests of removing the uncertainty about its nature and form, it is the purpose of this paper to set forth some of the key elements of the Anglican patrimony and in the process to foster a better understanding of it among the Latin Rite Catholics - particularly our Fathers in God - with whom we soon will be joined. These are things which we value and believe constitute the precious heritage of the Anglican way of being Christian, and which we hope to offer for the enrichment of - and where necessary correction by - the Catholic Church.

The Anglican Mind

Let us begin with a general description of the characteristics of the Anglican mind, which the particular elements of its patrimony (which will be discussed later) express.

The Anglican mind (also referred to as the Anglican Way or the Anglican ethos) was a variety within the species of the Christian mind. To be sure, there was a distinct flavour to its mixture of aesthetic, moral, and intellectual styles - a sort of golden moderation, reflecting a blend of the temperaments of the British, Celtic, and Norse cultures which were a part of the making of England, yet there was never any serious contention that such things as distinguished the Anglican mind from, say the Roman or Gallican or Iberian or Germanic or Slavic or Greek or Syrian or African or Oriental Christian mind were indicative of a difference in kind. All these were at least implicitly considered to be local or cultural streams flowing from the great well of Christian orthodoxy, and the Anglican mind habitually enriched and renewed itself by drinking liberally from all of them.

The Anglican mind, in its highest state of development, was supple without being flaccid, liberal yet disciplined, conservative yet open. It recognised that the opposite of protestant is not catholic, but corrupt, and that the opposite of catholic is not protestant, but sectarian. Even at its most polemical, it sought more reconciliation with its opponents than triumph over them. In every generation of its life - from Hooker and Field to Taylor and Cosin to Wesley and Wilberforce to Keble and Pusey to William Temple and Michael Ramsey - it has produced pastors and theologians who

exemplify these characteristics. Its ethos informed an entire family of national Churches. Now, however, though the Anglican intellectual tradition remains alive in certain individuals and groups of Anglicans, it can no longer claim to have any substantial influence on what passes for life in the national and international institutions of the increasingly moribund Anglican Communion.

[Samuel L. Edwards, "Anglicanism and the death of the Anglican Mind," in *Quo Vaditis: The State Churches of Northern Europe* (Leominster, Hertfordshire: Gracewing, 1996), pp. 10-11.]

In our present context it might well be added that, because of *Anglicanorum coetibus*, the treasury accumulated through the Anglican habit of drawing from the different *ethoi* which are comprehended under the roof of the great *oikos* of the People of God - together with those which shelter under its eaves or in its lee - now is made available as a resource for the whole of the Church in communion with the Successor of Peter. This conduit, which now can carry its contents in both directions, is available for mutual enrichment, recovery, and renewal.

The Content of the Anglican Heritage

So what, particularly, are the contents of the Anglican patrimony that are consistent with the Catholic faith? Without any pretense at completeness, they would certainly include the following:

A distinctly domestic approach to Christian corporate life.

This finds expression in such diverse things as the Prayer Book tradition of worship and the re-founded Shrine of our Lady of Walsingham. The Prayer Book itself, at least in its central 1549 English - 1928 American (not to forget the 1962 Canadian) editions, is the linchpin of a parish-based ascetical system which, while it has the Eucharist at its center, augments and thereby buttresses the center with the Daily Office. The Office itself is, both in spirit and historically, more the descendant of the parochial and cathedral offices of the middle ages than of the monastic offices, more inherently suited to the participation of lay people than the more clerically-oriented offices of the Roman breviary. This greater accessibility - together with well-framed lectionaries - has been a major contributor to genuine biblical literacy amongst Anglicans. The Eucharistic lectionary, which is essentially the Medieval one, provides the depth of reading Scripture as a doctrinal instrument of salvation. The lessons become familiar through the Eucharistic preaching. The Daily Office lectionary provides the breadth by covering virtually the whole Bible every year.

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) St. Gorgonius of Nicomedia was a Christian martyr, part of the group Gorgonius, Peter Cubicularius and Dorotheus, who died in 304 AD at Nicomedia during the persecution of Emperor Diocletian.

According to Lactantius and Eusebius, Gorgonius held a high position in the household of the emperor. When the persecution began he was consequently among the first to be charged, and with his companions, Peter, Dorotheus and several others, was subjected to the most frightful torments and finally strangled.

According to one version of the legend, Diocletian, wishing to expose Christians in his household, ordered everyone to pay honor to the Roman gods; if they refused, they would be exposed as Christians. The first to be exposed was Diocletian's butler, Peter, surnamed Cubicularius ("valet, chamberlain"), who was strung up, his flesh torn from his bones. Two Christians, Dorotheus, an imperial chamberlain, and Gorgonius, an army officer, protested this treatment, and were also martyred, together with another official, named Migdonius. In the meantime, Peter was boiled or burned alive, or "roasted on a gridiron."

Diocletian, determined that their bodies should not receive the honors which the early Christians gave the relics of the martyrs, ordered them to be thrown into the sea. The Christians nevertheless obtained possession of them and later the body of Gorgonius was carried to Rome.

There is a cathedral dedicated to St. Gorgonius in Minden, Germany.

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

3) **George Orwell's** six 'writing' rules:

Never use a long word where a short one will do,

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print.

Never use the passive where you can use the active.

Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or jargon if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.

If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous.

4) Someone mentioned **the potential power of the laity**. And they do have great power, which most of them never choose to use, partially from a lack of sacrificial leadership, but also from a lack of taking up the cross themselves. Any ten middle class households can start a faithful congregation, not only because God would have spared Sodom for ten just householders, but also because of the power of **the tithe**. Those ten households have the power on the very first day that they agree to tithe to support a minister in their community on an economic basis similar to their own. Their first year's budget is done on the very first day, so that every person God adds to their company is their store for the future. From an article by **The [late] Rev. Dr. Louis Tarsitano** in the March, 2004 issue of *The Rock*.

5) Giving a **minimum of \$1** each week for every \$1,000 of gross annual income **approximates tithing** - i.e. if your gross annual income is \$50,000, your weekly offering would be \$50.

6) **How and when to make the Sign of the Cross**

The sign of the Cross is made upon oneself as if to signify that the action in connection with which it is made is - to be stamped with the symbol of the

Christian Faith - as if to say "this is done in the Name of Our Lord". It is made in this manner. One touches with the tip of one's middle finger - the other fingers being extended and touching each other - first the forehead, then the breast; thirdly the left shoulder, and finally the right shoulder. Thus there are traced vertical and horizontal lines; the breast is not again touched at the end.

This sign is made on the following occasions, either as a prescribed ceremonial act, or by custom so widespread that it must be considered to be the correct form:

(1) At the Invocation *In the Name of the Father, etc.*;

(2) At the close of the Nicene Creed and *Gloria in excelsis*, and also at the end of the Apostles' Creed;

(3) When receiving a Blessing, e.g. at the close of a service;

(4) At the Verse *Our help is in the Name of the Lord*;

(5) At the opening words of the *Benedictus qui venit*;

(6) At the beginning of the *Benedictus* at Matins, of the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis* at Evensong, and of the *Nunc Dimittis* in Compline;

(7) At the verse *May the souls of the faithful etc.*

(8) [At the *Ecce, Agnus Dei*]

(9) Before receiving the Host and Chalice in Holy Communion.

(10) [At the beginning of the Introit.]

(11) [At the words *pardon and deliver you from all your sins* in the *Absolution* following the *General Confession*.]

Before the Gospel [and Last Gospel] the sign of the Cross is made in a rather different manner - with the right thumb, three small crosses are made on the forehead, lips, and breast, as if to recognise that the Gospel is to govern our minds, words, and hearts.

From *Anglican Services*

7) Every act of reverence, every genuflection that you make before the Blessed Sacrament is important because it is an **act of faith** in Christ, and

an act of love for Christ. And every sign of the cross and gesture of respect made each time you pass a church is also an act of faith. **Pope John Paul II**

8) The **magisterium** of the Church is not the fruit of a will to define on the part of the pope and the bishops, but depends upon, and cannot be separated from, Tradition. Before the magisterium of the Church there is Tradition, before Tradition there is Revelation, and before Revelation the Revealer, who is Christ himself. **Roberto de Mattei**

9) There is the story of a pastor who got up one Sunday and announced to his congregation: "I have good news and bad news. The good news is, we have enough money to pay for our new building program. The bad news is, it's still out there in your pockets.

10) Wonder who's teaching English these days?

Let everyone have their say.

At this point in time.

Above seasonal for this time of year.

12:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m.

Very unique.

If there is anything we can do, please contact myself, your Account Manager, or my team.

11) Four stages of life:

You believe in Santa Claus.

You don't believe in Santa Claus.

You are Santa Claus.

You look like Santa Claus.

PRESERVING OUR FAITH

The headline was so familiar: Yet another group was "challenging the Vatican" on something, this time, on upholding the timeless teaching of the Church that only men are called to the Sacrament of Holy Orders.

One can't really find too much fault with the content of the article, namely that some small groups in North America, Austria, and Australia, the usual lineup, are protesting this particular teaching of the Church.

What one does find frustrating is the tenor of the headline and the article that "the Vatican" has these bizarre, outmoded, oppressive "policies" that need to be "revised" so that such "guidelines of Rome" are brought more in line with enlightened thinking of today.

One would think that leaders in "the Vatican" occasionally meet to decide what "rules" they should issue or reinforce today, or what changes in procedure they should introduce to guarantee that the Church is more relevant.

While this seems to be the presumption of most people who attempt to report on the Church, it is, indeed, a presumption that is invalid.

"The Vatican" is a plot of ground the size of an eighteen-hole golf course on the banks of the Tiber River in Rome. It happens also to be the home of

the successor to the man buried on this acreage under the splendid basilica which bears his name, St. Peter's.

These 108 acres, "the Vatican" have absolutely no authority at all to alter the teaching of the Church. Its sacred duty, rather, is to preserve and hand on the deposit of faith we have received from revelation, from the Bible, from Jesus, from His apostles.

So, to imply that the Successor of St. Peter, Pope Benedict XVI, and his closest aides regularly meet as some political entity to read the latest poll and "change Church policy," like that of ordaining only men, is silly.

Call it whatever you want - "the Vatican," "Rome," "the Pope," "the Holy See," "the Magisterium" - whatever you call it, it does not "make up," "change," or "issue" new doctrines. It inherits them, receives them, "handed on" (from the Latin word *traditio*), by Tradition.

Yes, it may rethink how the truth entrusted to it might be better explained, or more credibly presented, or expressed in a more contemporary way.

Yes, it might become concerned when it's clear that a good chunk of people no longer follow a particular teaching or moral precept.

But it does not then call a meeting and vote whether or not to change the teaching.

At times it - "the Vatican," "Rome," "the Pope," "the Holy See," "the Magisterium" - might even wish it could change certain teachings. For instance, I would wager most bishops, priests, deacons, pastoral leaders, and maybe even the Holy Father himself has, at one time or another wished the Church could alter the teaching of Jesus that marriage is forever, and that one cannot break that sacred bond asunder.

But it can't, because it didn't make up the teaching to begin with.

So, plug in whatever word you want in the boilerplate headline: "Group Challenges Vatican on its Policy of _____" - abortion, marriage, euthanasia, lying, stealing, artificial contraception, sexual acts outside of marriage, ordination of women - fill in the "flavor of the day," but the headline is still inaccurate: these are not "policies" decided by some person in the Vatican; these are not "bans" put out by some committee. These are doctrines, timeless teachings not ours to alter.

It sometimes seems as if many view the Church as a political institution, with a new pope or new bishop able to set out his own positions and priorities the way an incoming president or governor would. Back in 2009, for instance, when I was appointed Archbishop of New York, I was asked by a reporter how my "policy" on gay "marriage" would differ from the "policy" of Cardinal Egan. I tried to explain, as

gently as I could, that the responsibility of any bishop is to clearly and charitably articulate the teaching of the Church, not to establish "policy" on which teaching he will follow and which teaching he will change.

To be clear, yes, the Church does have some "policies" that can be changed, for instance, abstinence of meat on Friday, fasting from food before Holy Communion, or even priestly celibacy. These indeed are part of the Church's discipline - still not to be dismissed lightly - and can be modified, and there are so many other areas of pastoral strategy where we need vigorous discussion and fresh ideas.

But, sorry, not in the area of doctrine, not part of the Church's received Tradition. Some might protest, take out ads, have yet another meeting. Go ahead. But, they should at least be accurate: don't blame "the Vatican" for doctrines you don't like. Blame Revelation, the Bible, Jesus, and Sacred Tradition. "The Vatican" does not "make-up" teaching, but only passes it on.

In the end, of course, our challenge is not to change the teachings of Jesus and His Church to conform to our whims, but to change our lives to conform to His teaching.

That's a headline you won't see.

By **Timothy M. Dolan, Archbishop of New York** - August 3, 2011 - on his blog, *The Gospel in the Digital Age*

TIME TO PROCLAIM THE PRIMACY OF JESUS CHRIST IN CREATION 7 of 7

"The Christian picture of the world is this, that the world in its details is the product of a long process of evolution but that at the most profound level it comes from the Logos. Thus it carries rationality within itself." (Pope Benedict XVI, as Cardinal Ratzinger, God and the World: A Conversation with Peter Seewald. Ignatius 2002 p. 139)

Conclusion: Time to Proclaim the Primacy of Christ

We have said before in *Faith* magazine that Pope John Paul II, supported especially by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, through his wide ranging and deep teaching over a long pontificate had really rebuilt the Catholic Faith and encouraged us all.⁹ In his teaching He had brought the Church to *the very threshold of a new synthesis of the Catholic Faith and the scientific vision of the universe*. In some of

his catecheses, in the Catechism, and in his Letter for the new millennium there has been a remarkable convergence.

What we are asking now is that Pope Benedict should go further and finally address the central synthetic principle of all Catholic teaching, *Christ the Sacrament of Creation*, and issue an encyclical on the Primacy of Christ in Creation. The Pope himself has got very close to this in the words quoted at the top of this piece. We ask that the Church should now

proclaim the Primacy of Christ over all Creation. For a new evangelisation we must preach the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Such a proclamation would be part of a tradition started in the Old Testament in the teaching that the world was only created for the Messiah. It was fulfilled by Sts John and Paul, the greatest and most profound teachers of the New Testament, and has then continued in the long history of the Church by a wide range of saints and doctors such as: St. Irenaeus, St. Justin Martyr, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Maximus the Confessor, St. Albert the Great, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Bonaventure, St. Mary Magdalen Pazzi, St. Francis de Sales, St. Maximilian Kolbe, St. Edith Stein, and not forgetting Pope John Paul II.

We would humbly ask the Holy Father to articulate this teaching and to proclaim finally that the Universe was only created for Jesus Christ, and for no other reason. Only Christ therefore is the ultimate answer to the personal, social and even ecological problems of the cosmos in which we live. Christ is the personal answer, bringing peace to our souls, conquering the appalling tragedy of sin and death. Christ is the social answer, teaching us to

value all human life and how we behave to each other. Christ is even the ecological answer, bringing God's presence into the cosmos which was created for Him. We realise that this claim for Christ is a staggering one, a "sign of contradiction". Many, however, disturbed by the emptiness and pessimism of the new atheism and agnosticism are yearning to find the true meaning of the universe, but there will be others who will hate and reject it. Thus it was with Jesus at the beginning so it will be at the end but the Gospel must be preached to the whole of creation.

If any reader, particularly from beyond *Faith* movement, would be interested in supporting the cause that the Primacy of Christ in Creation be more officially proclaimed and promoted do please let us know. It is also now possible for those committed to the importance of this vision to join *Faith* movement. On this theological theme the two *Faith* Pamphlets in the series Reasons for Believing *Jesus our Saviour* and *Jesus our Redeemer* are recommended.

⁹ "John Paul II: The Outstanding Teaching Legacy - But Is Anyone Listening?" *Faith* June 2005.

Editorial in ***FAITH Magazine*** - November-December 2009 - www.faith.org.uk

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)