

THANKSGIVING AFTER HOLY COMMUNION

By Fr Ignatius Douglas

A few years ago, one of the visiting teaching staff at an English seminary was an ex-nun, she had abandoned her vows and left her enclosed convent, having spent twenty years in that holy vocation. Unhappily, in these evil days, these are the kinds of characters that are often involved in priestly formation.¹

Nevertheless, I can remember on one occasion learning something quite significant from this tragic lady; she was asked what was the biggest change she had noticed on returning to the world after twenty years in an enclosed convent. The response she gave was profound, and it showed that whilst she had deserted her vocation she still believed the truths of the faith and the holiness of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. She responded:



"Before I went into the convent, people would remain kneeling down after Mass, but when I came out, they didn't do it anymore. Now, after Sunday Mass had finished, everyone was up and talking: there was no prayer, there was no period of thanksgiving, nobody did this anymore."

There has been a lot of progress since the Motu Proprio in the more widespread availability of the Old Mass, there has even been some uptake of the traditional breviary and a revival of the mantilla, but there has been minimal revival of this period of thanksgiving, of this period of speaking with Our Lord in Holy Communion, speaking one-to-one with Him, when the public liturgy has finished. I want to draw you into an examination of conscience on how you spend those moments of intimacy that follow Holy Communion.

¹ An amusing aside: When one of our many post-Conciliar "shepherds" of anti-Church put a radical feminist ex-nun in charge of his priestly formation, a good priest friend remarked, "It's a bit like putting Dr Harold Shipman in charge of the welfare of your elderly parents."

In the wonderful book by Fr Stephano Manelli, “*Jesus our Eucharistic Love*”, he makes it very clear, through quoting the saints, that the practice of thanksgiving is central to Catholic piety. The saints teach unanimously that each one of us should be spending at least 15 minutes in prayer after Holy Communion and preferably half an hour. This is because Jesus Christ is physically inside of you for that time span, and according to St Alphonsus this is the most efficacious time of prayer that there is. It is the time for the lover to speak to his beloved; it is the time to get healing and strength and all the graces that you need.

The manna that the Jews were fed with in the desert contained every delight of taste. However, Holy Communion is Jesus Christ, who is the source of every virtue, every grace, everything you could possibly need in life. He is there for your benefit, not for His. It is no wonder that He told St Margaret Mary how much it saddened Him that so many Catholics received Him lukewarmly, with so little devotion.

Do you plan your Holy Communion? Do you prepare in your heart an intention to lay before Him? Do you remain in His company even in times of dryness? It should be enough to know that he is physically with you at that time.

The question remains though, how did this time of thanksgiving get eliminated from the day to day piety of so many Catholics, and why is it that it is yet to be fully recovered even in Traditional Mass communities?

The problem lies with the Novus Ordo. Thanksgiving after Holy Mass is the natural urge of a genuine interior soul, one whom has learned to converse personally and intimately with Jesus. The root problem is that the new Mass is not ordered towards producing interior souls, it is ordered toward producing wholly exterior souls. This perverse influence of the New Mass has unfortunately pervaded into Old Rite communities because most of us who attend Old Rite Masses have not attended the Old Rite all our lives nor had the privilege of growing up with it.

At the Novus Ordo we subconsciously pick up the idea that prayer is slavishly following along with the words the priest is saying in a little missalette, and saying our parts in bold print. We pick up the idea that when the dialogue finishes, the show finishes, and the prayer finishes, and we can all go home.

This attitude can easily get transferred over into attending the Old Mass. You attend the Old Rite and slavishly follow the missal. You repeat the words of the server, howbeit in silence. You search around trying to track down the readings that the priest is using. You listen out and try to translate the bits of Latin that you can remember. And then, when the priest walks off at the end, you get up and go. The missal says that the rite has finished and so you presume that prayer has finished; this is attending the Old Mass as if it were the New Mass. It is allowing the exterior spirit of the New Mass to block the interiority that the Old Mass is designed to nurture and foster.

The Old Mass is designed to be a school of prayer, the sparseness of the exterior lay participation is a summons to interiority, to a full conscious and active participation in

the oblation of Jesus Christ. It is an opportunity to prepare your soul to receive Him and it allows you the silence to cover His feet with kisses following that beautiful and sweet moment when you do receive Him.

Our reformers deliberately made the New Mass to be more on the exterior, shallow level. They wanted the sacred mysteries to be more accessible. But this easy access is really just easy access to a surface level of participation in the sacred offering of Jesus Christ. So much so that the Catholic who claims to get more from the New Mass, doesn't usually mean that he understands more deeply that the sacrifice of our saviour has just been renewed in an unbloody way on the holy altar, no, he merely means that he knows when to say his bits.

Real active participation in Holy Mass is not familiarity with text, but spiritually inserting yourself, your life, all that you are into the sacrifice of Christ, which is being renewed on the altar in an unbloody manner. Real participation is offering yourself, a member of Jesus Christ's body, as a living sacrifice, in union with the offering of Jesus Christ the head of that body.

Tragically, if you want to go beyond surface level acquaintance with Christ, if you want to have real prayerful participation, the New Rite of Mass actually blocks this at every turn. St Teresa of Avila, the great Carmelite mystic would probably classify the dialogue based Novus Ordo as a type of prayer that belongs to individuals in the second mansion of the interior life. It stifles the interiority of the souls who are being drawn into the third and fourth mansions of more intimate prayer.

You are called to express contrition for sin in an abbreviated Confiteor that is made standing, a position of confidence rather than humble penitence. You spend all four minutes of Eucharistic Prayer 2 trying to contemplate Christ offering Himself to His Father for our sins, before being rudely interrupted to stand up and to turn your focus away from Him in order to shake someone's hand. You are forced to remain standing while Our Lord's sacred body is broken at the Lamb of God and then you are dismissed almost as soon as you have consumed Our Lord's holy body.

The Old Mass is less accessible on a surface level, but the structure of the rite actually allows an easier access into the depths of what is really happening, into a participation in Christ's mystical oblation. To use an analogy, imagine you are swimming in the coral sea off the coast of Australia. In the New Mass you have no oxygen mask and have to stay near the surface and keep bobbing up for air. In the Old Mass you can swim down and enjoy the beauty of the sights that are only glimpsed briefly from the surface in the Novus Ordo.

Attending the Old Mass fruitfully, reaching those depths does require some training; most people can't just jump in and attain a conscious participation in Christ's mystical oblation. Perhaps somewhat controversially, I believe the best way to enter into the depths of the Old Mass is by using a prayer book that offers meditations for the different parts of Holy Mass; for beginners, this is much better than trying to navigate around a missal.

Often these meditations are described as "a devout method for hearing Holy Mass". I recommend the one in the book "*The Reign of Jesus Through Mary*" by Gabriel Denis, it is called "Manner of Hearing Holy Mass in Union with Mary." These books break Holy Mass down into four or five parts and offer meditations and some prayers to be repeated during each section of the Mass.

The meditations for each section are linked to the actions and prayers of the priest at that point. So, for instance, the initial part of the Holy Mass ought to be centred around an examination of conscience and in sorrow for our sins; perhaps the time of the Gospel, in wonder at the earthly life of Our Lord and in gratitude for His sublime teaching; and the canon of the Mass, in contemplating His passion and death that is being renewed on the altar.

These books invariably include meditations for the post communion period after Holy Mass has finished, because for the truly interior soul, the moment of Holy Communion is not a pointer towards the end of Holy Mass, but the beginning of a personal and intimate time of prayer that will continue for some time after the public liturgy has finished. These books even offer different prayer strategies for this time of thanksgiving: thanksgiving for sorrow for sin, thanksgiving in adoration of the hidden Jesus, thanksgiving for petitions for the needs of the Church, thanksgiving in gratitude for the gift of Jesus in Holy Communion.

Many of us have been corrupted by the Novus Ordo mentality even in attending the Old Mass; we need to shake this off and get back to experiencing Holy Mass as a more intimate time of prayer, a time for offering your life in union with the sacrifice of our Divine Redeemer, and a time to meet Him really and truly in Holy Communion.

We read in Scripture, "... this is the will of God your sanctification." We know from our faith that the most efficacious means of sanctification is interior union with the unbloody sacrifice of Christ at Holy Mass and then devout reception of His Holy Body and Blood in Holy Communion. This call to sanctification is far more important than slavishly following the recommended postures and responses of the New Mass, especially when the ancient tradition of the Church offers something far more sublime. For this reason I strongly encourage everyone who occasionally or even frequently attends the New Mass, to enrich their participation by learning from the rubrics of the Old.

Many priests, including bishops and cardinals, are heeding the summons to enrich the New Rite by learning from the Old. For the priest the enrichment of the New Rite is accomplished by offering Mass *Ad orientem*, using the Roman Canon, with the traditional rubrics from the older form united to it. But there is a mutual enrichment that the laity should be carrying out when they attend the New Mass. There are three ways to do this, three ways of refusing to allow the Novus Ordo to thwart the personal sanctification that you are called to by your baptism.

1. Remain kneeling from the Sanctus all the way to Holy Communion, this will ensure that your prayerful participation in Christ's sacrifice will not be interrupted by what is called the Sign of Peace.
2. Repeat prayers during the course of Holy Mass, acts of love, acts of desire for Holy Communion, acts of faith in what is occurring. One can also enrich these private prayers with the traditional prayers from the Old Rite, such as the second Confiteor before Holy Communion, and the Leonine prayers following Holy Mass.
3. Finally, put aside that missalette and start focusing on the meditation of Christ's passion and on trying to contemplate the sacrifice that is being renewed on the holy altar.

I still remember, growing up in a Novus Ordo parish, being struck by the devotion of a lady who attended the new Mass with the postures and actions of the old. At that time I had never been to the Old Mass and therefore didn't realise the origin of her devout hearing of Holy Mass, but I knew instinctively that she was on to something, and I began to copy her, as did others. This is not inventing rubrics, this is maintaining the traditional rubrics that are ordered towards sanctification, this is getting serious about your baptismal call to holiness, this is refusing to allow the New Mass to stunt your spiritual growth and your active participation in the oblation of Jesus Christ.

Holy Mass is meant to be the principle means of our sanctification, of making available to us the riches of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary, and of allowing us to have real union with Him in Holy Communion. Something has gone drastically wrong in the last 50 years. For most people, Holy Mass has stopped being this time of intimate prayer, and has become a dialogue with the priest. As a result, that unparalleled time of grace, the thanksgiving, has become an endangered species, close to extinction.

We need to make a conscious effort to drink of the spiritual depths that are made available by the Old Mass by following meditations that guide you through the various parts of the Mass, personal prayer and especially by making a conscious and committed effort in the time that follows Holy Communion.

We must consciously resist the temptation of infecting the Old Mass with the exteriority that the New Mass imposes on us. On the occasions that you are obliged to attend the Novus Ordo, make a resolution to enrich your participation in it by harnessing the traditional postures and prayers that come from the traditional form.

Holy Communion is the source of everything you need in this life, and anticipates the joys of the next. If we really believe this, it should be evident in the fervour and devotion with which you attend Holy Mass, in whatever rite. And above all, it should be manifest in the concentration you give to that privileged and holy time with Our Lord, the time of thanksgiving.

And always be faithful to that time of thanksgiving that should follow Holy Mass. Our Lord single out and praised the one leper who returned in gratitude, when He had

cured ten. Resolve to be the one who turns to Our Lord in gratitude, be the one who makes reparation for the coldness and ingratitude of those who hurry to their cars or to fill their mouths with tea and biscuits.

THE LIBERAL PSYCHOSIS - By Graham Moorhouse

"The further a society drifts from the truth, the more it will hate those that speak it." - George Orwell

Just Asking

When some secular, hard-left, IRA thug, who has never been inside a Catholic church in his life, guns down a British soldier or off-duty policeman, it was always implied by liberals that it has something to do with Catholicism and religious bigotry. However, when a devout Muslim, who spends half his life in the mosque, murders a couple of hundred innocent people while shouting *Allah Akbar* for the zillionth time this year, the same media announces that (all together now) *"It has nothing to do with Islam."* Why's that? Just asking.



Liberalism in Pictures

It is not a hyperbole to describe the liberal mindset as psychotic. What do I mean by psychotic? I mean it has an inherent inability to confront, deal or cope with reality. A classic extreme example would be the lunatic claiming to be Napoleon Bonaparte. His psychosis enables him to maintain this patent nonsense in spite of a mountain of evidence to the contrary, not least of which is that the real Napoleon has been dead for some time. The liberal believes that he can define or redefine reality by a fiat of his will, and that is surely the very essence of psychotic. Note that it has nothing to do with intelligence or charm; the liberal is frequently both highly intelligent and charming.

One example would be David Cameron pushing through his gay sham 'marriage'. The reality is that what defines marriage, and separates it from all other relationships, is sex. Two men cannot have sex, therefore two men cannot marry - QED. Yes, we are all well aware that two men can indulge in a disgusting, unnatural and unhealthy, parody of sex, but a parody is by definition not the real thing. Thus gay sham 'marriage' is merely a parody of real marriage. To call what faggots get up to "sex" is like calling a lunatic stuffing food in his ear "eating".

Yet another example would be Jeremy Corbyn's statement at the Labour Party conference that mass net inward migration had no effect on house prices. Any schoolboy studying GCSE level economics would be able to tell you that prices are determined by supply *and* demand. But Jeremy, because of his liberal psychosis, is able to suspend the demand side of this equation as if reality could be waved away with a flick of his secular liberal wrist.

Another example from within the Church; a liberal bishop can be fully aware of the fact that over ninety per cent of the victims of clerical sex abuse by Catholic priests are adolescent males, and yet still vigorously assert that the Church doesn't have a homosexual problem - here we see the classic liberal ideological refusal to face reality on steroids!

What do I mean by "liberal"? Well it is an omnibus term for a reality that is not easy to pin down because it is a multi-headed hydra. Understanding its progenitors is helpful: international socialism, leftism, state-ism, cultural Marxism, communism, atheism, Freemasonry, ma-



terialism, Christophobia; all these entities are neither separate nor separable, they are intertwined, and readily morph one into the other. They can be traced back at least to the Jacobins of the 18th Century, a clique of secular humanists who were early globalists and heavily intertwined with Freemasonry.

The Jacobins spread from Germany to France with a fully developed plan, fermented in the Masonic lodges, to engineer a social explosion as a means to obtaining power. The Jacobin/Freemasonic destabilization plan became the template for many more bloody "people's" revolutions after the French Revolution. We are all familiar with Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Many are less familiar with the early 20th Century British Fabian socialists, or the Italian Marxist theoretician Antonio Gramsci, or the German "Frankfurt School" of international socialists, who transplanted their ideology to the United States via Columbia University. In the end, these clandestine international socialist forces wormed deep into the entrails of the West and achieved results that are far more profound and lasting than the crude militarily-imposed revolutionary "wars" of the likes of Lenin and Mao.

The left has believed since the French Revolution that it was their duty to impose a top-down order upon the "dumb masses," a new world order managed by self-certified experts chosen from among their own ranks. The EU is a classic materialisation of their dreams. Today, the leftist/liberal demonic march through the institutions, government, academia and the media, is complete. One has only to listen to someone like Tom Bradby anchoring ITV News to confirm the truth of that last statement.

What defines the liberal and sets him apart from his fellow man is that he has enthroned his will where his intellect should be. This can truly be described as the Devil's final victory, because it is in our intellect that man is the most obviously God-like. Liberalism is an ideology and something is true for an ideologue because he wills it to be true, reality has very little to do with it. This explains why liberals can believe that a sexual pathology (homosexuality) that has given us over fifty per cent of the world's serial killers, nearly eighty percent of convicted child molesters, the entire officer core of the Nazi Storm Troopers and some twenty percent of the Nazi death camps most sadistic guards, is merely a harmless "orientation" - he wills it to be true, therefore facts, science and history are all beside the point.

One can demonstrate that liberalism is a psychosis by just looking at the brouhaha around Bruce Jenner's supposed sex change. One liberal university even went so far as to cancel a speaking engagement by Germaine Greer because she dared to point out that a bloke in a frock, is just that, a *bloke* in a frock. Because liberalism is an ideology rather than a system of rational thought, liberals are like walking iPods and the current masters of the universe can write on them any tune they choose. If Bruce Jenner had claimed to be a four foot tall Chinaman, we would have been permitted to dismiss it, but a 6'-0" hairy bloke can claim to be a woman, and we must accept it or be denounced as haters. The only difference is that those who dictate what the latest liberal dogmas must be haven't as yet got round to mandating "trans-racism" or "trans-heightism", but embracing trans-genderism is now mandatory in the liberal asylum.

Liberals, whether they are the hectoring and bullying ones like Piers Morgan, or the snarling, sarcastic, mocking type like Jeremy Paxman, or the smiling charmers (men whom are very difficult to dislike) such as Tom Bradby, are all fanatically committed to promoting their post-Christian, secular, false religion, and are keen to push the dogmas of their faith, from Darwinism to transgenderism, with a missionary zeal that shames most Catholics.

To give a veneer of plausibility and intellectualism to his distaste for science and reality, the liberal is fond of pontificating, "*There is no such thing as absolute truth.*" However, the statement that, "*There is no such thing as absolute truth.*" purports itself to be a statement of absolute truth! So clearly here the liberal is hoisted by his own petard, but few indeed will have the courage or personal integrity to acknowledge this.

Once one has fallen into the trap of liberalism it is all but impossible, humanly speaking, to escape, for the key to this prison lies in one's intellect and the liberal has placed

that in bondage. Nothing is impossible to God, of course, and grace can break through, but the liberal is especially resistant to grace. Further, because he has dethroned his intellect, liberals are not very responsive to rational argument in the classical or scholastic form, i.e. arguing from established facts, first premises, to valid conclusions. However, they have developed a number of very effective techniques to compensate for this Achilles' heel.

One technique is to claim to have such overwhelming firsthand experience of the issues in question that arguments are utterly beside the point - facts after all must trump theories every time. Thus if you attempt to debate gay sham marriage, the liberal will always preface his response with, "*My gay friends ...*" It appears that every liberal can lay claim to at least twenty gay friends. Where are all these gay friends coming from? Are there a couple of dozen gay men out there who have been given the task to go round befriending every liberal on the planet? Of course not; the objective of this ruse is simple: to shut you up with your rational arguments and scientific facts by claiming such overwhelmingly superior experience that rational arguments and scientific facts are redundant.

Another technique one can only describe as pseudo-arguments. An example: Say you have broached the subject of same-sex sham 'marriage' on half a dozen occasions over the past year or so. The liberal will assert that because you have addressed this subject on a number of occasions you must be harbouring suppressed inclinations in that direction yourself. He will then sit back grinning smugly as if he had scored some devilishly clever debating point. Notwithstanding that this argument has about as much merit as suggesting that a daffodil enthusiast must be a secretly suppressed daffodil, it will not prevent many people acclaiming this liberal drivel with enthusiasm. Fifty years ago, when even small children were taught logic as a branch of mathematics, a reasonably intelligent primary school child would have been equipped to dismiss such patent nonsense out of hand.

Intimidation is their next tried and tested technique. One can witness this technique in operation every day. In fact, it is now so all prevalent, we barely notice it anymore. The following email recently received illustrates this point perfectly: "***I would like to request that you remove my name off your database. Your literature is full of hatred and despicable untruths attacking various groups in our society. You are so far away from Christianity that you are a disgrace to call yourself a Christian. I am forwarding your literature to the police to investigate under the "The Racial and Religious Hatred Act 2006" as to whether you are breaching the law and whether any penalties can be imposed to stop you promoting hate against large parts of our society. I suggest that you stop writing such hatred and learn what it is to be a Christian. Regards, Theresa Hellyer (Yorkshire).***" Here we again see the liberal mindset on steroids, for what this email is basically saying is, "*Because I do not like what you say, I shall seek to get you into serious trouble and silenced.*" This, from a mindset that never ceases to sanctimoniously preach non-judgmentalism and inclusiveness. Who was it wrote, if you scratch a liberal, you'll find a Fascist?

This email also perfectly illustrates another technique used by liberals, always keep it deliberately vague. They prefer to stick doggedly to generalisations when making their fuzzy bad-tempered accusations. "*Your literature is full of hatred and despicable untruths attacking various groups in our society.*" - surely, if the Flock was "full of despicable untruths" it would be a very easy matter for Ms Hellyer to illustrate the veracity of her wild assertion by quoting just one or two of these "*despicable untruths*". But no, the liberal will never do that, he feels on much safer ground by keeping it vague and saying things like, "I find your manner of addressing this issue offensive", or "divisive", or he will accuse you of being a "hater", or label you with one of his made-up mental illnesses like "homophobia" or "Islamophobia" or "right-wing extremism". The experience for the non-Liberal is rather like playing tennis with one's opponent standing in a different court.

An example of this sort of bullying was seen after the recent wicked murder of some fifty gay men and women in a gay bar in Orlando. The media immediately turned this into a bizarre celebration of faggots and faggotry. The message was clear, dare to question what we are doing and you will be publicly branded a bigot and hater and sent to stand in the corner with your hands on your head.

Political correctness is merely another facet of liberal bullying. What used to be called good manners and was taught by parents has now been refashioned into a weapon whose sole purpose is to stop you questioning liberal dogma. If you do, you will bring a pack of media hounds on your back, and they will not be satisfied until they have drawn blood and driven you from the field. Witness the liberal crucifying of Dr Church, an American physician driven from office for merely daring to suggest that homosexuals should be advised of the health risks that come with their chosen lifestyle. The liberal is forced to resort to bullying, precisely because his views cannot be supported by rational arguments; what possible rational argument could one muster to oppose Dr Church's modest proposal?

Another way at looking at this political correctness thing is to view it as the shouting that accompanies a certain type of lying. If you have ever had experience of alcoholics, you will know that lying comes as natural to them as swimming does to a fish. They lie, however, in a different way to most sons of Adam, who lie with a synthetic casualness, letting the lie trip off the tongue in a way that they hope will not draw attention. The alcoholic on the other hand will shout the lie in your face, his face contorted with rage; it is as if he believes that his shouting will give the lie substance. The shrill name calling that liberals indulge in when someone utters a rational thought that they don't like is analogous to this sort of lying.

The next technique is the manipulation of language. Modern history is littered with examples: the Nazis' "final solution" meaning slaughtering the Jews en masse (let's not forget that "Nazi" is just the acronym of their full name, the "National Socialist German Workers Party"); pro-aborts, "the products of conception" meaning an unborn child; "racist", "bigot", "hater", "homophobe", "xenophobe", "Islamophobe" and

"right-wing extremist" are similar nonsense, words describing invented illnesses and manufactured to save the liberal from having to engage in rational debate.

The liberal is very hot on what he likes to call "his values". He is the original Mr-Guardian-Reading-Lip-Biting-In-Earntness himself. His voice quivering with liberal superiority and his eyes gleaming like freshly polished snooker balls, he will prate on about his personal values, and say things like, *"that's so contrary to my values."* There is a big problem here, because in the material world of the Liberal, we are all just bags of chemicals walking around as a result of an evolutionary fluke. In such a world, one man's values are obviously as good as another's, for all views are chemically determined. The liberal is thus trapped, constantly regurgitating conventional wisdom, whilst comically and tragically imagining that it's his own opinion. He will then publicly pat himself on the back for living true to his values, and claim that this demonstrates that he is a man of integrity. Because they think about the world around them in ways guided exclusively by emotions, they react to disappointment or loss as self-righteous victims, or antisocial thugs, rather than mentally sound individuals

The non-Liberal believes he is right because he has followed a chain of arguments that lead to an inescapable conclusion, even if it is a conclusion which he may not like. This, of course, doesn't preclude the possibility that his conclusion is incorrect; his premises may be wrong, or the conclusion he draws from them invalid. The liberal, on the other hand, knows he is right rather like a member of the Hitler Youth knew that Jews are bad. Why, there was a scientific consensus, was there not? After all, his teacher had told him it was true, his youth leaders had told him it was true, the politicians told him it was true, the media told him it was true and academia was unanimous in holding it to be true; who would be so foolish and arrogant as to question such an overwhelming consensus? - the handful of deniers were, obviously, nutters who deserved their comeuppance. This explains why liberals as a class so enthusiastically embrace man made global warming (which has recently morphed into climate change). Indeed, to hear some liberals speak, one could imagine that before he was born, the climate was so predictable, one needed merely to look out the window to determine the date.

Because his creed is grounded in his will rather than his intellect, the liberal hates science with a passion. This explains why he can repeatedly assert that homosexuality is inherent, i.e. men are born that way, notwithstanding the fact that there is not a scrap of scientific evidence to support this theory, and a mountain of scientific evidence to debunk it. This hatred for science is also why he can support same-sex adoption, notwithstanding the mountain of studies that prove that this is extremely damaging for children - it has everything to do with the will of the ideologue.

The liberal seldom understands irony. One example, we had a rather scruffy middle-aged gentleman approach us recently outside Brixton station, who then launched into a 5-minute tirade against the Flock. His invective was inventive, colourful and abusive, to say the least. It was obvious that there was absolutely no point in trying to

argue, so we just smiled and thanked him for his comments. As Our Lord said, "brush the dust from your sandals". But what could be more ironic than spending 5-minutes publicly abusing someone for allegedly being abusive? Our friend concluded by threatening to report us to some unspecified authorities if we didn't become tame little liberals more to his taste. It is very interesting that no Flock reader would wish to silence this gentleman, indeed, many would want to protect his right to his patently daft views; but he would like to silence us if it was in his power. This, I repeat, is because his will is where his intellect should be, consequently, when we disagree with him, it is his will that is being challenged, not his intellect.

Such is the nature of his psychosis that a liberal has no difficulty believing that Islam, a religion that was founded by a sexually perverted war lord, and which has spent the last fourteen centuries expanding by military conquest and promiscuous slaughter, which has also been in a permanent state of bloody civil war since its inception, and which provides well over ninety per cent of the world's terrorists, is a "Religion of Peace"TM.

In 2015 alone there were 2,849 attacks by orthodox, practicing Muslims ("Islamist", "Radical Islam", "Extremists", etc, are all words made up by the liberal establishment to obscure the fact that **Islam itself** is inherently and irreducibly violent, inhuman, supremacist and anti-civilisational) in 52 countries, resulting in 27,435 innocent men, women and children slaughtered and 26,144 critically injured. Furthermore, these attacks were frequently ordered by commanders who hold degrees in Islamic theology from Islamic universities. The number killed by Islamists last year alone is over ten times the number killed by the Provisional IRA in the entire course of its 30 year war. The liberal is a man who can look at that fact, and say, with a straight face, "*It has nothing to do with Islam.*"

For one to truly follow Islam, one must emulate Muhammad to the best of their ability. This includes beheading, raping, enslaving, lying, and molesting children. To say that any of these practices are un-Islamic is to say that their "prophet" is un-Islamic. For a Muslim, that is blasphemy; for a non-Muslim, it is just plain nuts.

Because he has enthroned his will where his intellect should be, the liberal is perfectly capable of holding two contradictory thoughts in his head at the same time, without any cognitive dissonance, in a way that would make the non-liberal's head explode.

Thus, for example, a liberal can march on Monday to support the rights of a Samburu tribesman to defend his land, ethnicity, culture and way of life passed down to him from his ancestors, and then march on Tuesday to denounce an Englishman for seeking a tenth as much as a "Little Englander, xenophobic, racist bigot".

A liberal can routinely make the judgement that people who disagree with him are, by definition, bigots, while, at the same time, repeatedly affirming that one should not be judgemental.

The liberal has no problem believing that having black children adopted by white families is a bad idea because the children will grow up in an unnatural situation that

could cause problems in later life, yet at the same time believe that those who oppose the adoption of children by two men united in a sham marriage by an addiction to sodomy are homophobic bigots.

The liberal can march on Wednesday against Fascism because he passionately believes that the indiscriminate killing of innocent Jews by Hitler was an horrendous crime, and then march on Thursday in support of the world-wide indiscriminate slaughter of innocent children in the womb by abortion.

A liberal can march on Thursday in support of state funded artificial contraception and abortion to avoid overpopulation and demographic disaster, and then march on Friday to support uncontrolled immigration of a third of a millions immigrants per year into the UK because that is deemed good for the economy.

A liberal can believe that a white man who votes for a white presidential candidate because he is white, is a racist bigot, but a black man who votes for a black candidate just because he is black is a fine, decent, upright fellow.

A liberal can believe that the 700 woman who every day in the UK have their child murdered by abortion suffer no lasting psychological negative effects, but believe the odd one or two who put their baby up for adoption *must* suffer life long regret.

The same liberal media that has spent the last thirty years trying to convince us that AIDs is not a gay problem and that we are all equally at risk, is now campaigning for a drug costing £400 a month to be distributed free by the NHS to gay men to reduce their chances of catching AIDs. As someone has observed, "Liars need good memories."

The liberal can march on Friday to support a bill criminalising smoking in cars because of the alleged (and yet unproven) dangers of passive smoking, and then turn out on Saturday to support a Gay Pride march, notwithstanding that the death toll from AIDs is 30,000,000 and still counting, and that the "LGBT Community"TM suffers from so many diseases that some American hospitals are opening whole units specialising in them. In 2014, homosexual men accounted for 83% of primary and secondary syphilis cases in the United States. Homosexual men also acquire other STDs, including chlamydia, gonorrhea and HPV (Human papillomavirus), the most common STD, which can lead to the development of anal and oral cancers. In fact, homosexual men are *17 times* more likely to get anal cancer than normal men.

Moreover, the medical profession knows why homosexual men are prone to so much ill health, yet few are brave enough to explain this. For such is the liberal psychosis that merely telling the truth will get you branded as a "homophobe", and to be labelled with that invented mental illness can seriously blight, or indeed even destroy, your career.

The truth is simple; the human body is designed to reject anything that it perceives as foreign. This is why the recipients of transplant organs have to take drugs to suppress their auto-immune system for the rest of their life, or their body will reject the transplanted organ. Male sperm is a foreign body as far as the woman's body is concerned,

and her body's auto-immune system would attack and kill the sperm if it was not for something rather wonderful; sperm has within it a chemical to suppress the female auto-immune system. However, God has so magnificently designed the woman's body, that the auto-immune suppressing property of male sperm is restricted to just part of her reproductive system and thus in no way compromises the woman's general health. However, when male sperm enters the body of another male, there is no mechanism to restrict the auto-immune suppressant properties in the sperm to a given organ. The whole auto-immune system is, thus, compromised. When you consider that the average homosexual has a *minimum* of 500 sexual partners, one gets a handle on just how seriously his auto-immune system is being damaged by this continuous bombardment, and can understand why homosexuals are prone to a whole raft of diseases, including a number of fatal ones.

Should we be surprised by the disconnection between reality and the beliefs of those trapped in the liberal psychosis? Surely not! If you can believe that Bruce Jenner is a woman, there can be very little, if indeed anything, that you are not capable of believing when ordered to do so by the Masters of the Universe.

**BISHOP PATRICK MCKINNEY
YET ANOTHER TWO-A-PENNY BOG-STANDARD SHEPHERD OF ANTI-
CHURCH**

Bishop Patrick McKinney celebrated Mass for *obstinate* and *proudly unrepentant* grave sinners of the assorted lesbian, sodomitical, bisexual and transgender varieties in St Barnabas' Cathedral on Saturday 15th October 2016 at 3.00 pm. He even has the rainbow symbol of the militant homofascist collective displayed on his diocesan website. The hypocritical and sanctimonious pretext for this sacrilege is - you've probably already guessed it - the creepy Year of "Mercy".

The following month, his Lordship plans a special Mass for obstinate and proudly unrepentant Nazis and will be displaying a swastika on his website. And the month after that he plans a Mass for obstinate and proudly unrepentant sadomasochists and will be displaying a picture of a dominatrix with a whip on his website.

I jest of course, but why is his Lordship's faux mercy so narrowly focused on people who burn with lust for the unnatural, unhealthy, disgusting vice of same-sex anal copulating, you may well ask? Why no public displays of mercy for *obstinate* and *unrepentant* shop lifters, abortionists, rapists, paedophiles, wife beaters, racists and "right-wing extremists", for example? Why is their much vaunted "mercy" so narrowly targeted and restricted?

The answer is simple. It has absolutely nothing to do with mercy (faux or genuine) and everything to do with promoting the sodomite agenda within the Church. A true shepherd of the true Church would be on his knees begging grave sinners to repent before it was too late, that would be true mercy - just as our Blessed Lord implored the young woman taken in adultery to "go, and sin no more." I find it difficult to de-

cide which is the more offensive, his Lordship's rank hypocrisy or his obvious contempt for the intelligence of the faithful.

I recently learned that there were three Catholic priests on board the Titanic, Father Juozas Montvila of Lithuania, Father Josef Peruschitz, O.S.B. of Bavaria, and English rector Father Thomas Byles. All three men declined lifeboats and chose what must be one of the worst deaths imaginable, drowning - and a freezing, black, watery grave at the bottom of the Atlantic - rather than abandon souls in peril. Their bodies have never been recovered.

These priests led passengers in the recitation of the Rosary, and, according to the survivors, *“aroused those condemned to die to acts of contrition and to prepare themselves to meet the face of God,”* and they were, *“engaged continuously giving general absolution to those who were about to die.”*

Seriously? Do you actually mean that there was mercy in the Church before Vatican II, the election of Pope Humble the 1st and the present unctuous episcopacy? Go on, you're winding me up - having a laugh ... aren't you?

Once Bishop McKinney has prostituted his soul to the service of the egregious militant homofascist collective, it will be extremely hard to retrace his steps - sadly, once a whore always a whore.

What's to be done? Well, two things: Keep praying the rosary - and make sure you never put a brass farthing in the coffers of these charlatans. And stay cheerful; the revolution will fail. It's just a matter of time, prayer and perseverance.

“Throughout Sacred Scripture we see the same pattern repeating itself - God works through small numbers, 'faithful remnants' almost invisible within a larger sea of largely unfaithful humanity.” - Roy Schoeman

CHILDREN AND TV By Dr Joseph Shaw

I recently took my two oldest children, aged ten and eight, to see a Shakespeare play in Stratford-on-Avon. We were greeted with incredulity wherever we went. One of the theatre employees remarked that his own children didn't have the attention span to watch a whole episode of “Neighbours”. That struck me as a revealing remark.



The world created by television is an adult world, not because it is profound, but because it is shallow. There is more wisdom in a Victorian fairy story than in twenty episodes of a soap opera. There is a more sophisticated vocabulary, a wider range of styles, and even an appreciation of more different cultures. In reading “The Blue Fairy Book” or “Treasure Island” to my children, I was consulting dictionaries, maps, and Wikipedia to keep up. But children are content to understand things at their own level, and to fit what they don't know in with what they do.

Indeed this is true of everyone's appreciation of what is genuinely profound in literature or art. We don't understand it all; we don't suck it dry; we take from a parable of Jesus, or a great painting, something, not everything; perhaps something we need at that moment. We needn't be afraid of children having the same experience. Simple art and simple stories need not lack depth, but what is presented on the TV nearly always does. TV producers need to feed the short attention-spans they have created, and they are prisoners of a conception of human life which lacks a spiritual dimension, and sometimes even an emotional one. Which came first, a medium which creates passivity, or a world view which assigns value only to pleasurable sensations? It would seem they have grown up together.

I'm unable to do a 'before and after' study of my children with TV, because we haven't had broadcast TV since before the oldest was able to watch it. My children have watched DVDs: their favourite is a 30-minute animated version of Mozart's Magic Flute made by Welsh TV, followed by *The Taming of the Shrew* in the same series. But while there are advantages to them knowing what moving pictures look like (they aren't instantly mesmerised when they see them in a friend's house), it is true to say that the telly doesn't play a significant part in their lives.

What do they do all day? Chesterton remarked that it is perfectly possible to turn the clock back; it is just a matter of effort. In their free time my home-schooled children do the things children did fifty or a hundred years ago. They play; once they learn to read, they read. They play card games. They've just learnt to play draughts, and that has become quite a craze. Last summer they discovered croquet; it was set up on the lawn and on fine days they'd be playing before breakfast. They aren't especially precocious: they don't actually understand Shakespeare plays without it being explained, and I can still beat them at chess. But they are having a childhood.

Dr Joseph Shaw is a Tutorial Fellow in Philosophy at St Benet's Hall, Oxford, he is the chairman of the Latin Mass Society and runs St Catherine's Trust <http://stcatherinetrust.org/> which promotes Catholic education in accordance with the traditional teachings of the Church. He is a regular blogger on Traditional Catholic Issues.

BISHOP HAN DINGXIANG
with Acknowledgement to ACN

For China's Catholics, Bishop John Han Dingxiang is a martyr. The scale of his personal sacrifice and pastoral commitment is both deeply moving and inspiring. By the time of his death in September 2007, John Han had spent 30 years in labour camps, in prison or under house arrest, all for the love of Christ.

When he was ill and dying, the authorities summoned his closest relatives, but no priest was allowed at his bedside. Within six hours of his death, the authorities had cremated him and buried him in a public cemetery; his tombstone did not even mention that he was a bishop. Chinese Catholics were naturally outraged.

Bishop John Han's resilience in the face of persecution dates back more than half a century. John Han was born on the 17 May 1939. In spite of the turmoil caused by war with Japan and the civil war between Communists and Nationalists, it was a time of rapid growth for the Church. In 1946, Pope Pius XII established the Catholic hierarchy in China.



John Han entered a minor seminary in 1952 at the age of thirteen. A mere three years earlier Mao Tse Tung had declared victory over the Nationalists and had begun to clampdown on what the left deemed "unpatriotic" activities.

Barely two years into his studies, John Han's seminary was disbanded. He would have to wait some thirty years for ordination. In the early 1950's, the communists were expelling priests from China and many bishops were imprisoned. Seminary superiors advised their students to flee China.

John Han, however, opted to remain and continue his studies secretly in the Underground Church. The authorities sought to split the Church by setting up an official Church that owed allegiance to the Communist authorities, those faithful and their priest and bishops who refused allegiance to the state church were known as the Underground Church.

John Han was among those faithful who remained loyal to the Underground Church, resisting all government interference. In so doing they put their lives on the line for Christ, constantly in danger of arrest and even torture. In 1960 John Han was arrested and sent to a "reform through education" camp. It is interesting to note how the left abuses education to form people to their ideology; secular liberals are doing something very similar with the British education system today. Some 40 million people were sent to these camps. Survivors have described working in sub-zero conditions, amidst filth and degradation. Beatings were commonplace and many died from ill-treatment and sheer exhaustion.

It was now the late 1960's and the Church had outwardly disappeared. All Catholic churches had been closed and many demolished. China would not awake from this 'nuclear winter' until after Mao's death in September 1976. The new leader was a little more tolerant, and among the prisoners of conscience released from the camps at this time was John Han. He found work as a teacher and was ordained on 21st November 1986. Less than three years later he became a bishop.

However, in spite of the increased leniency, the authorities remained implacably opposed to the real, i.e "underground", Catholic Church. In the ten years following being raised to the episcopacy, John Han was arrested eleven times!



The last time Bishop Han enjoyed freedom was on the 20th November 1999. He was arrested while conducting a retreat for some religious sisters. The final eight years of his life were spent in custody with his health in decline. But he did not disappear completely. Footage shot in 2005 captured him on

the balcony of a police detention facility. His frail frame, clad in white, appeared behind the bars of the cage that enclosed the balcony. He was obviously aware of the cameraman concealed in the shrubbery below the balcony. He first ensures his jailors do not suspect anything amiss by turning to clean the windows with a rag. Once he is confident the coast is clear, he makes the Sign of the Cross to the camera, unfolds a banner emblazoned with a religious slogan, and then in a poignant moment holds up a crucifix, pushing it through the bars and holding it above his head.

Bishop Han's extraordinary life survives him in ways other than this clandestine video footage, he was an accomplished self-taught artist, and presented some of his water-colour work to Aid to the Church in Need. These exquisite studies of fish and butterflies were given to ACN in 1998.

In spite of the authorities' continuing efforts to divide the faithful, the flock of his diocese remain united by his memory. The authorities fear John Han even in death. During the Beijing Olympics, plainclothes police closely guarded his grave. But the people revere him as a martyr saint and regularly visit his grave. And many young Chinese men are studying for the priesthood, because they were inspired by Bishop Han's witness unto death.

BEGOGLIO THE BEFUDDLED STRIKES AGAIN

By: Graham Moorhouse (Based on a YouTube presentation by David Wood)

One would have thought that has Pope Francis as spent his life studying religion, his comments about Islam would at least be slightly more accurate than the patronising drivel we receive from the likes of President Obama, David Cameron, the BBC, ITV, CNN, ABC, The New York Times and such like. Wrong! Let's look at the Pope's recent remarks about Islam and violence:

"I don't like to speak of Islamic violence, because every day, when I browse the newspapers, I see violence, here in Italy ... this one who has murdered his girlfriend, another who has murdered the mother-in-law ... and these are baptised Catholics! There are violent Catholics! If I speak of Islamic violence, I must speak of Catholic violence ... and no, not all Muslims are violent, not all Catholics are violent. It is like a fruit salad; there's everything. There are violent persons of this religion ... this is

true: I believe that in pretty much every religion there is always a small group of fundamentalists. We have them. When fundamentalism comes to kill, it can kill with the language - the Apostle James says this, not me -- and even with a knife, no? I do not believe it is right to identify Islam with violence. This is not right or true."

So, all religions have their radicals. You don't condemn Catholicism when a baptised Catholic kills his girlfriend or mother-in-law, why would you condemn Islam when a jihadist kills several hundred unbelievers in the name of Allah? Pretty much the same dumb response we receive from just about every politician and media talking head. However, this one is a lot scarier because while we have come to expect utter drivel from politicians and the media, many people still trust the Pope. So, is the Pope right? Not even vaguely!

Why is the Pope wrong? Well, is a baptised Catholic commanded in Scripture, or by Christ, or by the Church, to kill his girlfriend or mother-in-law? No. So is a man killing his girlfriend or mother-in-law the result of his Catholic faith? Obviously not. Killing his wife or mother-in-law is a clear violation of his Catholic faith. When a Catholic gets angry and kills, he is acting *in spite* of his Catholic faith, not *because* of it.

There are of course cultural Muslims in the world who are peaceful, but Islam isn't defined by peaceful Muslims - or by violent Muslims - Islam is defined by the Qur'an and Mohammed. Now, when Muslims wage jihad, are they violating their Islamic faith? No. Is fighting unbelievers in the name of Allah something a jihadist just happens to do that is completely unconnected to his Islamic faith? No. When he saws off a non-Muslim's head, is he violating his Islamic faith? No. On the contrary, it's something that flows inexorably **from** his Islamic faith.

To confirm this, we merely need to read the Qur'an and other Islamic sources:

Qur'an 5:51 - O you who believe! do not take the Jews and the Christians for friends; they are friends of each other.

Qur'an 8:12 - [Remember] when your Lord inspired to the angels, "I am with you, so strengthen those who have believed. I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieved, so strike [them] upon the necks [i.e. behead or slit their throats] and strike from them every fingertip." [Charming!].

Qur'an 9:73 - O Prophet! - strive hard against the unbelievers and the hypocrites and be unyielding to them.

Qur'an 9:111 Surely Allah has brought of the believers their persons and their property for this, that they shall have the garden. They fight in Allah's way, so they slay and are slain. ["**slay and are slain**", that sounds peaceful doesn't it?]

Qur'an 9:123 O you who believe, fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you and let them find in you hardness.

Qur'an 47:35 - Be not weary and fainthearted, crying for peace, when ye should be uppermost.

Qur'an 48:29 - Mohammed is the messenger of Allah, and those who are with him are severe against disbelievers, and merciful among themselves.

Sahih Muslim 30 - Mohammed said: "I have been commanded to fight against people so long as they do not declare that there is no god but Allah."

Sahih Muslim 4366 - Mohammed said: "I will expel the Jews and Christians from the Arabian Peninsula and will not leave any but Muslims."

Sunan An-Nasa'i 3099 - The Prophet said: "Whoever dies without having fought or having thought of fighting, he dies on one of the branches of hypocrisy."

Sunan Ibn Majah 2763 - The Messenger of Allah said: "Whoever meets Allah with no marks on him [as a result of fighting] in His cause, He will meet Him with a deficiency."

Sahil al Bukhari 6922 - Allah's Messenger said, "If anyone changes his Islamic religion, then kill him."

Sahih Muslim 129 - "I have been commanded to fight the people until they bear witness that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah, and that Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah."

Sahil al Bukhari 29/77 - What tactic brought Mohammed victory? "I have been made victorious with terror (cast in the hearts of the enemy)".

Qur'an 9:29 - Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the Religion of Truth, from among the people of the Book, until they pay the Jizyah with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.

The historical context of this last passage is particularly interesting. Within the territory of Mohammed's tribe in Mecca there was a temple to numerous pagan gods. Mohammed's tribe earned a living from trading with and receiving tribute from the various pagan tribes that visited this temple. Mohammed, because of his monotheistic views, decided to ban the pagan tribes from visiting the temple. His fellow tribesmen were naturally concerned about the loss of revenue that would result from this ban. Mohammed basically responded, *"Don't worry, we will violently intimidate them until they willingly pay us protection money."* Note: the passage doesn't say fight those who attack or threaten you, it says fight those who do not accept Islam. They are even commanded to fight those who do not hold forbidden that, "which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger"; i.e. if you enjoy a bacon sandwich, you will have to pay protection money or have your throat slit! The Kray twins and the Rich-ardsons had nothing on Mohammed.

Putting all of this together, is a baptised Catholic killing his girlfriend or mother-in-law in clear violation of his Catholic faith the same thing as a Muslim waging jihad because he has been commanded by Allah and Mohammed to do so? Obviously not, not even close.

Now there is certainly much the Pope could learn about Islam, but given the level of ignorance among world leaders, it would be good if he simply learned why his response to Islamic terror is utterly ludicrous - not to mention dangerous and rash, because innocent people are being slaughtered in their thousands, while world leaders defend Islam, the depraved ideology that mandates this butchery.

ONE LITTLE, TWO LITTLE, THREE LITTLE MIRACLES.....

By Richard Lawler (the son-in-law of PEEP's vice-chairman)

*Prologue: I believe in miracles. Holy Mother Church tells us they are real, in fact, She tells us we are not Catholics if we don't believe in them. The Bible is stuffed full of them. The lives of the saints and the entire history of the Church provide countless examples. All of Christianity entirely rests on two miracles, the virgin birth and resurrection of Our Lord. So, yes, I believe in miracles. But I have another, more personal reason for my belief; my family has been blessed with five of them in quick succession! The first two were the conversions of my wife and I from being serious, committed practitioners of Buddhism, to Traditional Roman Catholics. I'm not going into that here (maybe another time); this is the story of the young man who is now our son-in-law, because the third and fourth miracles were the conversions of him and our daughter. I asked them both to write an account of their conversions from their individual points of view. Here is Richard's; Sarah is a bit busy at the moment, as I'll explain at the end. **Patrick Lawler (Vice Chairman)***

My Conversion

I have been asked to write about my conversion but every time I think about why I converted to Catholicism, it seems to be something I cannot say simply. For years I was an atheist. I did not believe in God. But about a year and a half ago, I started going to Church, praying the rosary and saying my morning and evening prayers; all the things I now think all Catholics should be doing.

So why did I convert? To answer this, I had to think back on my life; who was I then and who am I now? For most of my life I did what everyone around me did; get drunk, have casual sex, watch TV all day, spend all day on the PC playing games.....it's an edifying list.

I did begin to question. I was restless, unsatisfied and I wanted to know. I wanted to know.....what? Why are we here? What is the meaning of life? I usually kept my questions to myself. I reached a point in my life where I kept on thinking "What is the point in all this?"

Late in 2014, my girlfriend (she is now my wife) had this thing about going into churches just to look at the buildings. To be honest, I used to complain like a spoiled child, wanting to leave. But it did start me thinking about why people believe in this crazy thing called religion. So I turned on the PC and, instead of gaming, I looked into different religions and their 'answers' to such questions as, for example, the reality, or otherwise, of evolution. I found that the theory of evolution has no scientific,

philosophical or theological support to it. None at all. This was an enormous breach in my world view, conditioned as it was by the all-enveloping propaganda of the 'reality' of evolution in education, the media and public discourse in general. I began to wonder what else I took for granted might not be true.

After looking into other religions, I came to rest on Christianity. Eastern faiths were simply obscure, inaccessible and downright unrealistic. Islam is nothing other than systematised evil, brutality and the endless pursuit of worldly power, as any honest and genuinely open-minded reading of its theology, doctrines, history and current actions in the world plainly shows.

However, while instinctively reaching for a God whom I increasingly believed was real, I still found it hard to even conceive who God is.

During this phase of research and questioning, my girlfriend, Sarah, wanted to start going to Roman Catholic Mass. This had not come out of the blue, her parents had both converted from Buddhism to Catholicism two years earlier. Sarah had been raised to be more-or-less atheist but had a lot of exposure to Buddhism through her parents.

So we went to some Novus Ordo masses. This did not help! I felt as though I was in a tearoom; old people chatting, with this man at the front just saying random things. From reading and internet trawling, I knew bits and pieces, such as what communion was meant to be and other things, but very much in a theoretical way, rather than anything personally meaningful.

Something that struck as wrong was people taking communion in the hand. My understanding was that the Catholic Church taught that the Host actually is Jesus, literally in the flesh, not just symbolically. And yet, people were simply taking it in their hands and popping it into their mouths as if it was nothing special. Even though I did not then believe in the Real Presence, it seemed extremely disrespectful. After all, this is meant to be GOD, right? Thankfully, Sarah shared my disappointment, boredom and general disapproval of the Novus Ordo environment and our visits came to an end.

Then, at Christmas 2014, a major turning point occurred. Sarah's mother and father came to stay with us, as they often had over the four years we had been living together. As mentioned above, they had recently converted from Buddhism to Catholicism – Sarah's father, Patrick, in 2012 and her mother, Tracy, in 2013. I think it's fair to say that, at this time, I had reached something of a 'crisis point' in my constant struggle of trying to get to grips with the existence and reality of God. When everything in your upbringing, education and daily life has told you non-stop that there is no such thing as God, material existence is all there is and that religion is only for the stupid and weak-willed and yet, at the same time, the Holy Ghost is leading you to Our Lord, something has to give!

Both Sarah and I had a lot of questions about Truth, God and the Catholic Church and, on Christmas day, the four of us spent many hours in conversation, covering top-

ics such as why infinite regression is an impossibility, why God is outside Time and Space and why, without God, there is no possibility of Truth or Justice. I still did not get it. But they did give Sarah and me a Green scapular each and asked us to wear them and say the prayer on them every day, as they would pray for us. I did wear mine but only said the prayer now and again. Very importantly, they told us about a Traditional Priest, Canon Altiere, they had met at the church of St Walburge, in Preston (we were living in Manchester at the time).

Interjection: *When we went to stay with Richard and Sarah that Christmas, we had already, sadly, decided it would be the last time we would sleep under their roof. They had been living together for some years, beginning before we had become Catholic. However, we felt we could no longer validate their living in sin and had decided to tell them after Christmas Day that we would no longer come to stay with them. However, it was obvious to us that something very significant (and totally unexpected!) had happened in those long hours of conversation. So, we gave them the Green scapulars and prayed every single day for their conversion and held-off telling them our decision for the moment.*

Sarah was still searching to find a Mass and so one day she came home and said we were going to meet Canon Altiere for a chat. In truth, I was not particularly enthusiastic. However, she was insistent (thank God!) so, somewhat reluctantly, I agreed.

Despite everything that had led to this meeting, I was really blunt and, I think, rude in some ways. I just wanted answers, none of that “faith rubbish”! He was dressed as a traditional Priest (not as your mate down the pub!) and he answered any questions I had and explained them very well. Not once did he try and brush me off with, “Well, you just have to have faith”. No matter what I asked, including the perennial “So, where did God come from, then?”, Canon Altiere was clear, comprehensive and patient in his answers.

After this I started looking forward to meeting him and having our conversations about different things. Sarah and I used to meet him once a week and he gave us instruction in the Faith. The more I learned about being a Catholic and the Faith, the more things began to make sense, the more I fell in Love with God and started to see that without God there is no meaning in life. It’s like Sarah’s mother said, “Without God there is no absolute Truth and no possibility of Justice; everything is simply opinion and, in such a world, ‘Might makes Right’”.

This was the start of the journey that led me and Sarah to baptism, confirmation and sacramental marriage. It is impossible to overstate the importance of the role played in my conversion by Canon Altiere; his patient, kind yet uncompromising guidance, instruction and example as a true and holy Priest have been indispensable in my coming home to the One, True Faith.

But I found out that converting is really hard and you have to give up a lot to find God. The old man has to die for the new to come to be and it is certainly not a “one shot deal”. I can honestly say I have found the answers I looked for and the challenge

now and for the rest of my life is to try as hard as I can to truly understand them and, most important of all, to live them fully.

Epilogue

So, is it a little overblown for me to refer to the conversion of our family as a series of miracles; perhaps somewhat presumptuous? (“Ooh, look at us, aren’t we special!”). Well, I don’t think so, and that certainly isn’t the intention.

I truly don’t think it is going too far to regard our coming to the One, True Faith as miraculous:

- *Tracy and I were Buddhists and for many years socialist and anti-Christian in our attitudes and beliefs, unthinkingly accepting almost every leftist and materialist lie going. Richard and Sarah were very much the same.*
- *The entirety of the media, entertainment, education, politics, popular culture....the whole of contemporary post-Christian western society portrays Catholicism in the worst possible light and relentlessly reinforces a non-stop message that there is no such thing as God, the material world is all there is and, anyway, all religions are the same.*
- *The massive corruption, apostasy and heresy within Holy Mother Church means that genuine Catholic evangelisation is almost nonexistent and the fearless proclamation “**Extra ecclesiam nulla salus!**” is almost nowhere heard.*
- *Traitorous false ecumenism is rampant in the Church and potential new converts are frequently presented with an effeminate, watered-down, pick-and-mix ‘catholicism’ as just one ‘preference’ in a bewildering number of “spiritual paths”, all equally valid.*

For these and many other reasons, I think the designation “miracle” is appropriate. In the process of their instruction and conversion in the Faith, Richard and Sarah moved from Manchester to Preston in order to be able to participate as fully as possible in the sacramental life and growing Traditional Catholic community of St Walburge. The fifth miracle mentioned at the beginning, and the reason Sarah is a little busy right now, is the imminent birth of their first child, who will be raised in the Faith of our fathers, home-schooled and loved as a precious gift from God the Father. - Deo gratias!

THE MOST SATANICALLY DECEITFUL DOCUMENT EVER ISSUED BY THE VATICAN.

The following article is a précis of an essay by James Larson in the September 2016 Christian Order. The original article, and his important October follow up, can be read in full at:

**http://www.christianorder.com/features/features_2016/features_augsept16.html
and at: <http://www.christianorder.com/features.html>**

And there shall come forth a rod out of the root [stump] of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root [stump]. [Is. 11:1]

Pre-eminent among such stumps in all of salvation history is that of Jesse, father of King David. The temporal line of Kings of Judah (the line of Jesse) ended with King Sedecias in 587 B.C., when Jerusalem was captured by Nabuchodonosor, the temple was burned, the Ark of the Covenant disappeared, and Judah was reduced to a province of the Babylonian Kingdom. But out of the root [stump] of Jesse, in the line of David, would rise the Incarnation and the spiritual Kingdom of Jesus Christ.

The parallels that can be drawn between the bankrupt state of the Judaism at the time of the birth of Our Lord and the current state of the Catholic Church, especially (but not exclusively) during the 3-year old Papacy of Francis, are striking. Virtually all things Catholic seem in the process of being destroyed. Pope Francis' denigration of traditional Catholicism and Catholics; his out of control promotion of a false ecumenism; his denial of the Catholic Church's commission to convert people of other religions, and even atheists, to Catholicism; his promotion of a false mercy at the expense of Catholic truth and the integrity of the sacraments; his promotion of an ecological pantheism in *Laudato Si*, in imitation of Teilhardian theology - all of these policies, and more, are deeply destructive of Catholic identity. Faced with this disintegration of the Church, the faithful remnant have been reduced to the "stump" of the Church

Communion" with Decadence and Heresy

Possibly no single event will more clearly unite all the elements of this Catholic disintegration than Pope Francis' visit to Lund, Sweden on October 31, 2016 in order to kick start a year-long celebration honouring Martin Luther and the Protestant Revolution.

The Lutheran Church of Sweden is not only heretical it is also decadent. Women have been ordained as priestesses since 1960, the "Primate" is a woman, and in 2009 the performance of same-sex sham weddings was approved. A second woman "Bishop," Eva Brunne (Bishop of Stockholm), is "married" to a fellow priestess and is (or was) the world's first openly lesbian "bishop" within a mainline Christian denomination. She and her partner have a son. Her Episcopal motto is "Don't show favouritism." In September of 2015, Bishop Brunne attained worldwide notoriety for proposing that the Seaman's Church in Stockholm Harbour remove all Christian symbols, including crosses (so as not to offend incoming Moslems), and replace them with directions to Mecca. Seeking any sort of "communion" with such decadence and heresy is spiritual suicide.

Satanic Deceit: From Conflict to Communion

The Ecumenical Commemoration in Lund Cathedral will be based on the Catholic-Lutheran *Common Prayer*, This *Common Prayer*, in turn, follows directly from the publication in 2013 of the document titled *From Conflict to Communion* (the fruit of 50 years of ecumenical dialogue). The *Common Prayer* praises Luther and "the many

guiding theological and spiritual insights that we have all received through the Reformation”.

***From Conflict to Communion* is the most satanically deceitful document ever to issue forth from the Vatican.**

The False Guiding Principle

We must first dispose of the false principle stated repeatedly in this document, and also listed as the first principle in the *Common Prayer*, that all future relations between Catholics and Lutherans “should always begin from the perspective of unity and not from the point of division...”. This might indeed be a valid guiding principle if, as the document dishonestly claims, “the things that unite us are greater than those that divide us”, but this is simply false. Let us consider the following three points about which, in its rush to embrace a false unity, the document *From Conflict to Communion* is deviously silent:

1) The Lutheran Church is not Apostolic and therefore in no way a “part” of the One Mystical Body of Christ.

2) The Lutheran Church does not have valid ordinations and therefore cannot confect the Eucharist, offer valid sacramental Confessions, Holy Orders, Confirmations, or the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. To gloss over all of this, to never mention it, and to place “what unites us” at the forefront, involves not only the most profound deception but also a horrendous sin against the fundamental principles of charity and mercy towards those souls who are suffering under these deceptions and deprivations.

3) It must be pointed out that the document *From Conflict to Communion* deals very specifically, and somewhat extensively, with the following doctrines: Justification; Eucharist (including the concepts of Real Presence and Sacrifice), Ministry; and Scripture and tradition (the document always uses the lower-case “t”). In obscuring and falsifying the radical divide between Catholic and Lutheran theology in regard to every one of these doctrines, the authors are faced with the “hard” and substantive definitions and anathemas of Trent. This is especially true of the Tridentine Canons concerning Justification and the Eucharist. *From Conflict to Communion* therefore finds it necessary, from the very beginning to establish the following principle as the foundation of its aberrant conclusions:

While the Council of Trent largely defined Catholic relations with Lutherans for several centuries, its legacy **must now be viewed through the lens of the actions of the Second Vatican Council**. This Council made it possible for the Catholic Church to enter the ecumenical movement and **leave behind the charged polemic atmosphere of the post-Reformation era**. [paragraph 90] [emphasis mine]

We are here faced with an emphatic denial of the binding, dogmatic, infallible teachings of a General Council of the Church!

The Lutheran Revolt: the genesis of Luther’s revolt is found in his neurosis with regard to his personal inability to cooperate with God’s grace. His entire theological

system is therefore built on his man-made dogma of justification by "Faith Alone". In his own translation of the Bible he went so far as to insert the word "**alone**" into Romans 3:28, so that it read: "For we account a man to be justified by faith **alone**, without the works of the law."

The word "alone" is simply not in the original. Nor can the words "without the works of the Law" be interpreted to mean "faith alone". Under the New Law of the Gospel man was indeed freed from obeying all the ritualistic prescriptions of the Old Law. But this does not mean that he was freed from the Ten Commandments, the moral law of the New Testament, or the ability and obligation to exercise his free will in order to cooperate with God's grace. Luther denied all this, and in fact labelled the Epistle of St. James as an "epistle of straw", because St James declared that "*faith without works is dead.*"

If you read Luther's writings, you will find scores of sentiments along the following lines: "*It is more important to guard against good works than against sin.*" and "*If Moses should attempt to intimidate you with his stupid Ten Commandments, tell him right out — chase yourself to the Jews.*" And Luther's denial of free will is clearly expressed in his following passage: "*So man's will is like a beast standing between two riders. If God rides, it wills and goes where God wills: as the Psalm says, 'I am become as a beast before thee, and I am ever with thee.'* (Ps. 73: 22-3). *If Satan rides, it wills and goes where Satan wills. Nor may it choose to which rider it will run, or which it will seek; but the riders themselves fight to decide who shall have and hold it.*" (II, viii). The "fight" between God and Satan mentioned above is only a metaphor disguising the fact that Luther believed that God was the author of all evil as well as good. In denying free will, Luther, logically must make God the author of sin. Luther's entire theory of Justification made man totally depraved, and in so doing, blasphemes God Who created man in His own Image.

The Corrective Canons of Trent

The Decree on Justification of the Council of Trent contains scores of Canons, all of which are specifically directed against Martin Luther and Lutheranism. Any attempt to reduce these Canons to historically conditioned **polemics** is indeed a work of Satan whose goal is to undermine all Catholic doctrine:

Trent infallibly teaches that the exercise of man's free will is **necessary** for cooperating with the graces which lead to justification; **necessary** in cooperating with the grace of justification itself; **necessary** for persevering in Faith and good works, both of which are **necessary** for salvation; and **necessary** for performance of those good works which merit an increase of glory in eternal life.

We have been rightly very concerned about Pope Francis's support of pastoral efforts which would undermine the Sacrament of Matrimony, and promote Eucharistic sacrilege. But what is happening in Lund, Sweden, can be seen as a much deeper assault upon the Catholic Faith. Even though no doctrine is to be promulgated, and the Infallible Magisterium will remain intact, the blessing and leadership which the Pope will

be exercising over this event undermines the deepest roots of Our Faith. The ruinous effects that this will exercise upon the whole Church cannot be overestimated.

Triumphant Flower of the Naked "Stump"

No one can deny that the current nakedness of the Catholic Church - spiritual, moral, and even physical - is now widely exposed to both those who have loved and those who have hated her. In this time of "stripping" of the Church, a "band of brass and of iron" will have been placed around the "stump", the faithful remnant, by God, and the flower that shall rise from this "stump" is the long promised Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

FROM THE MAIL BOX

NB Because of the toxic atmosphere in which orthodox priests have to work in the modern Church, we never publish their real names. All priest are called Fr Ignobilis and reside in Stat Veritas for the purposes of this mailbox

... an incredible lift to the spiritual feelings!

Dear Mr Moorhouse: Thank you for all the time and effort you put in to producing the Flock.

It often makes for distressing reading, but your straightforward honest approach gives an incredible lift to the spiritual feelings!

Be sure of my prayers in your brave work.

God bless: Mrs Maureen Brady (Aldridge)

... the SSPX are very kind and I now attend their masses up to 3 times a month.

Ed: In response to the letter from Barbara Daws - the SSPX are very kind and I now attend their masses up to 3 times a month. I go to them for confession and mentioned not going to Novos Ordo anymore (I found it chronic in my parish) and I was told that the NO does not bind us under sin - indeed - it can be harmful to attend NO as the theology is Protestant - making us think like Protestants. This was a young SSPX priest.

My son recently attended the SSPX boys camp in Devon - 25 boys from 8 to 14. Daily mass, catechism and rosary and confession formed part of it. There is no way a NO parish will offer such camps. The camp was 8 nights.

One day we will find out the whole truth behind the last 50 terrible years in Catholicism.

Regards: Dominic Mary Beatrice Stemp (Sent from iPhone)

... taking the scales from our eyes.

Dear Sir: Thank you so very much for keeping me on your mailing list. The Flock is a breath of fresh air, and may you long continue in your quest for taking the scales from our eyes. Enclosed is a small donation.

Sincerely: Mrs Kathleen Mosses (Oregon, USA)

... yet another classic example of how the liberal ideology/mindset works.

Dear Sir: I received in today's post the summer edition of a periodical called 'The Flock', addressed to Sr Gabriel O'Driscoll of our Congregation. Sadly, she died some months ago, so please delete her from your records.

I was surprised to see the photo on the front, of Rev Dominic Howarth, a long standing colleague and close friend of mine and our Community (our Sisters live and work in his parish). I do not know the organisation you represent, but I was astonished to read comments, which I feel to be profoundly offensive and untrue, regarding Fr Dominic. I felt the tone of the whole magazine to be negative and to present a rather dismal and dark picture of the Church. On the whole my experience of Church is of joy and celebration (though there have been occasions when I have been very near the brink. These, I have to say, have been at what I assume are the opposite end of the spectrum to where you are standing, a seeming return to a triumphalist and inward-looking view of 'Church', as it were).

If you yourself had ever heard Fr Dominic speak, you would hear how non-judgemental, pastoral, Spirit-filled and Gospel-rich his preaching is. And he lives the Gospel he preaches. You probably do not think he should be taking regular deliveries to the Jungle in Calais; or leading young women and men through social activities as well as prayer to discern how they can most fully give themselves to living out the Gospel in their lives. He could not be a better role-model. Or being prepared to give the clothes he is wearing to someone who might need them more. Or to visit a dying person in hospital at 3 am.

Please hear what people like him are saying, don't judge them, ask why it is that to you the Church appears to be in such a parlous state.

Yours faithfully: Sister Anne Spilberg OSU (Congregation Leader)

[I've published the above letter because it is yet another classic example of how the liberal ideology/mindset works.

Right off the bat we are accused of making untrue statements, but as usual not one specific example of an untrue statement is cited; liberals always prefer to keep it general, fluffy and vague.

Next, we have the usual irrelevancies: Father went to the bedside of a dying woman - it would be a scandal if he didn't, but what has that got to do with him being or not being a promoter of sodomy? And the fact that Father embraces trendy lefty causes like dishing out sandwiches to would be illegal immigrants at Calais, ninety-nine per-

cent of whom are young males of military age who have as much claim to being genuine refugees as I have to being an Egyptian belly-dancer, hardly comes as a shock - indeed, it is precisely what one would expect of the genre.

Next, we have the usual trotting out of a string of liberal buzzwords in a passing semblance to rational thought: joy, celebration, judgemental, triumphalist, inward-looking, 'Church', pastoral, Spirit-filled, Gospel-rich, etc., etc.

Next, Sister sees nothing amusing or contradictory in making a string of harsh judgements about the Flock and its readers, and then telling us that we should not be - you guessed it - judgemental. Liberals clearly don't understand irony. In reality, of course, the Gospels are full of moral judgements, indeed, Christ actually commands His followers to make judgements, "Do not judge according to appearance, but judge with righteous judgment." (John 7:24). Liberals, however, prefer to use the Scriptures like a drunk uses a lamppost, for support rather than illumination.

When I experience so much harvest when the real Jesus is presented to our young people, reading the irritating waffle above actually encourages me to step out in faith and feed our youth ever more with the truths of our Catholic faith. The refrain I often hear is, "why didn't anyone tell me this before." Consequently, I do warn our youth that they must be prepared to deal with scheming naysayers who call themselves 'Catholics' but who will nevertheless seek to pour cold water on their new found faith.

Some good news: I've heard on the grapevine that Father has been dismissed from his post as vocations director for Brentwood, an office he was no doubt prostituting in order to turn good, solid, Catholic men away from the priesthood.

I expect the Ursulines of Brentwood, as a result of the much vaunted "Springtime of Vatican II" have enjoyed a veritable plethora of fresh young recruits since the Council - nevertheless, it wouldn't be advisable to hold your breath while waiting for confirmation. - ED]

"... and you might even be prosecuted."

Dear Sir, I have read your report on the so-called Moslem atrocities and should point out that the Christians also perpetrated many atrocities themselves later on. You do not even deal with the Crusades themselves, which were a rather messy affair overall, nor the persecution in Spain, with forced conversions a feature, to say nothing of the Auto da Fe. In fact the article is so bias (*sic*) that it could well be defamatory to such an extent that it is illegal, and you might even be prosecuted. I have played my part in the past in supporting PEEP and I am sad to condemn you for this article. But I have specialised in Church history and am now too old to do any more.

Yours sincerely: Fr Michael Clifton (by email)

[Fr Clifton seems to be an aficionado of the BBC school of denial and dissimulation, ("So-called Islamic State"); the events and activities detailed in our new Crusades leaflet are historical facts; by referring to "so-called Moslem atrocities", does he doubt that Muslims carried these out? Or does he doubt that they were atrocities? On

either basis he's on very dodgy ground. However, this goes even beyond denial and dissimulation; by asserting that the information in the leaflet "...could well be defamatory to such an extent that it is illegal, and you might even be prosecuted." he is, *de facto*, promoting Sharia. All the facts in the leaflet are referenced and verifiably true. It is a tenet of Sharia that anything showing Islam in a bad light is "slander" or "defamatory" and should be punished, often by death, even if it is completely accurate and true. Whom does Fr Clifton think might prosecute us for listing a chronology of historical facts about Islam between AD 635 and AD 1095, one of the increasingly numerous Sharia Courts operating illegally in this country (with the full knowledge and tacit approval of our complicit government and police)?

The entire purpose of the leaflet is to counteract the partial and dishonest account of the Crusades which has been propagated for over two hundred years by Protestant anti-Catholic historians and, latterly, by leftist anti-Western academics. It is the false history taught in Primary and Secondary schools and in Higher Education, and Fr Clifton maintains the lie by following the common liberal/leftist tactic of, first, holding up the Crusades as morally reprehensible and, second, asking, about the Spanish Inquisition, under the guise of "...persecution...". To dispose of this in short order:

"You do not even deal with the Crusades themselves, which were a rather messy affair overall...."

The clear structure and purpose of the leaflet was to demonstrate the four hundred and sixty years of unremitting conquest, murder, theft, rape and slavery committed by Muslims against Christians in the name of Islam and in full accordance with the teachings of Islam, which led to the self-defensive military campaigns known as the Crusades. By the way, Fr Clifton, as a History teacher, I can tell you, wars tend to be messy.

"...nor the persecution in Spain, with forced conversions a feature...."

Fr Clifton is clearly referring to the Spanish Inquisition, once again, faithfully maintaining the historically and factually false anti-Catholic narrative promoted by Protestant historians and leftist academics. It is true that forced conversions did occur in a small number of instances, especially in the early days of the Spanish Inquisition in the late fifteenth century. Yet, to call them "...a feature..." as if they were an integral part of the Spanish Inquisition, is to convey an entirely false and inaccurate impression. Holy Mother Church has always condemned forced conversion and did so unequivocally at the time.

"...to say nothing of the Auto da Fe."

{Buries head in hands and sighs deeply!} Far from the mass public burnings and cowed monk torturers of fevered Protestant imaginings (i.e. lies), "Auto da fe" simply means "Act of faith" and was a public event where those accused of various sins made confessions and were thereby reconciled to the Church. It was rare for anyone to be handed over to the civil authorities for execution (the Inquisition did not have the power to execute offenders) and, when they were, they tended to be unrepentant,

repeat offenders. Modern Historians (Carlo Ginzburg, Henry Kamen, E. William Monter, John Tedeschi, for example) have examined the records kept in Aragon and Castile and found that, in the poorly documented first fifty years of the Inquisition, 1,500 people at most may have been executed. The records after that are highly detailed and accurate and show that, of the 44,674 cases that appeared before the Inquisition between AD 1530 to AD 1700, 826 people were executed. All told, the Inquisition resulted in the deaths of, at most, 2,326 across the period, AD 1480 to AD 1700, about ten per year for the whole of Spain. Islam killed more than that in one day on September 11th, 2001.

The Inquisition was strictly limited in its use of torture (rarely used at all, in fact) and its evidential standards and leniency of punishments, e.g. public confession, penance, etc, were far superior to civil authority anywhere in Europe at the time. Finally, the Inquisition was only for baptised Catholics and had no authority whatsoever over Jews or Muslims. One would hope someone who has, "...specialised in Church history..." would, actually, know that. - Patrick Lawler (Vice-Chairman)]

The Flock is published by:

Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice

118 Shepherds Lane

DARTFORD

DA1 2NN

PEEP@cathud.com

0132-240-9231

Note: The Flock can be viewed, downloaded and printed out at

http://www.proecclesia.com/page_newsletter.htm

PLEASE REMEMBER PEEP IN YOUR WILL

*Help us to carry on the fight against the enemy within the gates
for the faith of our children*