

THE SERAPH

May 2021

Vol. XLI No. 9



The Vision of St. Francis in the Portiuncula
by Bartolomé Esteban Murillo

PUBLISHED WITH EPISCOPAL AUTHORIZATION

Contents

When Jesus Walked This Earth	1
The Makeup of the Church	4
The Communist Threat	10
Mary Ever-Virgin	15
St. Therese of Lisieux	19
The Gift of Oneself	22
Franciscan Saints	25
Among Infidels - By Divine Grace	28

EDITOR

Bishop Giles Butler, OFM

PRODUCTION

Bishop Giles Butler, OFM
Mr. Francis Y. No
Sister Catherine, TOR

CONTRIBUTORS

Fr. Joseph Noonan, OFM
Fr. Anthony Lentz, OFM

CIRCULATION

Bishop Giles Butler, OFM

The **SERAPH** is published monthly, except in July and August, by the Franciscans in Rochester, NY.

The **SERAPH** defends the authentic doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church and the moral values upon which Godly nations were founded.

The **SERAPH** stands opposed to any and all heterodoxy, particularly as manifested in today's heresy of Modernism. It holds to the principle that good will without truth is a sham and that truth without good will is a shame.

The **SERAPH** seeks to serve and unite in spirit all Roman Catholics, faithful to tradition, and all men of good will, for the betterment of society according to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of Saint Francis of Assisi.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

USA: Free upon request.

Suggested donation - \$20.00.

FOREIGN: Air Mail - \$40.00 per year.

ALL CORRESPONDENCE SHOULD BE SENT TO :

The SERAPH
3376 MOUNT READ BLVD.
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14616

TELEPHONE: (585) 621-1122

EMAIL: father@friarsminor.org

WEBSITES: friarsminor.org &
franciscanfathers.com

EDITORIAL POLICY

Articles dealing with Roman Catholic doctrine, morals, history and spirituality are welcome. The Editor reserves the right to edit and/or use articles submitted. Manuscripts returned with SAE. Opinions expressed in The SERAPH are not necessarily those of the publishers.

© 2021 All rights reserved. No part may be reproduced without written permission of the publishers.

Publishers:

Order of St. Francis of Assisi, Inc.
Rochester, New York 14616 USA

*In essentia - Únitas. In dúbio - Libertas.
In ómnibus - Cáritas.*

WHEN JESUS WALKED THIS EARTH

Bishop Giles, OFM DD

When Jesus walked this earth, He longed to return to the glory of Heaven with His Father. As much as it pained the Apostles to hear Him speak this way, it was necessary for them and for us to listen to this. Jesus came to this earth to redeem us from our sins and show us the path to eternal glory. In following Christ, He asks us not only to deny ourselves and take up our daily crosses but just as importantly – maybe even more importantly - we must imitate His sentiments and desires.

Jesus often spoke of Heaven and His desire to return there to help form this desire in ourselves. It is difficult for us because we have never seen Heaven, all that we know is this earth. Those who caught glimpses of Heaven tell us that it is so wonderful that there are no words to describe it. Only through analogies do we gain some understanding of Heaven. In parables, Jesus frequently tells us: “The Kingdom of Heaven is like...” The glories that St. John speaks of in the Apocalypse are often overlooked by the reader because we tend to focus upon

the destruction of all that is evil in this world. Consumed with fear of the Judgment and destruction of this world as we know it, we miss what St. John tells us of the renewal of the earth, the glory of God, and Heaven.

For many of us, we never lift our thoughts higher than considering what Heaven is not. We think of Heaven as that place where there is no evil, no sickness, no suffering, or death. Yet, Heaven is so much more. The happiness and joy, the blessed (beatific) vision of God, beholding the mysteries of God – filled with wonder and amazement – the angels and saints never grow tired or weary.

Heaven is beyond our greatest imagination. The brief passing pleasures of this world are as nothing compared with the delights awaiting us in Heaven. Suppose we can imagine taking any one of those pleasures and multiplying it a hundred times or extending its duration hundreds of times. In that case, we still only have a minimal understanding of Heaven. We would have to

increase this pleasure and this time so that it extends forever into eternity. But there are so many other pleasures and much greater ones that we will also enjoy in Heaven.

Our words inevitably must fall noticeably short of describing Heaven. Our imagination can barely conceive the minutest glory and happiness that is in Heaven. If we are to understand Heaven, it is God Who will reveal it to us. This grace is not for everyone. He gives it to whom He pleases. What we can do, and what we should do, is frequently beg of God this grace as well as all the graces that we need to obtain the blessing of spending eternity with Him.

Lest we become consumed with selfishness in the pursuit of our eternal happiness, we should also frequently recall that God created us for His greater honor and glory. A primary goal for us should be to join the angels and saints in Heaven, glorifying God.

In our prayers, we should recall that our being and our purpose for being is only for God. We will only find happiness and meaning when we live as God created us to live. It is the love of God and the longing to be with Him that enables us to forget ourselves,

deny ourselves, and take up our daily crosses. For this reason, we should frequently beg of God the grace to love Him and desire to do His Will and to be eternally united with Him. When we enter into this love and desire, we can genuinely say that we are God's children, and He is Our Father in Heaven. Yes, we are adopted children because of our sins and fallen nature. Still, He has made us, nonetheless, true children through uniting our penances and sacrifices with the infinite merits and love of the Son of God – Our Lord, Jesus Christ.

When our hearts and minds are focused upon God or, through anticipation, already dwelling in Heaven, we find that the troubles of this life and this world are minor and insignificant. The most painful sickness and death in this world is a small price to pay for eternal peace and joy.

Our difficulties and sufferings are not mountains in the grand scheme of things but truly molehills. What is a lifetime of painful suffering in this world compared to an eternity of pleasure in the next life? The saints tell us that they would willingly increase their suffering hundreds of times, for the greater honor and glory of God and a higher place in

Heaven, nearer to Him. Whatever we do for God in this life will be rewarded a hundred-fold, and, also, He promises us eternal life.

The more we can do for God, or the more of ourselves we offer Him, here and now, infinitely increases our future peace, happiness, glory, and honor. We should pray and work so that our love will con-

tinually expand and grow, and our hearts will yearn and ache with ever-increasing intensity for God and Heaven.

God has made us for Himself. As St. Augustine tells us in His "Confessions," our hearts are restless until they return to God. We cannot truly live this life on earth if we do not live for our future life in Heaven.



THE SUNDAY SERMON is a biweekly paper that offers a few spiritual thoughts for each Sunday throughout the year.

THE SUNDAY SERMON began with a desire of our people, who could not attend Mass on Sundays, to receive these messages.

THE SUNDAY SERMON has now become very popular. Subscribers are asking that we send **THE SUNDAY SERMON** to their friends and relatives.

THE SUNDAY SERMON

We only ask the small donation of \$10.00 per year (or whatever you can afford) to help us cover the cost of production and mailing.

Why not subscribe today, for yourself or for a friend?

Please write to:

THE SUNDAY SERMON
3376 Mt. Read Blvd.
Rochester, NY 14616

THE MAKEUP OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Bishop Giles, OFM DD

Understanding the makeup of the Catholic Church is of vital importance in our days. Many are wandering and wondering where they must turn for the life-giving graces only found within the Mystical Body of Christ – the Catholic Church. A lot of confusion arises from the acceptance of popular theories which are not dogmatic. A theory, even if the majority of theologians accept it, is still just a theory. We must also consider that history has shown us that sometimes (maybe often) the majority opinion is wrong. Many disagreed with the Franciscan theologian John Duns Scotus in establishing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It was, however, the minority opinion, as simple and humble as it may be, that he showed to be the true one and the Church even dogmatized.

Many theologians (both clerical and lay) appear to hold to a “Papal” theory of the Church structure. (Since I do not hold to this theory, I must beg the reader's pardon as I struggle to put into words this position.) It seems that they believe that

Jesus gave all power and all authority to St. Peter alone and that everyone else in the hierarchy of the Church receives whatever power or authority they have from the Pope. Hence, bishops ordained without a papal mandate have no authority and are outside the Church. There are Canon Laws to this effect which they use to maintain their theory. There is no doubt that these laws exist, but we must now consider why the Church made these laws and their historical context.

Laws are made to stem or correct abuses. In the Church's history, we find frequent abuses of the Church's power of orders and jurisdiction. Civil authorities often arranged to have their own bishops consecrated to serve the desires of the state. Often this led to various bishops contesting the same jurisdiction. At one point in history, there were many wandering bishops perpetuating themselves without any restraint, and they would often ordain priests that were left to wander and do whatever they pleased without any limitation.

To correct this abuse and promote unity and harmony, it became necessary to have the pope approve of or authorize every new episcopal consecration. This also would, theoretically, stop the secular government from intruding on Church affairs.

These laws did not state that the newly ordained bishops received their power from the pope but necessitated that those ordained were in unity and conformity with the pope. The promoters of the "papal" theory would have it that the bishop is given his power from the pope or is nothing more than a pope's delegate or agent.

The dogmas of the Church clearly show that this is not the case. "By virtue of Divine right, the bishops possess an ordinary power of government over their dioceses." (De Fide.) This is a matter of faith that all Catholics must believe. The word "ordinary" seems to be easily confused by many who are unaccustomed to the specific meaning given by the Church. In the Catholic Encyclopedia (1910), under the article "Jurisdiction" we read "*Ordinary jurisdiction is that which is permanently bound, by Divine or human law, with a permanent ecclesiastical office. Its possessor is called an*

ordinary judge. By Divine law, the pope has such ordinary jurisdiction for the entire Church and a bishop for his diocese. By human law, this jurisdiction is possessed by the cardinals, officials of the Curia, the congregations of cardinals, the patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, archbishops ..." In the interest of brevity, we must stop the quote here, even though it is most interesting. The points we wish to bring forward are that 1) "ordinary" does not mean "common" or "usual" but has a very definite connotation of jurisdiction that is permanently bound to an ecclesiastical office. In the case of popes and bishops, their authority is of Divine law. 2) The bishop's ordinary jurisdiction is of Divine origin and not a papal (or human) origin.

The following quote is taken from "Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma" by Dr. Ludwig Ott 1954.

"In regard to the relation between the Papal and Episcopal powers, the Vatican Council declared: "This power of the Pope in no way derogates from the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction by which bishops 'who have been set by the Holy Ghost' to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles feed and

govern each his own flock as true pastors; but rather this authority is asserted, strengthened and vindicated by the Supreme and Universal Pastor.”

According to this declaration, the episcopal power is:

- a. An ordinary power, that is, it is associated with the episcopal office.
- b. An immediate power, that is, it is not practiced at the order of a superior but in the Bishop's own name. Thus bishops are not delegates (agents) and not vicars (representatives) of the Pope, but independent pastors of the flocks entrusted to them, even though they are subordinate to the Pope.
- c. A power appointed by God; for the Apostles, on the ground of Divine ordinance, whether in the immediate commission of Christ or on the direction of the Holy Ghost (Acts 20, 28) have passed on their pastoral office to the bishops. The bishops are the successors of the Apostles, not in such a manner that an individual bishop is a successor of an individual Apostle, but that the bishops in their totality are successors of the College of Apostles.

d. A true pastoral power, as it embraces all the ecclesiastical powers appertaining to the exercise of the pastoral office, the power to legislate, to judge, and to punish.

e. A power which is limited locally and materially, since it extends only to a definite segment of the Church and is circumscribed by the Papal power which is superior to it. In addition, the so-called *causae maiores*, that is, matters of more than usual importance, touching the welfare of the whole Church, are reserved to the Pope.”

Dr. Ott then explains the “Papal” and “Episcopal” Theories about how individual bishops receive their power. He tells us that the “Papal” theory is probable and that most theologians endorse it. However, near the end, he tells us: “...but the question still remains without final decision.”

It seems evident from the dogma that the power, authority, or limited jurisdiction of a bishop is from God (“Episcopal” Theory). This is perhaps too simple for the majority to grasp? However, let’s consider the Church’s situation today (accepting the position that we do not have a pope). The

“Episcopal” theory must be the correct one, or else we would have no one with any authority in the Church today, and then we must conclude that the Church Militant no longer exists.

Some argue against the position that we do not have a Roman Catholic Pope. They will say that he is a bad pope, but he is still the pope, and we must obey him. An argument was given that in the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew, Jesus gave all power to St. Peter and then shortly after that rebuked Peter for his evil ways, even calling him Satan. So, a pope can be as evil as Satan, and still, we must obey him. If we read this chapter a little more carefully, we see that Jesus did not at this time give St. Peter this power but only promised it. *“I will give...”* Secondly, when Jesus does give power to Peter, it is with all the Apostles. We can find this in Chapter 28:18-20. We only need to consult the Catholic commentaries on the passage to clearly understand that this power was given to all the Apostles with Peter at the head of them. For example, Father Haydock’s commentary says in part: “See here the warrant and commission of the apostles and their successors, the bishops and pastors of Christ’s Church.”

Our position is not that a pope has gone bad and thus lost his authority. Instead, the man before ever assuming the “office” was a heretic and therefore ineligible for the office. Hence his election was invalid, and he never was a true pope. A heretic is one cut off from the Church. It is illogical that someone cut off from the Church could become the head of the body from which he has severed himself.

Another argument against the bishops having jurisdiction is that “all power (jurisdiction) was given to St. Peter (alone) by Jesus Christ.” This is not the understanding of the Church. “Universal” jurisdiction is not the same as “all” jurisdiction. “Universal” jurisdiction tells us that St. Peter and all his true successors have authority over all the souls on earth – from the humblest to the highest, from layman to bishops. To say that “all” jurisdiction was given to St. Peter and his true successors implies that no one else has been given any power because it is “all” in the pope’s hands. This is false and contrary to Catholic Dogma. Universal does not mean all in this sense.

If there is no pope to assign individual bishops to definite

territories, how do we know which bishop rules where? In the absence of a pope, it is logical that the bishops must work out among themselves each bishop's territory. They need to cooperate rather than compete with one another. Regions are made by mutual agreement, which is essentially what happens when there is a true pope. All the bishops agree to exercise their authority where the pope wishes or arranges for them to work. Yes, the pope may command, and the bishops must obey, but this is much better understood if we recall that the pope is "The Servant of the Servants of God." He is the principal of unity and harmony. For order and harmony, the pope assigns territories, but God gives the power of jurisdiction to the bishops. (Recall the bishop's jurisdiction is Ordinary and of Divine origin, not human.)

The late Bishop Louis Vezelis OFM related to us that he once asked Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, "What are we to do if the priests will not obey us?" Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc's response was very simple and concise: "Too bad for them!" Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc firmly believed that bishops have authority and that the priests must be under a proper bishop.

What about the "papal mandate?" The law says that a priest cannot be elevated to the episcopacy without one. Bishops promoted without this are considered rebels and intruders. They are illicit (illegal) even though they may be valid.

A principle of morality is that a law ceases to be binding when it is impossible to observe. Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc publically declared that the papacy was vacant and that the New Church created at the "Second Vatican Council" was not the true Roman Catholic Church. He then began to Consecrate true bishops for the Church for the good of the Church and the salvation of souls, without "papal mandates." Obviously, without a pope, it is impossible to obtain a papal mandate. His goal was not to create bishops that did not have any power (half bishops) but true bishops that true priests and laity must obey. And for those who refuse to obey: "Too bad for them!"

The Church can continue without a pope, but She is dead without true bishops (successors to the Apostles). Recall the four marks of the Church: One, Holy Catholic, and Apostolic. The Church must have bishops. And a

bishop without authority is no bishop at all.

The Sacraments cannot be administered without authority. A “bishop” without authority cannot give any “priest” jurisdiction to celebrate Mass for people, perform marriages, or absolve in the confessional.

For the Church to continue in the absence of a true pope, bishops must have authority, and those within the bishop’s area must obey him.

Some wish to present a permanent or semi-permanent situation of epikeia (presumed permission). In this theory, valid but illicit (illegal) priests presume that an absent or unaware authority (bishop) would or should permit them to do what they are doing. This can only be honestly maintained for a very short time. This presumed permission was allowed in very narrow specific situations – one-time events, not perpetual ones.

The next argument is that the Church permits Catholics in extreme cases to go to valid but illicit (either heretical or schismatic) priests for the Sacraments. The extreme case is when in danger of death. This, too, is a one-time thing and not a perpetual situation.

The only logical and accurate answer is simply that even in

the absence of a true pope, true bishops have proper jurisdiction by which priests and laity can be directed in the way of Salvation and receive true Sacramental grace for the life of their souls.

Bishops who claim not to have any authority need not be obeyed because they are not true bishops. Far from receiving anything from them, Catholics should flee from them as they would from devils. The devils are the promoters of anarchy, and what are clergymen operating without any authority but anarchist?

Just as throughout history, everyone knows the bishop is the shepherd or pastor of our souls, so must it be today. If we wish to save our souls, we must enter and remain in the flock. We must not join the community guided by heretics (wolves) or those led by hirelings (those without authority). These lead to damnation. We must align ourselves in holy obedience to the bishops with authority from God and together enter onto the path to salvation.



THE COMMUNIST THREAT

Father Joseph Noonan, OFM

Part Three: The Undermining of Education

*Note: This article's information comes from **The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America** by Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt.*

Through the course of time, most countries have been conquered as the result of fighting a war. The world's history is filled with bloodshed, one nation fighting another to the point too often of ending in a "scorched-earth" scenario. Millions of lives are lost, families are devastated, and generations of young men are killed. To what good?

When an enemy wants to conquer a country but does not have the military to accomplish this, what does he do? It would seem that either the country must put aside this unreasonable ambition for the time being or find another way to reach this goal.

The Russian Communists in the first half of the 20th century knew they could not defeat the United States on the battlefield, nor did they want to annihilate this country in a nuclear war. They did make plans,

though, to defeat this nation in a manner that is rare in the history of wars. They would do it by undermining and infiltrating its political, religious, and academic institutions.

In Part Two of this series, I explained the infiltration of the Catholic Church. This article will cover how the Communists set out on their plan to destroy the American education system, which was in 1960 considered the best in the world. You will be surprised, unless you already know this, that the Communists had a lot of help by taking advantage of those destructive forces which were already present in the American public education system before their socialistic agenda began to dominate the schools before an unsuspecting and naïve public at large.

One must begin by going back to 1762 and the book written by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*, and the Social Contract presented in the book. This book affected the French Revolution, which is to say it had a bad or evil effect upon the Revolution. In this book,

Rousseau promoted child-centered “permissive education,” in which a teacher should avoid strict discipline and tiresome lessons. Both Rousseau (1712-1788) and Swiss educator Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827) believed the “whole” child should be educated by “doing” and that religion should not be a guiding principle in education, a theme we have seen repeated over 238 years.

Wilhelm Wundt, the founder of Experimental Psychology and the force behind its dissemination throughout the Western world, was born in 1832 in southern Germany. The following excerpts concerning Wundt’s “contributions” to modern education are taken from *The Leipzig Connection: The Systematic Destruction of American Education* by Paolo Lionni and Lance Klass (1980).

“To Wundt, a thing made sense and was worth pursuing if it could be measured, quantified, and scientifically demonstrated. Seeing no way to do this with the human soul, he proposed that psychology concern itself solely with experience. As Wundt put it ... Karl Marx injected Hegel’s theories with economics and sociology, developing a “philosophy of dialectic materialism.”

From Wundt’s work, it was only a short step to the later redefinition of education. Initially, education meant drawing out of a person’s innate talents and abilities by imparting the knowledge of languages, scientific reasoning, history, literature, rhetoric, etc. – the channels through which those abilities would flourish and serve. To the experimental psychologist, however, education became the process of exposing the student to “meaningful” experiences to ensure desired reactions:

“Learning is the result of modifiability in the paths of neural conduction. Explanations of even such forms of learning as abstraction and generalization demand of the neurons only growth, excitability, conductivity, and modifiability. The mind is the connection-system of man; and learning is the process of connecting. The situation-response formula is adequate to cover learning of any sort, and the really influential factors in learning are readiness of the neurons, sequence in time, belongingness, and satisfying consequences.

If one assumes (as did Wundt) that there is nothing there to begin with but a body, a brain, a nervous system, then one must try to educate by inducting sensations in that nervous

system. Through these experiences, the individual will learn to respond to any given stimulus, with the 'correct' response. **The child is not, for example, thought capable of volitional control over his actions, or of deciding whether he will act or not act in a certain way; his actions are thought to be preconditioned and beyond his control, he is a stimulus-response mechanism.** According to this thinking, he is his reactions. Wundt's thesis laid the philosophical basis for the principles of conditioning later developed by Pavlov (who studied physiology in Leipzig in 1884, five years after Wundt had inaugurated his laboratory there) and American behavioral psychologists such as Watson and Skinner; for laboratories and electroconvulsive therapy; for schools oriented more toward socialization of the child than toward the development of intellect; and for the emergence of a society more and more blatantly devoted to the gratification of sensory desire at the expense of responsibility and achievement." (Emphasis ours)

This short quote from Dennis Cuddy, Ph.D., in an article titled "The Conditioning of America," December 11, 1989, is quite telling.

"The conditioning of modern America society began with John Dewey, a psychologist, a **Fabian Socialist** and the 'Father of Progressive Education.' Dewey used the psychology developed in Leipzig by William Wundt and believed that through a stimulus-response approach (like Pavlov), students could be conditioned for a **new social order.**" (Emphasis ours).

The first experiment with "Outcome-Based Education" was conducted in England in 1862. Teacher opposition resulted in the abandonment of the experiment. The following excerpt outlines the experiment:

"The call for 'sound and cheap' elementary instruction was answered by legislation, passed by Parliament during 1862, known as The Revised Code. This was the legislation that produced payment [for] results, the nineteenth-century English accountability system ... The opposition to the English payment – [for] – results system which arose at the time of its introduction was particularly interesting. Teachers provided the bulk of the resistance. They based their objections on both educational and economic grounds ... They abhorred the narrowness and mechanical character the sys-

tem imposed on the educational process. They also objected to the economic burden forced upon them by basing their pay on student performance.”

“Payment for Results” and Outcome-Based Education are based on teacher accountability and require teaching to the test, the results of which are to be “measured” for accountability purposes. Both methods of teaching result in a narrow, mechanistic system of education similar to Mastery Learning. Teachers in the United States in 1999, as were teachers involved in the experiment in England, will be judged and paid according to students’ test scores; i.e., how well the teachers teach to the test. Proponents of Mastery Learning believe that almost all children can learn if given enough time, adequate resources geared to the student’s individual learning style, and a curriculum aligned to test items (teach to the test). Mastery Learning uses Skinnerian methodology (operant conditioning) to obtain “predictable” results. Benjamin Bloom, the father of Mastery Learning, says that “the purpose of education is to change students’ thoughts, actions, and feelings.”

Edward Thorndike was born on August 31, 1874, in Williamsburg, Massachusetts. Thorndike

was trained in the new psychology by the first generation of Wilhelm Wundt’s proteges. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1895 after having studied with Wundtians Andrew Armstrong and Charles Judd. He went to graduate school at Harvard and studied under psychologist William James.

Thorndike’s primary assumption was the same as Wundt’s: that man is an animal, that his actions are always reactions, and that he can be studied in the laboratory in much the same way as an animal might be studied. Thorndike equated children with the rats, monkeys, fish, cats, and chickens upon which he experimented in his laboratory and was prepared to apply what he found there to learning in the classroom. He extrapolated “laws” from his research into animal behavior which he then applied to the training of teachers, who took what they had learned to every corner of the United States and ran their classrooms, curricula, and schools, based on this new “educational” psychology.

Psychology by John Dewey, the father of “Progressive Education,” was published in 1896. This was the first American textbook on the “revised” subject of education. Psychol-

ogy would become the most widely-read and quoted textbook used in schools of education in this country. Just before the publication of his landmark book, Dewey joined the Rockefeller-endowed University of Chicago faculty as head of the combined departments of philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy (teaching). In that same year, 1895, the university allocated \$1,000 to establish a laboratory in which Dewey could apply psychological principles and experimental techniques to the study of learning. The laboratory opened in January 1896 as the Dewey School, later to become known as The University of Chicago Laboratory School. Dewey thought of the school as a place “where his theories of education could be put into practice, tested, and scientifically evaluated”...

Samuel Blumenfeld, in his book, *The Whole Language/OBE Fraud*, 1996, further explains Dewey's perspective:

“What kind of curriculum would fit the school that was a mini-cooperative society? Dewey's recommendation was indeed radical: build the curriculum not around academic subjects but around occupational activities which provided maximum opportunities for peer interaction and socialization.

Since the beginning of Western civilization, the school curriculum was centered around the development of academic skills, the intellectual faculties, and high literacy. Dewey wanted to change all of that. Why? Because high literacy produced that abominable form of independent intelligence which was basically, as Dewey believed, anti-social.”

Thus, from Dewey's point of view, the school's primary commitment to literacy was indeed the key to the whole problem ...

All of the events in this article took place in the 19th century. There is more to come in the 20th century, all setting the stage for the Communists to take control of organizations and programs that continue to dominate the public school system in the 21st century. The system is now filled with socialists and Communists. Many politicians have promoted the socialist agenda and worked to destroy the school systems' once high standards.

To Be Continued



Mary Ever-Virgin

Father Anthony Lentz, OFM

I intended to continue my series of articles about the “Bill of Rights and the Natural Law,” but something was brought to my attention earlier last month and to address it now is very appropriate.

A parishioner told me about a Protestant co-worker who stated that Mary, Our Lord’s Mother, had other children after Jesus and was not, ergo, *ever-virgin*. As Protestants often do, his co-worker quoted various passages from Scripture to give credence to his case. I do not know exactly which passages this particular Protestant used, so I will provide the common ones as examples throughout this article and then give the proper Catholic interpretation.

The Church defined the dogmatic term *ever-virgin* early in Her history. It was incorporated into the *Creed* by the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, A.D. 553; and the Sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (A.D. 680)

expressed this truth: *The virginity of Mary ... remained before, during, and after parturition.*

Our Lord was the *firstborn son* and if He had siblings, they would have come after Him, so I will only focus upon the Blessed Mother’s virginity *after* parturition (the act of giving birth to the young).

The problem when trying to debate such points with Protestants is that they believe in *Sola Scriptura*, or “Scripture alone,” and any point you make regarding Holy Tradition and the Church’s numerous dogmatic degrees will fall upon deaf ears. Also, simply trying to convince them with a purely Scriptural argument can be tricky because Mary’s virginity after giving birth cannot be cogently proved from Sacred Scripture. However, the dogma is deducible with moral certainty from the fact that she had resolved to remain a virgin all her life. It was this resolution that in-

spired her timid query: *“How, shall this be done because I know not man?”* Only after the Angel had assured her that her chastity would remain intact did she consent to become the mother of Jesus: *“Be it done to me according to Thy word.”* (St. Luke 1: 34-38)

While researching for this article, I came across a website called Jehovah’s Witnesses. They touched upon these very same points and supplied their interpretation. I must say they do present their arguments reasonably. Of course, this reasonableness is meaningless because they fail to apply the *Analogy of the Faith*. This means that any interpretation that goes against the divinely revealed truth given to and preserved by the Catholic Church is false. I will explain this with a simple logical syllogism: The application of the *Analogy of the Faith* is necessary for the proper interpretation of Scripture. These Protestant arguments ignore the *Analogy of the Faith*. Ergo, the Protestants have an incorrect interpretation of Scripture.

Here are a few other points taken from Scripture that support Mary’s virginity after giving birth to Our Lord, thus keeping her perpetual virgini-

ty intact. The Scriptural arguments that I will be using are from my dogmatic theology book on *Mariology (the study of Mary)* by Puehl & Pruess. Here is how they are listed, and with some added commentary from the Doctor of Scripture himself, St. Jerome of Bethlehem:

“While on the cross, Our Lord entrusted the care of His Blessed Mother to St. John. If He had any siblings, why did they not take upon themselves this noble task? To deny them this right would be a note of dishonor.

The term ‘brother’ is used in both Testaments as a synonym for ‘kinsman’ (nephew, cousin, etc.); the so-called ‘brethren of Jesus’ were probably near relatives of His Blessed Mother.

‘When His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph before they came together she was found with child, of the Holy Ghost.’ (St. Matt. I, 18). ‘Came together,’ in this case probably means, ‘dwelled together under the same roof.’ However, if this means marital intercourse, it would merely be indicating that the act was not performed or that its performance is regarded as of secondary importance. St. Jerome argues, ‘From the phrase ‘before they came to-

gether' it does not follow that they came together afterward; Holy Scripture merely intimates what did not happen.' Writing against Helvidius, St. Jerome argues further, 'If I say: 'Helvidius died before he did penance for his sins,' does it follow that he did penance after his death?'

'And he [Joseph] knew her [Mary] not till she brought forth her firstborn son.' (St. Matt. I, 25) St. Jerome demonstrates the absurdity about the inference that St. Joseph had marital relations with the Blessed Mother after the birth of her firstborn by pointing to such analogous texts as Ps. CIX, 1: 'Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool,' and Gen. VIII, 6: '... the raven ... did not return till the waters were dried up upon the earth.' Does it follow, he asks, that Christ will not long sit at the right hand of God the Father when His enemies lie defeated at His feet? Or did the raven return to the ark after the waters were dried up?

The term 'firstborn,' as St. Jerome points out from Scriptures, is frequently employed to denote a mother's first child, no matter whether it is followed by others or remains the only one."

I know that there are those out there who would question what St. Jerome taught, but I would rather trust the interpretation of the man who translated the Sacred Text into Latin from ancient Greek and Hebrew. A man who lived closer to the time and region of Our Lord. A man whose erudite observation is in line with the unanimous teaching of the Church Fathers. That unanimous teaching is not a merely personal opinion but a teaching that is supported, confirmed, and promulgated by the One, True, Holy, Apostolic Catholic Church.

The belief in Mary's perpetual virginity is so firmly rooted in primitive Tradition that the Fathers regard its denial as an insult to Our Lord Himself.

Here is a quote from St. Ambrose which confirms the dogmatic degree from the Council of Constantinople:

St. Ambrose exclaims: "But Mary did not fail, the mistress of virginity did not fail; nor was it possible that she who had borne God, should be regarded as bearing a man. And Joseph, the just man, assuredly did not so completely lose his mind as to seek carnal intercourse with the mother of God."

Even if they are scholars, it is illogical for Protestants to question the Catholic interpretation of Scripture. They would not have the Bible if the Catholic Church did not compile the different books and categorize them. They would be completely unaware of its presence. Actually, the only reason they know that these books are divinely inspired is because the Catholic Church told them so. How come it took 1500 years for the proper interpretation of Scripture? What was the Holy Ghost doing all that time?

Why would they even want to question the Virginity of Mary in the first place? The only reason why some Protestants want to question Mary's virginity is a diabolical one. They have a dislike for the Blessed Virgin because the Catholic Church has such a love for her.

All the honor that one gives to Mary is also given to Jesus Christ; and all the dishonor that one gives to Mary is also dishonoring Him.

O, Blessed Mary ever Virgin, pray for them!



The Catholic Faith

RADIO PROGRAM

The Catholic Faith Radio Program is broadcast live each Friday from 1:30-4:30 p.m. (CST) in the studios of KRFE AM580, Lubbock, Texas.

It is streamed live on <http://catholichour.org>. If you are unable to listen live, you may go to the website anytime and listen to the recorded broadcasts at your leisure.

*The call in telephone number is (806) 745-5800.
You may also email your questions or comments to father@catholichour.org*

ST. THÉRÈSE OF LISIEUX

An Autobiography

CHAPTER FIVE VOCATION OF THÉRÈSE

What struggles I went through before I could decide! But I had to act promptly, for I was now fourteen and a half. In six months' time the blessed feast of Christmas would be here, and I had resolved to enter Carmel at the same hour at which, a year before, I had received the grace to overcome my childish failings, the hour of my complete conversion.

I chose the feast of Pentecost on which to make my great disclosure. All day I prayed for light from the Holy Ghost. I called upon the Apostles to plead for me, and begged them to inspire me with the words I ought to use. Were they not the very Saints to help a timid child whom God destined to become an apostle of apostles by prayer and sacrifice?

In the afternoon, on our return from Vespers, I found the opportunity I so much desired. Papa had gone into the garden, and was sitting there, with hands clasped, admiring the wonders of nature. The birds were warbling their evening prayer, and the crimson rays of

the setting sun still fingered on the tall trees.

His face wore a heavenly expression — I could feel that his soul was full of peace. Without saying a word, I sat down by his side, my eyes already wet with tears. He looked at me with indescribable tenderness, and, pressing me to his heart, said: "What is it, little Queen? Tell me . . ." Then as if to hide his own emotion, he rose and walked slowly up and down, still holding me close to him.

Through my tears I spoke of Carmel and of my great wish to enter soon. He too, wept, but did not say one word to turn me from my vocation; he simply pointed out to me that I was still very young to decide on so grave a matter. I insisted, urgently pleading my cause, and because of his upright, generous nature, our noble Father soon yielded. For a long time, we continued our walk in the garden; my heart was relieved, and Papa no longer shed tears. He spoke to me just as a Saint might have spoken,

and showed me some little white flowers, like miniature lilies, which were growing on a low stone wall. Picking one, he gave it to me, and remarked with what loving care God had brought it to bloom and preserved it until that day.

I thought I was listening to my own life story, so close was the resemblance between the little flower and little Thérèse I received it as a relic, and I noticed that in trying to pluck the slender blossom, Papa had pulled it up by the roots: it seemed destined to live on, but in other and more fertile soil. He had just done the same thing for me, by permitting me to leave the sweet valley of my childhood's years for the mountain of Carmel. I fastened my little white flower to a picture of Our Lady of Victories, so that the Blessed Virgin smiles upon it and the Infant Jesus seems to hold it in His hand. It is there still, but the stalk is now broken close to the root. No doubt God wishes me to understand by this that He will soon sever all the earthly ties of His Little Flower, and will not leave her to fade here below.

Having secured Papa's consent, I thought I could fly to Carmel without further hindrance. To my dismay, however, when I confided the

secret to my uncle, he declared that to enter such a severe order at the age of fifteen seemed contrary to all human prudence, adding, moreover, that it would be doing a wrong to religion to let a mere child embrace such a life. He said that he would oppose it in every possible way, and that nothing short of a miracle would induce him to change his mind. I clearly saw that all arguments were useless, and I left him, my heart overwhelmed with grief. My only consolation lay in prayer, and I entreated Our Lord to work the miracle of which my uncle had spoken, for thus only could I respond to His divine call. Some time elapsed, and apparently my uncle had forgotten our interview, though later I learned it had been constantly in his thoughts.

Before sending a ray of hope to shine on my soul, God allowed me to pass through a three days' martyrdom of another and most grievous kind. Never before had I so well understood the bitter sorrow of Our Lady and St. Joseph as they walked through the streets of Jerusalem in search of the Divine Child. It was as if I were lost in some fearful desert; or rather my soul seemed like a frail skiff, without a pilot, left to the

mercy of the stormy waters. I knew that Jesus was there, asleep in my boat, but how could I see Him through a night of such darkness? Had the storm really broken, a flash of lightning might have pierced the clouds that hung over me, enabling me to catch a momentary glimpse of the Beloved of my heart, but even that was denied me. All around was night, dark night, utter desolation, death! Like my Divine Master in Gethsemane, I felt that I was alone, and that I could find no comfort, neither on earth nor in heaven.

Even Nature seemed to share my deep sadness, for during those three days there was not one ray of sunshine and the rain fell in torrents. Again and again I have noticed that, all through my life, Nature has reflected my feelings. When I wept, the heavens wept with me; when I rejoiced, no cloud darkened the azure sky. On the fourth day, a Saturday, I went to see my uncle, and what was my surprise to find his attitude towards me completely changed! First of all he brought me quite spontaneously into his private study; then, after gently reproaching me for being somewhat reserved towards him, he told me that the miracle he had exacted was no longer necessary. He had prayed to God to guide his heart aright,

and the prayer had been heard. Indeed I scarcely knew my uncle, so sym-pathetic had he become. After embracing me like a father, he said with deep feeling: "Go in peace, dear child, you are a privileged little flower which Our Lord wishes to gather for Himself; I will no longer put any obstacle in your way."

How joyfully I retraced my steps homeward under a beautiful sky whence every cloud had vanished! In my soul, too, dark night was gone; I no longer heard the roar of the waves — Jesus had awakened to gladden my heart. Instead of an adverse wind a light breeze swelled my sails and I thought myself safe in port. But alas! More than one such storm was yet to arise, making me fear lest I should be driven, without hope of return, from the shore I so longed to reach.



To Be Continued

THE GIFT OF ONESELF

*From the French of
THE REVEREND JOSEPH
SCHRYVERS, C.S.S.R.*

*Translated by a Religious of Carmel,
Bettendorf, Iowa*

PART THREE

The Practice of Abandonment

CHAPTER TWO

The Life of Self-Forgetfulness



Article 7

***The more the soul forgets
self, the greater is God's care
for her***

The more the soul advances in perfection, the more her spiritual life is simplified. Finally, it may be summed up in these words which Jesus addressed to one of His servants: "Think of Me, and I will think of thee." This means: "I will think of thine honor, thy health, thy temporal welfare; I will think of thy salvation, thy perfection, thy sanctity." Jesus, Who knows all, forgets nothing.

When He asks of a soul such a great sacrifice as the complete forgetfulness of self, He assumes the obligation of providing against any difficulties which, humanly speaking,

might result. The soul should simply obey and refrain from peering into the future.

At the time of her meeting with the Prophet Elias, the poor widow of Sarepta was in very great distress. She was about to consume the last of her provisions; after that, nothing but death remained for her and for her child. Nevertheless, at the request of this stranger, she gave him her last morsel of bread. From the human viewpoint, it was folly; but it was wisdom in the sight of God. It caused Him to work a miracle.

In this manner the truly simple soul always acts with God. She thinks only of the duties of her state. She has nothing to do with calculations, evasions, pretense. But God provides for

her. Cunning and deceit can do nothing against her. The cleverness of the world attempts to hold the simple soul in its net. But the attempt does not succeed; an unforeseen event, even a word or a gesture, will foil the intrigue.

Jesus said to His disciples: "When you shall be brought before the rulers of this world, take no thought of what you are to say in your defense. The Holy Spirit Himself will put into your mouths what you are to speak."

If the Apostles, at the beginning of their public career, had paused to weigh the consequences of their bold enterprise, they never would have preached. There seemed no hope that they would win favor for the doctrine of the Crucified; and, after their efforts, torture and death awaited them.

But they went wherever the Spirit of God urged them to go, without hesitation or fear. Their mission was to preach: *Prædicate*. They preached. God did the rest; and He did it magnificently.

Not only does Jesus think for the simple soul; He also repairs the errors she commits by her ignorance or improvidence. No man is so clever that he does not sometimes make a mistake

or take hazardous steps. For worldlings, these imprudences are subjects of profound regret and of harrowing humiliations. For the envious, they are occasions for cutting jests and severe judgments. For God, they are means of abasing and correcting the presumptuous.

But toward the simple soul God's conduct is quite different. He permits certain acts of imprudence — the life of every Saint will furnish examples — but, singularly enough, they remain without evil effect; or they are the occasion of greater good.

The soul will never lose by allowing God to think for her. When, on the Lake of Genesareth, Saint Peter recognized that the apparition which at first had frightened him was Jesus walking on the waves, he had a sublime impulse of self-forgetfulness. He cried: "Master, if it is Thou, bid me come to Thee upon the waters!" Of an impetuous nature, Peter had not taken time for reflection. At once he went forward upon the waves. Suddenly a column of water raised by the wind advanced threateningly. Peter no longer thought of the all-powerful Master; he thought of himself and of his weakness; he doubted; he began to sink. Happily, Jesus was there to make all right.

It is noteworthy that, in the Gospel, Jesus always takes up the defense of the weak, the maligned, even of the repentant sinners. He feels bound to defend one who, in any way, shows confidence in Him.

Against His disciples, He took the part of the mothers who crowded about Him with their children. Against the envious, He defended the newly-converted Zacchaeus who had braved ridicule by climbing into a tree to see Him pass. He took the adulteress under His protection, confounded her hypocritical accusers, and sent her away free and converted. He forbade His disciples to dismiss the crowd that had followed Him into the desert without thinking of bringing provisions for the journey. He defended the Apostles who, pressed by hunger, plucked grain in the field on the Sabbath-day. Above all, He protected Magdalen, the sinner. Oh, the penitent Magdalen! How Jesus loved her! How He took care to defend her against her detractors! Had she not need of defense? Her love had taken no precautions.

Of one of the greatest families of Magdala, reputed a public sinner, she, without having told anyone of the change wrought in her, comes to the Feet of Jesus "the Prophet," to perform

an action so wondrously humble that the world deems it extravagant. She enters a strange house, makes her way to the dining-hall, causes a stir among the guests, and covers with confusion the master of the house.

O Magdalen! little dost thou heed all this, for Jesus is there and awaits thy coming to His Feet — for the first time! The Master cannot do otherwise than answer for thee.

Jesus does not fail her. Later, He defends her against Martha, who would take her from her sweet repose at the Feet of the Master, and against Judas, who accuses her of wastefulness. He does more. He takes care that her defense shall be written in the Sacred Books, and that, wherever the Gospel is preached, the loving folly by which Magdalen strove to please her adored Master shall be recounted and praised.

Thou too, faithful soul, surrender thyself to Jesus and forget thyself. Jesus will think for thee. It shall never be said that any helplessness, any poverty, took refuge in His Heart and could be torn away. "*Qui venit ad me non ejiciam foras. Him that cometh to Me, I will not cast out.*" (John 6:37.)



FRANCISCAN SAINTS

MAY 21ST

Blessed Ladislav of Gielniow

Confessor, First Order

Blessed Ladislav was born at Gielniow, a town in the diocese of Gniezno, Poland. The very first fruits of his life he offered to God, who alone had the right to them. In compliance with the wishes of his parents, he pursued his studies at the University of Cracow, and after making great progress in learning and virtue, he recognized the call of God to forsake the world.

In 1464, he entered the convent of Friars Minor at Warsaw, which had been quite recently founded by St. John Capistran. There the young man strove so earnestly for perfection that the highest hopes were placed in him. He observed all the austerities of the order most faithfully, and regarded interior mortification as the goal of all exterior practices of the kind. His profound humility and perfect obedience greatly edified all.

As soon as he was ordained to the priesthood, he asked in his

zeal for souls for permission to go among the Kalmuks in neighboring Russia, in order to preach the Gospel to this heathen nation. The permission was granted, but Ladislav met with so many obstacles in that country that he was obliged to return without achieving any success. He now labored without tiring at his apostolic work in Poland.

In towns and villages, he preached the word of God, and his zeal, coupled with a holy life, produced blessed results everywhere. He had a special way of presenting for the consideration of the faithful the sufferings of Christ and the glories of the Mother of God. Above all he recommended the recitation of the Crown of the Seven Joys of Our Blessed Lady.

Because of his outstanding qualifications, our saint was five times elected to the office of provincial. During his

administration he sent many missionaries to Lithuania and to Russia, where it was now possible to convert many heathens to Christendom, a task which he had once attempted in vain.

Broken with age and the fatigues of an exhausting apostolate, he completed his last term as provincial. The fathers who attended the chapter did not wish to assign him a definite convent for his residence, but left it to him to choose one for himself. But the holy old man said: "My fathers, so you wish that at the end of my life I should live according to my own will and fancy! Never before have I done that, and far be it from me ever to follow my own will. Dispose of me entirely according to your own good pleasure." He was then appointed guardian of the convent at Warsaw. There he had begun his religious life, there he was also to close it in the very next year.

On Good Friday, he preached a sermon on the sufferings of Our Lord. All at once his countenance was transfigured. He fell into ecstasy and was raised in the air above the pulpit before the eyes of the astonished multitude. When the ecstasy ended, he was seized with a fever, and about

a month later, on May 4, 1505, he slept in the Lord. Many miracles occurred at his tomb in the church of his order at Warsaw. Pope Benedict XIV sanctioned the veneration paid to him.

ON DENYING ONE'S OWN WILL

1.) Behold how a saint treasures the sacrifice of his own will. Blessed Ladislas was obliged to govern others for many years. In such a capacity self-will is apt to assume additional strength. He was advanced in years, a time when persons are usually more inclined to be self-willed. The fathers of the chapter, whose duty it was to decide where each friar should reside, left it to him to choose a residence according to his own wishes. But the holy man declined the offer. He did not wish to lose the merit which the sacrifice of one's own will brings with it, and he wanted the assurance of obedience that he was where God wished him to be. All religious are obliged by their vows, and subordinates by their duty of obedience, to give up their own will if the authorities decide what is contrary to it. But far from being considered a nuisance, such submission should be regarded as good fortune. "We

are happy, because the things that are pleasing to God are made known to us” (*Baruch. 4:4*). — Have you placed the proper store by this happiness?

2.) Consider on the other hand the dangers that accompany the pursuit of one's own will. The will of man is a blind power, which must be guided by the light of the understanding and by divine grace. One should not permit children, who do not yet know how to use their understanding properly, to follow their own will. But even in the case of adults, the will too often and too readily follows not the guidance of grace, but rather the passions and inordinate desires, so that it drives people to all kinds of evil. “Self-will,” says the holy Abbot Anthony, “is a wine so intoxicating that under its influence we no longer recognize the value of virtue and the hatefulness of vice.” Therefore, the Wise Man admonishes us: “Go not after thy lusts, but turn away from thy own will” (*Ecclus.*

18:30). Only he who is always prepared to deny his will, will be saved from the danger of being lost through it.

3.) Consider that for all men the denial of self-will is the most necessary and salutary means of arriving at Christian perfection. Perfection consists in devoting our heart to God. In the case of good Christians who forswear wickedness, the evil spirit endeavors to prevent their progress in perfection by luring them on to practice virtue merely because they so will it, not because it is their duty, or because it is pleasing to God. Those, however, who overcome also this last hindrance, who prefer in all things to do God's will and, therefore, accept what is disagreeable to them as readily as what pleases them, have already arrived at great perfection. Hence St. Philip Neri used to say in his brief but significant way, pointing to his forehead: “*Within a space four fingers wide. There holiness doth oft abide.*”

PRAYER OF THE CHURCH

O God, who didst will that Blessed Ladislav should distinguish himself before all in the practice of religious perfection, mercifully grant, that imitating his example, we, too, may advance in virtue. Through Christ Our Lord.

Amen.

AMONG INFIDELS - BY DIVINE GRACE

Father Louis Vezelis, OFM

Chapter Four - Land of the Morning Calm - Korea!

My feelings were uncertain as I boarded the Northwest Orient flight for Korea that November morning back in 1957. There was no doubt in my mind that I would have liked to stay in Japan - in one of those picturesque little villages that exude simplicity. It was surprising to me to see so many civilians on their way to Korea. I would learn later that these were the modern equivalent of carpet baggers that invaded the South after the Civil War! For the most part, the kind of people any country would like to forget and disown were the types that went to a place like Korea after the war. More will be said of these Americans later on.

After a short flight of a few hours over terrain that looked bleak and barren with tiny clusters of huts dotting it all, our plane began to bank and sweep in for a landing. We had landed on Korean soil. *I was actually in Korea - a country so close to China and Siberia!* And this would be my new «home» for God only knew how long. As the cabin door opened and the stewardess beckoned the pas-

sengers to proceed with caution down the narrow and steep aircraft stairs, my first impression of Korea was not the best. Numbed with resignation and making a supernatural act of abandonment to God and His providence, I mechanically descended the stairs and followed those ahead who were directing their steps to a far-off building. I'll never forget that sight as long as I live, nor will I forget the first sentiment I felt when I walked about fifty feet on Korean soil: I stopped, looked back at that lonely plane sitting on a patch of concrete.. like a lone fly on a bald spot. And I wondered: would it be too late to get back on board...and go....home?! But I knew this could not be. The austere mountains in the distance and the barrenness about me told me that this wasn't going to be easy. And how many YEARS did I say I would be here!?

The passengers all walked silently and solemnly. No one felt like talking - there were no beautiful sights of flowers or trees. We walked between huge concrete walls full of shell

marks. These obviously protected grounded planes from strafing and cannon fire. They looked ugly. After that our little procession passed through the hovering skeleton of what apparently used to be an aircraft hangar. The 'terminal' was a quonset hut that was shabby and dirty. We all filed in to have our papers checked, stamped and approved. Customs was a little corner of the building where officials clad in poor-fitting and well-wrinkled uniforms performed a peremptory function. At the other end of this line, safe from the peering officials, stood Fr. Justin Bellerose, O.F.M., Superior of the Franciscan Friary in Taejon. When I finally finished, Father Justin welcomed me to Korea in his warm fashion.

Fr. Justin had taken a jitney bus from Seoul to Kimpo, «international airport». This jitney bus was made from flattened out 55 gallon gasoline drums fitted onto the chassis of an U.S. Army truck as only the ingenious Koreans could make it. The interior was nothing more than wooden benches upholstered with bright-colored vinyl.

Fr. Justin had seen hard times as a missionary. He had been in Japan at first and later came to Korea during the occupation by the Japanese. He had been a prisoner of war and had been interred right there in the Friary.

Actually, he was the only 'veteran' among all the Franciscan missionaries in Korea. When the bus was filled with passengers, the driver collected his fare and urged the protesting engine into action. The whole thing rattled and shook; and the noise was deafening. Seated right next to Father Justin still required that I shout so he could hear me over the noise of the motor. The drive to Seoul was uneventful. The scenery along the road was really different from anything I've ever seen. There was an atmosphere of suffering and despair in the entire surroundings that oppressed one's spirit. As we arrived in Seoul, it was necessary to cross the Han River. There was only one bridge. And this was under repair. The little bus bravely went down a steep embankment alongside the bridge. Logs tied together with rope and resting on what looked like pontoons made up the temporary crossing. Looking out the window I saw the rushing waters of the Han River just below. There was no guard rail...not the least bit of safety factor to protect the bus and its passengers. Hiding my astonishment and fear, I just sat frozen in my seat and afraid to breathe. I was to learn later that this was standard procedure in Korea and adapted myself to it as a matter of necessity.

The long street leading to the downtown area where the cathe-

dral and bishop's residence were located was lined with an endless line of little shops. Each shop was grimy and gritty and I wondered how in the world anyone could buy anything from such a place. I had never seen anything like it in my whole life. It was, to the untrained eye, sheer chaos.

We arrived at the bishop's house - a large, red-brick structure built many years ago by the Paris Foreign Mission Society. It was originally the seminary and later became a residence for the bishop and priests of Seoul. It looked austere as nothing I had ever seen. Archbishop Rho (pronounced 'No') was polite and kind. Father Justin often stayed at the bishop's house when in Seoul on business. The few priests who resided in the house seemed rather old to me. But, then, I was all of 27 years old at the time!

The city was truly a sight to behold! It was the exact opposite of Tokyo. Seoul was grimy and dirty and the signs of war were still clinging to everyone and everything. We said Mass with one solitary candle - because candles were hard to come by; we used wine very sparingly - because wine was scarce. The vestments we wore looked like they had died of old age and someone forgot to bury them - but they were still being used. Saying Mass in the basement of the cathedral seemed like having Mass in the catacombs. It was

November and the weather was already cold. But there was no heat anywhere. I would get used to this...and much more!

The following day, Fr. Justin and I went to pay a courtesy call on the Vice-President of the Republic of Korea, Mr. John Chang. The administration of Syngman Rhee was such that Vice-President Chang seemed always under house arrest. An attempt had been made on his life already. Now this is strange because if anyone is the target of assassination it would normally be the head of State. Apparently, Mr. Chang was too much of a political threat to Syngman Rhee's little empire. The Vice-President received us kindly and enthusiastically. He was a fervent member of the Third Order of St. Francis and was an exemplary Catholic. He welcomed me to his country and wished me much success in the apostolate.

Post-war hardship and poverty were visible everywhere and the streets were full of little boys in tattered clothes, soot-smudged faces, and tin cans to receive alms dangling from their sides. They were a sight! But it didn't take long to see that this was not an ordinary display of ordinary poverty: this was their uniform and the dirty faces were their badge of begging. They lived in groups and they travelled in little packs. Their begging was not really begging in the accepted sense - it was more like out and out intimidation.

Storefronts looked dismal and dreary; their wares unattractive. The people looked lost in resignation to their fate and their very clothing looked equally tired as it hung on the thin frames of their owners. The capital building had been gutted and looked ghostly.

The Seoul railroad station was once an architectural gem. But in 1957 it looked like a large catch-all for the homeless and hungry and smelled like a urea factory.

We bought tickets for the train which would stop at Taejon. It was necessary to wait some time in the crowded waiting room. Consequently, there was always the real danger of pickpockets and every time someone came close, it was necessary to be extremely alert. A Korean pickpocket might easily conduct courses for his American brother in the trade.

It would take a few years before things got better in post-war Korea. And every positive step in the direction of progress was cause for real pride in my new homeland. The train was composed of well-worn Japanese engines and cars. The steam engines were kept in repair only through the miraculous touch of their engineers. The coaches were still the wooden variety we used to see in movies when I was a boy. They were falling apart - literally. When the engine jerked forward, the body of

the coach would sway slightly and you could see the seams parting momentarily. The seats were made of wood: straight backed...and very hard! We sat on these hard seats for three hours. The passengers directly in front of us and facing us looked at these «Yangkoes» (Western noses - as we were called) with curiosity and amusement. We did our best - especially myself - not to betray our discomfort and to pretend that everything was just normal and dandy. Of course, I was more fascinated with everything - no matter how insignificant. I wanted to get the 'feel' of the country. The 'feel' of travelling by train was very impressive! In order to keep some fresh air circulating in the confinement of the small coaches, most windows were kept open. That is...until a blast of the whistle warned of an approaching tunnel. Then there was a mad effort to close the obstinate windows before the soot and smell of smoke invaded the compartment. Usually, the effort was successful and then you would only get a strong hint of acrid smoke in the nostrils. But there were times when speed was not fast enough and a window had been left open! Then the full impact of engine smoke in your coach left you gasping for air...

Taejon means «Big Ricefield». It is visible from a distance while the train is still on an higher elevation. It was no small town. Its

population was about 400,000 in those days. Hardly a remote Korean village! For all its size, however, Taejon was very limited as far as finding all your needs goes. It would be necessary to go to Seoul often for supplies. When we debarked from the train, I noticed some American soldiers on the platform. They were there to meet other soldiers from the nearby military camps whose chaplain I was destined to become.

I still didn't know where the friary was located and kept silent on the matter because I knew that any explanation would be useless. The only thing to do was to follow patiently and silently with expectation. Outside the station which was nothing more than a dingy wooden structure, Fr. Justin hailed a taxi. In his Korean which no one really understood, but through some primitive charisma ended up comprehending. Fr. Justin directed the cabbie to where I assumed would be located the friary. We drove through all of Taejon's main shopping district: Main Street Taejon, you might say. It was truly pitiable for eyes that had never seen such things except in war movies. The taxi was more akin to a moon monster than any kind of car I had ever been in. It was a mixed breed between an army jeep and a bad dream. Nevertheless, it kept on chugging somewhere thanks to the constant and expert coaxing

of the driver. We drove through dirt streets both wide and narrow. Then, finally, the driver made a sharp right between huts bunched together and went bravely up what I would describe as a path - just wide enough for a jeep to go on. People jumped to the side and pressed against the fences while the driver ignored their pleas of carefulness. We arrived in front of a large gate topped with barbed wire. It looked more like the entrance to Stalag Thirteen more than the entrance to a friary. In large Chinese characters was a sign that read: «Song Puransisko su-do-hoe su-do-won» -Franciscan Monastery.

There was a little house next to the big gate. From it came running a little Korean lad who laboriously heaved the huge gate open - all the while grinning a beautiful welcome. The taxi lumbered up the last hillock upon which stood my new home: it lacked every sign of cheeriness and looked more like it just came back from a funeral. My life as a missionary in a country I came to for the purpose of establishing the Franciscan Order was about to begin. And be it ever so humble, it would be this scene of suffering and hardship that would become my greatest joy.

To Be Continued

GENERAL INFORMATION

The **SERAPH** is sent **FREE** anywhere in the United States, upon request. Cost of production and mailing is borne by your fellow Catholics, who are concerned for your soul. They desire that you, too, would become informed as to **TRUE DOCTRINE** and **SOUND SPIRITUALITY** as Roman Catholics totally loyal to the Apostolic See.

Won't YOU join them in this world-wide apostolate?

SUBSCRIPTION

Please note the expiration on your label. You will find the expiration of your subscription immediately following your name on the address label.

- A1 Benefactor Subscription - donation of \$50.00 or more.
- B1 Supporting Subscription - \$20.00 donation,
- C1 Free requested Subscription
- Tr Trial Issue

Example: **01-22 A1** indicates a subscription which will expire in January 2022. The A1 indicates that this is a Benefactor Subscription.

Please Note: There is an annual request for renewal.

Back Issues: Due to the extra cost in postage and handling, we must ask a minimum donation of \$5.00 for available copies and \$6.00 for any reprint.

Most Reverend Bishop Giles, OFM
The SERAPH
3376 Mount Read Blvd.
Rochester, New York 14616

Your Excellency,

Here is my offering of \$ _____ to help defray the cost of publishing the SERAPH - to help you keep sending it to someone who might otherwise never be able to benefit from it.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI
The SERAPH

3376 Mt. Read Blvd.
Rochester, New York 14616-4344

ELECTRONIC SERVICE REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

ROCHESTER, NY
PERMIT NO. 27