

BULLETIN – OCTOBER 16

In a society in which moral flaws and failures are fairly celebrated on the front pages of the supermarket tabloids, isn't it amazing to have the politicians trading accusations about years-old locker-room conversations, lurid remarks, and the use of politically incorrect language? "Here's a 1986 tape where he uses the d-word!!!" "Here are photos of her shaking hands with someone who was once caught looking at porn during his high school biology class!!!" And on and on and on. The thought police and the "news" media reach new levels of buffoonery by repeatedly dragging out new examples of sinful or vulgar behavior which, because of our fallen human nature, is as common as breathing. They pretend to think that sensible people will be swayed rather than bored by these "gotcha" moments. The sad thing is that they prove nothing, are typically edited and altered, and are often in themselves unjust and untrue. Why would we be surprised when sinners act like sinners? And the sanctimonious and hypocritical politicians who quickly jump on their high moral horses and claim they could NEVER vote for someone who did such-and-so are just disgusting, playing right into the political schemes of their opponents.

Would any of us pass muster if all the words of our lives were put out in transcripts as public accusations? The real problem here is not the sinful or vulgar behavior of one or another candidate. Those things have always been and will always be there. The real problem is that the free-thinkers of the 1960's became the journalism professors of the 1970's and 1980's. They are the ones who have brainwashed the people who are now in the mainstream media, from the major networks right on down to MLive, which currently publishes what used to be our local daily newspaper. These elites can't believe that anyone would entertain views and opinions at variance with theirs, and so they work with all their might—NOT to be objective in their reporting, but to throw the entire weight of their position and influence behind whomever they see through their own eyes as the OBVIOUS candidate. The gullible do not question or ask questions beyond what they see or read in the mainstream media, because they still entertain the pious belief that good and objective people are in charge of the means of communication in this country.

In case you didn't notice, in the vice-presidential debate, one of the candidates gave a stirring explanation of his pro-life position based on the natural law. The natural law is what has been planted in our hearts by our Creator. It has nothing to do with legislation, nothing to do with politics, nothing to do with -isms, feminism, nationalism, or anything else. Natural law is what Our Lord appeals to when he asks the scholar of the Mosaic Law in Luke 9:36 regarding the Good Samaritan: "Which of these three, in your opinion, was neighbor to the robbers' victim?" There was no appealing to the Mosaic Law, temple statutes, Roman imperial law, or anything else in that case. The answer is clear to everyone who has eyes and a soul. To give any other answer is to be willfully in denial.

The same principle of natural law is what must govern our attitude toward human life. The more we dare to ponder the mystery, the more it will unfold for us. Is the baby in the womb a human person? If the baby is a human person, no act of Congress, no executive order, no decision of the Supreme Court can make it otherwise. As Judge

Andrew Napolitano reminded the crowd of 2,000 gathered for the Right to Life dinner on Monday evening, October 3, St. Thomas More used a similar natural law argument in his defense almost 500 years ago: If the world is flat, a decree of the king cannot make it round. If the world is round, a decree of the king cannot make it flat. We know that the baby in the womb, conceived through the action of human parents, cannot grow up to become a mineral, a vegetable, or an animal. The baby is not simply a part of the mother's body, and certainly not a hostile invader, but a unique and distinct individual, in a very vulnerable state. Let's face it, we are all in a very vulnerable state every time we fall asleep. That certainly does not deprive us of personhood while we are in a state of slumber! And the law recognizes that, even as it did regarding human life in the womb until 43 years ago in the *Roe v. Wade* case.

It continues to be discouraging to hear some Catholic politicians defend their hands-off attitude toward abortion law, even about the butchery of partial-birth abortion, basing their position on every woman's right to make her own decisions. Surely they don't mean this, when the legal deck has been so clearly stacked AGAINST any counseling or information or regulation of clinics that would be routinely expected in any other decisions regarding one's health. Planned Parenthood doesn't want women to make THEIR OWN decisions: it wants them to agree with ITS decisions, which are always pro-abortion and anti-life; and not be exposed to anything to the contrary. Remember who Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, was, and the elitist eugenics and racism which she blatantly preached. Then remember which presidential candidate has happily accepted the Margaret Sanger Award (2009) in recognition of the candidate's defense and pursuit of the same goals.

It was really disheartening to hear one of the vice-presidential candidates speaking admiringly about his Catholic upbringing and Jesuit training, and about how he credits his Catholic morality with what is often an unpopular position against the death penalty. And yet he does not see the inconsistency in his defense of *Roe v. Wade* and the 56,000,000 deaths of American children it has brought about! There is no doubt that the weight of Church teaching has been and continues to be more frequently applied to defense of the life of the innocent unborn than to the defense of the life of the criminally guilty. The first defense is one of fundamental justice and the sanctity of life; the second is one of mercy and hope for the conversion of the sinner. Both are important, but the candidate's Jesuit training apparently did not touch upon the obvious hierarchy of importance in various facets of moral theology. He apparently prefers the intellectual company of cafeteria Catholics who approach Church teaching as a buffet of self-pleasing choices rather than the ongoing presentation of revealed truth intended to assure eternal life for all who accept it.

World Mission Sunday next week! Elsewhere in the bulletin, you will find Bishop Walkowiak's urging of our generosity to the Church's great mission work. We all have our own favorite societies and missions to whom we donate, and we all have opportunities through the parish to help with the Church's missionary efforts both near and far. This annual collection goes to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, the international office entrusted with the task of supporting ALL our missionary activities, even those which are so small and poor that they cannot afford to ask for themselves.

Appeals seem to come to us “fast and furious,” but frankly, one could do much good just by being generous with the causes that are presented to us in the course of parish life over any given year. The Church has a fine record, compared to any other charity, of having amazingly low overhead and an outstanding delivery of financial help from those who give, going to those in need. And the World Mission Sunday collection is not primarily for the material needs of the mission parishes and institutions, but for their efforts in proclaiming the Good News of Jesus Christ in word and deed in the midst of societies and cultures where the Good News is as yet both unfamiliar and unwelcome. Our assistance is not only enabling, but encouraging and supportive for the pastors and congregations whom it affects. We are bound together in faith in the Body of Christ! God bless you!

Fr. Den

Thought for the week: If a vegan lodges a complaint, can it still be considered a beef?