

Silver Sword International

www.rapeofthesoul.com

Michael A. Calace – Producer
Copyright 2007 ©

Former Monsignor John Murphy’s “Homily From Hell”

Monsignor John Murphy was in line to be a bishop. This was disrupted when embed art expert and film producer/director Michael A. Calace uncovered the satanic pornography scandals at the Archdiocese of Toronto and transcribed Murphy’s “Homily from Hell” in the feature film documentary “Rape of the Soul.”

The result at the archdiocese: Murphy was laicized and defrocked, along with Cardinal Ambrozic being forced to resign and Suzanne Scorsone being removed from her high profile positions in disgrace.

Below is Murphy’s shocking “Homily from Hell” which he gave on nationally televised Daily Mass in Canada from St. Michael’s Cathedral in Toronto, shortly after he learned that Michael A. Calace had discovered the scandals at his archdiocese in January 2004.

This “homily” as blasphemous and cunningly deceptive as it is, was also “the answer,” the only communication that Calace would receive from the priestly hierarchy of the archdiocese. This continued the brash arrogance course of Murphy, Ambrozic and Scorsone, and ultimately led to their disgraceful downfalls due to the persistence of Calace and the overwhelming pictorial imagery, evidence and professional analysis presented in “Rape of the Soul.”

(Underlined for emphasis and commentary is at the conclusion)

This followed the gospel according to Mark, which focused on 2:21-22.

[My Dear Friends in Christ,

Jesus was very aware that He jolted people with new ideas and new ways of understanding the truth. He was well aware of how difficult it is to get a new idea into people’s minds, to get them to grasp it and to accept it.

So our Lord uses two images today, which the people would well understand. The first He says, “no one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old cloak, otherwise the patch pulls away from it, and the new from the old, a worse tear is made.”

The religious leaders of Jesus' time were passionately attached to things as they were. The trouble for the Pharisees was that the whole religious outlook of Jesus was so startlingly (mispronounced, said twice- "that's hard to say") new, that they simply could not adjust to it. The law was to them God's last and final word. Add to it or take away from it, didn't just bring into it the matter of the question of error, but really the question of sin, and it was mission of the Scribes and Pharisees to try and build a fence around the law. So to them, a new idea about religion was not so much a mistake as it was a sin, and I think we can say that that same kind of thinking, that same spirit, is by no means dead.

Very often in a church, in a parish, in a group, if a new idea or a new method or any change is suggested, the objection is promptly raised, "We never did that before" or "We never did it that way before." I suppose that there is in religious people, a kind of passion for the old, and I suppose that this is because religion deals with eternal questions, nothing fleeting, it deals with eternal truths.

Now we add that to the fact that we have more familiarity with the past, certainly than we do with the future. Hence an attachment to the things as we know them, can make things move rather slowly and that is not altogether a bad thing. But it has its shortfalls.

Throughout all its history, the Church has clung to tradition and rightfully so because, tradition is part of the Church's lived experience. It is the proof of the life of the Church, and we can't know what we are or where we should be going, unless we know where we have come from, and what Jesus is saying though today in the Gospel, is that there comes a time when building on tradition or trying to patch it just won't work. There comes a time when the only thing to do is to scrap something entirely, and to begin again. So what does this mean in terms of the Church's life?

For example, there are forms of the Church's governness, methods of ministry, formulae of words expressing our beliefs, which we could try to adjust and tinker with, in order to bring them up to date. We could try to patch them.

No one would willingly or recklessly or callously abandon what has stood the test of time, and in which former generations have found their comfort and put their justifiable trust. However, by definition, the present always poses a challenge to the past. For example, how successfully could the church have been in updating the Latin use for the liturgy? This language has served the Church so well for centuries, and it is still the official language of the Church, but for purposes of worship, the fact remains that the Latin language is simply not understood by the vast majority of Catholics around the world. There was obviously a time when it was.

But language, like the universe, is a constantly changing and adapting thing. There comes a time when patches are useless, and when a person or an institution has to accept the reality of the new, or withdraw into a void where one worships not God, but the past.

We do well to remember that while God is the author of history, God also transcends history, and is the author of the present. Secondly, no one said Jesus tries to put new wine into old wine skins. In the old days, people stored their wine in animal skins, a kind of leather, and not bottles as we do today. The new wine was put into a skin, the wine was still fermenting, the gasses it gave off exerted a kind of pressure in the skin. In a new skin, there was elasticity, and no harm was done because the skin gave with the pressure. But an old skin had grown hard and lost its elasticity, and if new and fermenting wine was put into it, it could not give way to the pressure of the gasses, and it could only burst.

To put this into contemporary terms; our minds, our institutions must be elastic enough to receive and contain new ideas. The history of progress is the history of overcoming the prejudices of the closed mind. Every new idea has had to fight for its existence against the instinctive opposition of the human mind. Just think about some of these things. And within the Church, we should never be afraid of adopting new ways of proclaiming the good news of Jesus Christ.

While Christ is the same, yesterday, today and forever, we are not. And if we believe in the Holy Spirit, then we also believe that it is God who is leading us into the future.

Commentary by Michael A. Calace:

- Murphy the heretic was clearly getting everyone ready for the “Big Change” and he clearly took the words of Christ out of context. He commits blasphemy and then he separates the Blessed Trinity in his closing sentence.
- Jesus didn’t come along with “The Big Idea.” He *was* the big idea.
- Jesus changed everything when He came, and that is it. There are no changes in store for us now. The main prophecy to fulfill - He will come again.
- Murphy’s assertion that anyone who doesn’t go along with the big change will not be part of the body, as God Himself is the author of it, is yet another ridiculous scare and control tactic of the Conciliar Church, designed to proclaim that God takes care of the Church and people should not interfere. This would also falsely claim that the sanctifying grace of all Popes prior to John XXIII were wrong and that the Church has been misled from the beginning up until now.
- No one can really believe that God Himself would just suddenly change His mind after 2000 years, deciding to forget His original story and prophecies, insert “*new ideas*” & “*scrap something entirely and begin again,*” as Murphy said, in order to “get with the times.” This is insanely ridiculous!
- There is evil at the highest levels of the Church as clearly shown in “Rape of the Soul.” When you hear commentary by priests, especially those in high ranking positions becoming salesmen of heresy, excited at the thirst of the “big change,”

which they believe is not only eminent, but something that they will see in their lifetime, they need to be exposed.

- Jesus was giving an example of Himself, a new covenant, not a new idea, nor to accept future ideas of change after He came.
- The new law that Jesus was talking about was His law. He was talking about Himself, not a new rule or law to come after him, not to apply “anything goes tactics” and to feel free to make changes at any time in the future because it is God that is the “*author*,” and feel free to “*scrap something entirely and begin again*.” This is pure blasphemy.
- Jesus was introducing and confirming Himself as the Messiah, and that He would come again. This is NOT a change, but a fact.
- Jesus has only one way, not new ways, or “*ideas*.” In fact, Jesus didn’t come up with “the big idea” or even discussed ideas. His way was the way from the beginning, and it is the only way, and it will never change.

September 10th, 2007

Permission is granted to forward, link, print and distribute this PDF document in its entirety, without any adjustments or edits, when user credits its source as www.rapeofthesoul.com - Michael A. Calace - Producer.

Copyright 2007 © Silver Sword International