

The Reign of Mary

VOLUME 40

De Maria Nunquam Satis

ISSUE No. 50



- **To Promote Faithful Obedience to the Legitimate Teaching Magisterium of the One, True, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church Founded by Jesus Christ...**
- **To Preserve Without Compromise or Dilution the Traditions and Doctrines of the One, True Church...**
- **To Work and Pray for the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Our Queen and the Resultant Reign of Christ Our King...**

Mother Inviolata

No doubt some of us would never deliberately do anything that we knew to be very seriously wrong, but we are perhaps not at all particular about what we call little sins—little outbursts of impatience, dislikes, disobediences, meanness, unkind or sharp words, negligence or laziness.

If this is our habit of mind, we should feel ashamed when we invoke Our Lady as “Mother Inviolata.” For the very meaning of this title is that Our Lady hates all sin, even the very smallest imperfection.

Deliberate venial sin is, as it were, an act of indifference towards God. Suppose there was some small thing which somehow had the knack of causing you intense annoyance, as small things do often annoy people. Most of us have some peculiarity like this. Some noise, some sensation, some sound, seems intolerable, and sets one’s nerves on edge—like rubbing a balloon or scratching a chalkboard.

Supposing someone knew of this pet aversion of ours, and yet did the offensive thing constantly in our hearing—not perhaps to annoy us, but just because he liked it, and did not care whether it troubled us or not. How would we feel towards that person? This is only a far-away, faint notion of the displeasure God must feel with what we call our little sins. It is because of the negligence, the contempt of God’s wishes, the indifference implied in being careless about venial sins, that they are so displeasing to Him and resemble more His horrible scourging than our little analogy.

There are also consequences disastrous to ourselves, which have to be taken into account, when there is question of venial sin. The most serious of these is the loss of grace.

We have already seen that grace is God’s most precious gift to our souls. It is the only thing which is really indispensable, for without it we should be eternally lost. There are two kinds of grace—sanctifying grace and actual grace. The first one, *i.e.*, the state of grace, is a quality, something permanent which raises and transforms our soul, makes us have a real likeness to God, makes us His children, worthy and deserving of Heaven and of eternal glory. This is sanctifying grace, a quality which is always ours, once it is given, unless we lose and destroy it by mortal sin.



There is another kind of grace, which comes and goes. It is like a light, a touch, a whisper, a caress of the Divine Lover of our souls, an impulse to do something He wishes or omit something displeasing to Him. We all get many such impulses every day. They fall on our souls like the sparkling drops of dew on the grass in the early morning hours. This is actual grace. It comes and goes, according to the way we receive it. If we shut our ears against it, turn away our thoughts, and refuse to obey its call, it passes from us. If we receive it, and act upon it, God sends us ever more and more grace.

Both of these gifts of God are interfered with by venial sin. Mortal sin takes away the glorious life of grace altogether, and kills sanctifying grace, which is the life-breath of our souls. That is why we say a soul in mortal sin is dead, for it no longer has the life of grace. Venial sin does not destroy sanctifying grace, but lessens it. It chills the love of God in our hearts, and makes our souls weak and easily inclined to fall into mortal sin. It closes the doors of our hearts against actual graces, or brushes them away as the drops of dew are brushed off from the blades of grass as we walk upon them. We lose these precious gifts of grace every time we deliberately give way to venial sin—to an outburst of temper, to self-indulgence, or a fit of wounded pride or vanity, a temptation to resentment, a small lie, or an impulse of sloth or greediness.

Each of these acts deprives us of a priceless grace which will never return, besides the loss of peace which resistance to grace brings. As Holy Writ says: “Who hath resisted Him, and hath peace?” Our Mother Inviolata, then, calls upon us never again to think little of an evil which has power to do us so much harm. Her Son suffered all the agonies of His Passion to win for us these graces of which we make so little use, and can *she* ever forget what they cost? Let us then resolve never again to grieve our Mother by willful indifference, and ask her to obtain for us a clear view of the evil and deformity of “little sins.”

Motto: Mother Inviolata, keep me this day from willful sin.

Practice: To invoke Mary when tempted to be unfaithful to grace.

Example

In olden times, there lived in a certain part of England a rich and powerful knight, who kept a great estate and lived royally. But he forgot God, and thought people fools who confessed their sins to a priest.

But he had a friend who grieved to see him in this state. And one Good Friday this friend met him, and said: “How can you bear to go about with this load of sins unconfessed? Let us, in honor of this great day, when Our Lord died to save us from our sins, go to that good hermit nearby, for he will give you wise counsel which you sorely need.”

The knight’s heart was touched by divine grace, and he agreed to go to the hermit.

The holy man said: “There shall be joy in Heaven over one sinner that doth penance, more than over ninety-nine just who need not penance.”

The knight then spoke long to him of his sins, for there was indeed much to be told, and the hermit, who was an expert in the cleansing of souls, knew well how to search and question him, so that he was presently acquainted with the whole of the matter.

Then he said to the knight: “Dear brother, rejoice, God will forgive you all your sins, and give you His grace, which will soon be yours, because of the holy penance you will now do.”

But the knight much disliked the idea of penance, for he wanted to have the grace of God for nothing, like so many of us.

He replied: “Alas! my father, I am not one for penance. I

was brought up softly, and only like to eat nice things. Give me the easiest penance that is to be had, or I will fall back into my sins.”

“Do not fear, my brother,” said the hermit. “You will have such an easy one, that no one could refuse it.”

“Oh, God be praised!” said the knight. “I ask no better.”

“Take this small flask,” said the hermit. “Go down to the stream there, and fill it with water to the brim. Then bring it back to me, and I will give you absolution from all your sins.”

“With pleasure,” said the knight. He ran forthwith to the stream and seated himself on the bank. But the water that was flowing so swiftly, turned aside when it came near him, and flowed by, leaving the flask empty. He tried another stream, but all to no purpose. It was the same all that day, wherever he went, and he began to wonder what it was that prevented him from filling the flask. But suddenly it dawned upon him that the pure water fled from him who was so deeply sunk in sins, and so he could not do his penance. This brought home to him the evil state he was in, and being loyal and true-hearted, he resolved not to return to the hermit till his penance was done.

Leaving his wife and estate, he set off through the world, and wherever he came to a spring, he dipped the flask into it, but he could never fill it. He wandered about thus for two years, in the heat and cold and dust and rain, weary and sad, his clothes in rags, and his boots full of holes, suffering much, but bearing all most patiently.

One day, being overwhelmed with sadness, he bethought himself of Mary, the Consolation of the Afflicted, and cried out to her: “Alas, dear Lady, how badly have I treated thy Son, that He thus turns away from me. Most glorious Virgin, wilt thou not pray for me? I deserve indeed my sufferings, no man knoweth this better than I, but, gentle Lady, have pity on me.”

When Our Lady heard this prayer, she put it into his heart to return and tell the hermit, and confess his failure.

He was so worn and thin and weary that the hermit did not recognize him, but he gave him a kind welcome, as he did to all pilgrims. But when he discovered who the knight was, he wept and gave thanks to God, and said: “My friend, you have gained great merit by your sufferings. God has forgiven you all your sins, because you were faithful in obedience. Now you may leave me that flask, and I will give you another penance.”

But the knight’s heart had been changed by grace, and he humbly answered: “Nay, my father, it is not right to leave off a quest begun. I will set out again when you have given me more good counsel.”

Then the hermit comforted him, and both the hermit and pilgrim wept, the one in compassion and the other in contrition for his sins. And as he wept, one of the pilgrim’s tears fell into the flask which he still carried round his neck, and lo! in a minute it was filled to the brim, and he knew that his penance was done, and that God had forgiven him all his sins.

Then the holy man absolved him, and said: “Go back in peace to your wife and your estate, for to the tear of your penance Our Lord hath added the ocean of His love.” And thus will Our Lady help all who have recourse to her to deliver them from their sins.

The Age of the Universe

Adapted from *The Death of Evolution* by Wallace Johnson

The Catholic Church has not defined the age of the universe. The genealogy in the Old Testament indicates that the human race is about six thousand years old, but this genealogy may be incomplete. The “days” of creation could possibly be eons. Belief in creation does not depend on a “young universe.” On the other hand, the theory of evolution *does* depend absolutely on an “old universe.” Whether one prefers the “natural selection” or the “chance mutation” flavor of evolution, billions of years would be required. If the “old universe” theory falls, evolution falls.

Unfortunately for evolutionists, there are many natural phenomena which seem to limit the earth and the universe to an age of only some thousands of years. Here are several of them:

Carbon-14 Imbalance: Carbon-14 is produced by cosmic rays and nitrogen high up in the atmosphere. The carbon-14 is assimilated into organic beings along with ordinary carbon-12. The difference is that carbon-12 does not decay, but carbon-14 does. When the world began, presumably there was no carbon-14 on earth to decay, so production had a head start over decay. As more carbon-14 is produced, there is more to decay, so eventually decay catches up to production. The devisers of the controversial “carbon-14 dating method” calculated that the balance or “equilibrium” between the rate of production in the atmosphere and the rate of decay on earth, should have been achieved after about 30,000 years. But it has not. Production in the upper atmosphere still exceeds decay on earth by 30-40% (some say by as much as 50%). In the absence of a better explanation, this means that the cosmic rays have been acting for less than 30,000 years.

Helium: When uranium decays, it produces not only lead, but also helium. The helium passes into the atmosphere. The puzzle for evolutionists is that there is not nearly enough helium in the atmosphere. If uranium has been decaying for billions of years, there should be a lot more helium. The evolutionists tackle the problem by an assumption that the missing helium must simply have escaped into space. But there are several studies which show that helium is probably *entering* the atmosphere from the sun’s corona. And there are studies that show that the proposed escape of helium in sufficient quantity to meet the problem is unlikely.

Comets: Short-period comets complete their orbits in less than 200 years. Every time a comet circles the sun it has a moment of glory as the beautiful tail forms. But it pays for this

glory by losing mass at a prodigious rate. Comets are relatively small, averaging perhaps a kilometer in diameter. They cannot sustain many of these moments of glory before they disintegrate.

Astronomer R. A. Lyttleton estimated that no short-period comet could survive for more than 10,000 years. Recent assessments of Halley’s Comet may allot to that big comet a much longer life than 10,000 years, but it must still be a very limited lifespan.

Multitudes of surviving short-period comets are heavenly witnesses that the solar system is very young. They are a problem for evolutionists who require a multi-billion year old solar system. They meet the problem by proposing that there must be a huge number of spare comets waiting out in space; and they suggest that, from this postulated reservoir, new comets are kicked into the solar system to replace old comets. There is no evidence to support the hypothesized cloud of spare comets—the Oort Cloud, as it is called. It actually falls apart under critical scientific analysis. Furthermore, the parabolic shape of the orbits of short-period comets indicates that they were not kicked from space into the solar system.

Earth’s Magnetic Field: Dr. T. G. Barnes, Professor of Physics at the University of Texas in El Paso, has studied and updated previous scientists’ work on the strength of the earth’s magnetic field, which has been carefully measured during nearly a century and a half. Its strength is decaying exponentially with a probable half-life of 1,400 years. This means it was twice as strong 1,400 years ago; four times as strong 2,800 years ago. Projecting forward, it means that there will be no magnetic field remaining in the year 4,000 A.D. Professor Barnes says, “It would appear from these arguments that the origin of the earth’s magnetic moment is much less than 20,000 years ago.”

Oil and Gas Wells: That oil and gas are still at extremely high pressures is something of a mystery for modern geology. If oil and gas had been trapped in the rocks for millions of years, the pressure would have seeped through the rocks. No excess pressure should remain at all if the formations are more than some thousands of years old.

The Poynting-Robertson Effect: This means that dust and stones orbiting the sun are being struck by the sun’s radiation. This decelerates them, and they gradually spiral into the sun. The smaller the particle, the faster it is swept into the sun. This effect should have cleared our solar system of dust, and of particles up to 4 centimeters in diameter, in less than 200 million years. This is a small fraction of the solar system’s supposed age of 4½ billion years; and yet, the dust is still there.

Dear Father, please continue to send The Reign of Mary to:

1) NAME: _____	3) NAME: _____
ADDRESS: _____	ADDRESS: _____
CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____	CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____
2) NAME: _____	4) NAME: _____
ADDRESS: _____	ADDRESS: _____
CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____	CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

Then, if we look out to the really big suns (the “O stars” and the “B stars”) with 100,000 times the radiation of our sun, those giants should sweep up their dust 100,000 times faster than our sun does. Yet, these giant stars are nearly all surrounded by huge clouds of dust and gas. Here is evidence of a young universe.

There is another problem with those O and B stars. They are burning up their energy at a prodigious rate. To support the energy consumption each of them would need to have been an “infinite” mass not many thousands of years ago. This is realized by evolutionists. The simple answer is that the universe is only some thousands of years old.

Meteorite Dust: This fine dust is constantly falling through the earth’s atmosphere. In 5 billion years it should have formed a layer about 130 feet thick if accumulating undisturbed. There is no sign of such a layer. Meteorite dust is rich in nickel, but in earth rocks, nickel is rare. In billions of years the nickel-rich dust should have made our oceans rich in nickel. In fact, ocean water and ocean sediments have so little nickel that the meteorite dust could have been falling for some thousands of years at most.

The moon tells a similar story. Meteorite dust has been falling on the moon’s surface just as on earth. On the moon there is no wind, water or weather to disturb the dust as it accumulates. Assuming an age of billions of years for the moon, it was feared that the astronauts’ landing craft might sink into 60 or 100 feet of dust, so the landing craft was fitted with pancake landing feet. When the astronauts landed on the moon they found half an inch of dust, which indicated that the moon has been there for only about 8,000 years.



The Sun: The question of what makes the sun burn has long been pondered. *Chemical burning* is inadequate. It could last only about 5,000 years. Around 1850, Hermann von Helmholtz proposed the sun’s incandescence comes from the sun’s *gravitational shrinkage*. He calculated a burning life of about 20 million years. His theory was rejected because, and only because, evolution requires billions of years.

About the beginning of the 20th century came knowledge of radioactivity. *Nuclear fusion* could be the source of the sun’s energy. Evolutionists grabbed it because nuclear fusion in the sun and stars could go on for billions of years. It became accepted dogma, even though it has no better scientific justification than gravitational shrinkage.

Is it correct? If nuclear fusion provides the sun’s energy, the sun should be showering earth with neutrino particles. Ingenious neutrino traps have been counting neutrinos for decades; but not nearly enough neutrinos have been detected to support nuclear fusion in the sun.

From 1979-81 a handful of scientists studying data collected over the last three hundred years began arguing over what appeared to be evidence that the sun is shrinking. The last statement was from Ronald Gilliland, who found that the overall shrinkage of about 0.1 seconds of arc per century since the early 1700’s is real. He used cautious words in his statements: “Given the many problems with the data sets, one is not inexorably led to the conclusion that a negative secular solar radius trend has existed since A.D. 1700, but the preponderance of current evidence indicates that such is likely to be the case.”

The overall shrinkage he reported would mean that the sun would have been twice as large if it existed two million years ago. That posed two alternatives: either the shrinkage must be explained away, or a young age for the sun must be accepted. Evolutionists have adopted the first alternative, claiming that the sun probably shrinks *and expands* in cycles, yielding long-term stability. This suggestion is not verifiable except by future data observed over hundreds of years.

Meanwhile the observed facts are: a) solar neutrinos are missing, which should discredit the assumption that the sun (and other stars) are burning by nuclear fusion; and b) direct evidence that the sun’s diameter has shrunk during three centuries is prima facie evidence that gravitational collapse is a tenable theory for the burning energy of the sun and stars. However, that would imply that the total life of the sun must be limited to about 20 million years, a minute fraction of the “billions and billions of years” (in the words of Carl Sagan) needed for evolution.

Dear Father, please continue to send me The Reign of Mary.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____ DONATION: \$ _____

The Reign of Mary
P.O. Box 69027, Seattle, WA 98168 U.S.A.