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*Dover Beach*, in 1851

“The Sea of Faith
Was once, too, at the full and round earths shore...
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furled
But now only I hear its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar…”

Here is T.S. Eliot in 1945 – “the trouble *of* the modern age is not merely the inability to believe certain things about God which our forefathers believed, but the inability to feel towards God as they did.” Notice that the poet says the trouble *of* the modern age, not simply a trouble in or with the modern age, but the trouble *of* the modern age. He gives it that wider dimension.

Belief about God and feeling towards God is a key distinction for a Catholic educator in these days..

I put these quotations at the beginning of this paper not to give gloom, but to freshen us up with a sense of perspective. Matthew Arnold was writing in 1851, and T S Eliot wrote his passage sixty-eight years ago, so despite the challenges that face us in faith formation among our young – which includes many of our teachers – a sense of perspective can embolden us (despite what they said, we are still here), and remind us of the Gospel reassurance that the Lord is Emmanuel – God with us.

The Christian faith has the assurances of hope as its strong supportive framework. Those engaged in Catholic education should be encouraged to remain always as people of hope. It is so easy to count our failures, and be dispirited: we are a big target for critics, easy to hit. “We sent him to a Catholic school but he gave up his religion. Wouldn’t you think that a Catholic school would have done better”, and so on. These critics forget that the school life
of a child is only part of his/her continuum of life – the formative continuum started years before, in a family where no or little faith witness might have existed.

There is also the whole Christian anthropology that supports us. We know that we have the truths about human development. The Cro-Magnon caves discovered in France contained the oldest cave paintings there in Europe, some forty to fifty thousand years old. You have seen the slides I am sure, the coloured buffalo or bison on the walls. The caves teach us a lot about the purpose and nature of a human being. They show man the thinker, the lover, the artist and the worshipper. There are scratches of the calendar, indicating thought. There is pollen from flowers put around the bodies of a deceased one, indicating love. There are the tools, indicating creativity. And the paintings are religious paintings. A human being will never be complete unless he or she shows those dimensions of thought, of love, of imagination and creativity, and of worship. No matter if our efforts of faith formation programmes are not as successful in the immediate sense as we would like, then we must hold on to the faith and hope and conviction that the seeds we plant are those of a full humanity, to produce a man or woman fully alive, one who is a reflection of the glory of God.

The ways we have been undertaking religious faith formation in our schools needs always to change to meet cultural realities. With cultural shifts go learning shifts. With changing contexts there is a need for changing adaptations. We have travelled from Religious Instruction to Religious Knowledge to Religious Education in our terminology. We know that ideally the faith is caught in the home, nurtured in the school, and celebrated in the parish community. Clearly there is now a skew in that equation.

The Church will not be reborn again until the Word is born again in our homes, in our families. The disaffiliation of the young from a worshipping community, (outside of school), is known to all of us, and is particularly apparent in a country situation. In a city, the absence of the local school children from the Church worshipping community may not appear as stark, but in a country town it is very obvious. We might have ninety Year 12 students at the local school, and only see three of them at Mass. There will be no vibrant Church of the future unless there is a family Church. I look to the people of the Jewish faith who centred their worship and prayer in the home, with the mother lighting the candles on the Friday evening, chanting the Psalms and giving thanks, and fostering a faith that has stood two thousand years of persecution, pogroms and holocaust. We know that the faith is caught in the home, nurtured in the school, and celebrated in the parish. But we know that in many of our homes there is no Word of God not even a Bible to read, no family prayers or grace at meals or devotions practised, no religious images, not a crucifix, to reinforce the sense of the presence of God in that sacred place, the family. Our boys and girls are not at Sunday Eucharist, so that, apart from what happens at school, there is no regular exposure to Scripture and Gospel teachings and the presentation of Jesus as Saviour and Lord, as more than just a fine man. Of the four high schools in my diocese, one may not need two hands to count the number of Year 12s regularly at Mass in those four towns. Absenteeism from a Church of the Word of Life and the Bread of Life is the norm, a
conformity enforced by a peer group pressure of the strongest order. This is the real world in which we are called to serve, and address.

To put it squarely, faith formation is the greatest challenge placed before those who lead our schools – unless they are content to run simply what Pope Francis described recently, that some Christian works have become “an NGO without Christ.”

This may require a whole new recasting of the models used by our principals and religious educators in our schools, a two-stream approach of Religious Knowledge (content) and Faith Formation (an affective spirituality). Perhaps a re-naming, such as Theology and Spirituality (T & S).

The phenomenon facing us of the distantation of our young from the institutional Church puts us back to asking the question why we conduct our schools. They are a vast enterprise in the life of the Church in Australia. The first Church building erected in our land by Fr Joseph Therry was a school, not a church. We know the history and the struggle and the enormous generosity of literally hundreds of men and women in Religious Orders, most coming from overseas to work here, and now we have an educational movement, the Australian Catholic schools, which claims one child in five in Australia as a student.

We do not conduct our schools in order to get every child to go to Mass. We conduct our schools for the same reason we conduct Homes for the Aged, because we are Church. The mission of Jesus is to reach out to care for all, especially the young and the vulnerable, the frail and the weak. All our ministries as Church should be conducted with the two wings of mission and justice. For our schools, justice demands that we provide the best education we can to help the development of a young life placed on this earth but once, and charged with unknown potential by the loving Father.

All of our works of charity as Church, including our schools, are based on the three great pillars of faith, hope and love. We do all that we do because the Catholic school is founded on faith – faith in the child, faith in the future, faith in the culture, and faith in the love of God for this child. They are based on hope, the hope that this child will be an instrument of peace, a servant to his or her neighbour, that his or her God-given potential will be realised. And all these things, including our schools, we conduct because of love. That is the inspiration that distinguishes and motivates us. We conduct our schools only because of love. Faith, hope and love.

The absence of faith formation at home does not excuse us from attempting to bring about the wondrous journey for a child as they grow into early adulthood of not simply knowing
about Jesus, but knowing Jesus. The cognitive to the affective; the most difficult of journeys, as Teilhard de Chardin called it, the journey within. The Church says the Eucharist is central to our meaning and purpose; we cannot rest until our boys and girls feel this in their hearts, and know they must pray, to be human. To enable this, to allow God’s grace to work, demands a multiple approach from our religious educators, because no human being can be served by a single approach, as every human being is multi layered; in faith formation there is no one size fits all.

We face another scoff – Jesus good, religion bad, and we face an ocean of other awesomely powerful formers of values, beyond and in many cases above the family and school – the social media.

The situation facing us is known to all of you. I was taken by something that Fr Chris Middleton, Headmaster at St Aloysius College in Sydney, and he has the gift of keeping his ear to the ground concerning youth culture. He referred in his school newsletter recently to the YouTube clip of the twenty-two year old American Jefferson Bethke reciting a poem in rap style. More than 27 million people had hit on that clip – 27 million! It was entitled Why I hate religion, but I love Jesus. Older people might class this as naiveté, but this young man has addressed a contrast we are all familiar with, namely that between personal spirituality and organised religion and religious institutions, such as the Church. Spirituality in; Church out. In these our days we face a phenomenon that religious educators up until the seventies did not have to face, the distantation of the young from the institutional Church, a distancing not helped at all as the wave of scandals of sexual abuse bedevils the Church. These scandals may have brought the Church to its knees, which is not a bad posture for the Church.

We must beware of any tendency to demonise the secular, to revert again to seeing the world as a hostile place, forgetting that “God so loved the world, He sent His only Son”. It is against any spiritual tradition as Ignatian to shy from the world – to find God in all things is the motto. When God completed all creation and made a human being, He looked and said it was very good. The world is charged with the grandeur of God, as the poet said, and not just through nature but through every human being, every one of whom is made in the image and likeness of God. We must take the world where it is, and look for the signs of God’s presence in it.

The Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor has a small work published in 2002, entitled Varieties of Religion Today: William James Revisited. It is a series of reflections on the work of William James, written on the occasion of the centenary of the publication of James’ seminal work, The Varieties of Religious Experience. His outline is known to all of you. He speaks of the three ages – medieval, modern, and our present, contemporary age.

The Contemporary Age, commencing after WWII four or five decades ago has developed a culture of individualism, “expressive individualism” as Taylor calls it. This expressiveness was present in nineteenth century artists and writers, but clearly now in our time, Taylor
contends, this self orientation has become a common trait of our society. Each of us has his or her own way of living our humanity. I do not want to hurt others, but others cannot tell me what to think, how to act, and certainly no Government or previous generation, or religious body, can impose a conformity on me. To conform for conformity’s sake means I have abandoned my own personal journey. For a contemporary person, lifestyles—such as straight or gay, married or not married, Christian or Buddhist, a gay couple organizing a father or mother-less baby—are assessed in terms of what is good for me. It may be quite different to what is good for another person, but what that person chooses will probably be good for him or her. Nobody is wrong on Q&A. Concerning the faith-life, Taylor states that “the religious life or practice that I become part of not only must be my choice, but must speak to me; it must make sense in terms of my spiritual development, as I understand this”.

What this means is that we can no longer act in our schools as if there can be a return to a Golden Age. It is futile trying to put toothpaste back into toothpaste tubes. Being born Catholic and raised in a Catholic culture, symbolised by the twin poles of parish and school, and various devotional practices, meant through the Modern Era that most would remain Catholic all their lives. In the contemporary era there is no longer a necessary link between being in the Catholic group and remaining Catholic. In an Expressivist Age, each person is engaged in making sense of their own spiritual journey. So I marry on Henley Beach, with no sense of Sacrament or need to invoke Jesus.

This is the formidable challenge for a Catholic school today. The leaders of the school, the atmosphere makers, the religious educators and those responsible for faith formation, must create a school context where the Catholic school must recognise that each of its students has an individual religious quest, and we do this knowing that each of our students can be led to discover that the Gospel is God’s clearest word about our lives. It demands a shift in gearing, this approach, and places great demands on those charged with the leading of the school. I don’t think we have even started in most of our schools to re-construct our faith formation programs to accommodate the individualism of this age. The Timetable God is a fearsome god, and the most powerful of deities.

Those leading schools and those responsible for religious education, know that the question of faith formation is one not simply addressed towards our students, but also to significant numbers of our staff, especially the younger ones. Is it unrealistic or too harsh to say that many of our teachers had stopped listening in RE classes around about Year 10, and have had not much more than a smattering of religious formation since then, and have themselves been disengaged from a worshipping community during their university time, and now as primary school teachers find themselves teaching religious education every day, modelling prayer styles and telling the children that the Eucharist is the source and summit of the Christian experience. We all know the stirring words of Paul VI in Evangelii Nuntiandi that young people will listen to witnesses before teachers, and to teachers only if they are witnesses. Our young, and middle-aged, teachers continue to show all the heroic traits of good teachers. They are generous, devoted to their students, worry about them and ponder how an individual child might be helped better. So how do we take this deeper,
what are our schools to do to enable our teachers to become models of faith, teachers of
prayer, witnesses with a conviction about the truth of Christ Jesus in our lives?

Back to our schools. The D’Orsa’s argue for a mission theology for Catholic educators, which
befriends the culture and human experience and the living religious tradition, so that
students might find meaning and purpose in the midst of globalisation, secularisation and
pluralisation. There is a focus in their work on the orientation of the heart.

Professor Richard Rymarz on the other hand emphasises the importance of a critical mass of
human witness, and makes a persuasive case about the crucial role of content in our RE
curriculum. As many of our schools in the country find it difficult to achieve the critical mass
of committed Catholics among teachers and families to animate the Catholic culture which
he advocates, those of us in that impoverished situation must challenge city-based thinking.
Rymarz suggests correctly, however, I believe, that pedagogy can focus on process in ways
whereby content might be overlooked.

Religious illiteracy among our Catholic school graduates seems to me to be an ignored
phenomenon of our times. In my experience it is rarely discussed by Principals. But if we
were to do a NAPLAN on knowledge of the faith and the ability to be literate about it, I
wonder what the scores would be. Raising the issue with other Principals while still a
Principal myself often led to a silent response which nobody seemed at ease to take up. It is
the closest I have known in Catholic schooling to us living the fable of the Emperor’s Clothes.
We can walk around pretending that our students are fully clothed in their knowledge of the
faith, and not see that they are clothed very scantily, in fact. We often point to Catholic
identity expressing itself in terms of help for the elderly, service of the poor, involvement in
Project Compassion, and so on. Replace Project Compassion by World Vision and you could
give the same list for any good Government school.

She claimed her son had received a confectionery religion, consisting of be nice and to do
justice. She claimed that we will have a lay population totally ignorant of their own
background as religious people, and hence a population of the non-involved.

I doubt whether there would be many Principals who would argue that their students are
able to argue with the same knowledge of content and sophistication the key features of
their Catholic tradition compared to how they might analyse an author or a playwright, or
various economic theories, or the scientific explanation of Climate Change or human
biology. It is a challenge.

I am following with great interest the development of the Enhancing Catholic School Identity
Project that is being conducted by Victorian and other Catholic schools in association with
the Belgian Leuven Catholic University. The developments and processes described in that
study seem to echo so strongly with our own Australian experiences. Once we have learned to say eight-syllable words easily – like recontextualization – a picture emerges which provides a framework upon which to reflect for further action. The three critical elements in the role of the teacher are dubbed WSM. W is for witness, so that the RE teacher needs to be willing and able to witness to his or her faith; S is for specialist, so that the teacher needs to have specialist understandings of the Catholic tradition and religions in general; M is for moderator, that the teacher needs to be a skilled moderator of the dialogue he or she engenders and facilitates between the different world views held by the students, our pluralist culture, and the Catholic tradition.

The challenge that we face is that secular values are very satisfying in themselves. In his talk to the National Catholic Education Conference in Adelaide, Professor Didiet Polleypet put up a slide which showed a traditional statue of Our Lady on a pedestal in a classroom. The statue had Mary with hands joined looking upwards, rosary beads, flowers at her feet and a votive lamp. On the pedestal were attached a series of placards stating “generosity” “kindness” “service” “caring”, and so on. It could have been in the corner of any Catholic classroom. The danger is that these secular values by themselves can satisfy the soul. They can take the place of the religious dimension. When one acts in a caring, generous and serving manner, our religious core is expressing itself but only at a basic common level, the same for Hindu, Moslem or Jew. Those values by themselves could lead the child away from personal faith, away from any sense of the real religious dimension. The answer is not to make the statue of Mary bigger, he said, but to ensure that each of those values is explicitly connected to the Gospel of Jesus. Why do we wish to be caring? Why do we regard it as a value to be generous? Why should we have a sense of service? Each of these must be rooted in the Gospel, that we do these things because that is what Jesus asked of us, that is how we lead the life that Jesus wished for us.

A new tack. Fr Michael Paul Gallagher makes the point that those whose starting point in religious education is to arrest the decline of Church practice and find ways of inviting people back to Church, will adopt a different starting point from those who wish rather to approach the process of the deadening of spiritual desire or sensibility, the need to reawaken the question of God as a personal hunger. He quotes Grace Davie who has described the phenomenon of “believing without belonging” as a description of many of our age. Others, he says, have turned that round, pointing to the frequency of inactive, passive Church membership as “belonging without believing”. But he says that for many of the searchers of today who are not touched by present Church language there is another line, that of “longing without belonging”. He speaks of the three wounds, the main cultural and spiritual wounds that people might suffer from, and for which evangelisation would require a healing before the Word of God can be heard fruitfully. The wounds are in memory, belonging and imagination.

The third wound concerns “religious imagination”, to use Cardinal Newman’s expression. If the constant message about our autonomous self-fulfilment is the key to happiness, then that creates an impoverishment on the level of our self images and our God images. We
need to look at a re-enchantment for the human imagination. The popularity of Tolkein, and the film *The Life of Pi* might point towards this, as perhaps does the outburst of positive response to the person of Pope Francis.

The issue in front of us is well summarised by Gallagher, when he says we have moved from a situation of faith-as-inheritance to one of faith-as-choice. Charles Taylor again.

There are so many questions a modern Catholic educator must attempt to face as we consider faith formation. I put before you two which must be considered as basic in our enterprise of schooling if we are to provide an education that enables the growth of our students within, (their spirituality), as well as without, (the secular knowledge), education for depth and education for choice. Our vision for Faith Formation must be situated within our overall goal for what sort of human being are we trying to form.

**Education for Depth:**

When Mr Kevin Rudd, then just very recently retitled Minister for Foreign Affairs rather than Prime Minister after Julia’s assumption, was part of the parliamentary delegation which went to Rome on the occasion of the canonisation of Mary MacKillop, he made arrangements to visit Fr Adolfo Nicolas, the Superior General of the Jesuit Order. There are Jesuit Provinces in more than eighty countries world-wide, so the Superior General receives feed-in from many places. During the visit, Mr Rudd asked Fr Nicolas what he thought was the most significant social issue facing the Western world a nice, informal early conversational gambit for Morning Tea! The Jesuit General’s reply was, “the globalisation of superficiality”. I can only imagine Mr Rudd’s reaction – lips pursed, learned nod!

To unpack that, we are an instant society, we have twenty-four hours news sessions, we can Google rather than research, emails, internet, blogs and twitters are all immediately available. There is a decline in the readership of newspapers, and bookstores are closing. We are in danger of becoming an age which does not ponder, does not reflect. In our consumerist world we are growing into a society of the more – more computers, more sports facilities, more resources, Smart Boards and iPads, and so on. Perhaps the significant challenge for our age as educators is the challenge to cultivate depth – depth of thinking, depth of analysis, depth of reflection, the ability to ponder.

**Education for Choice:**

Our young people confront not just choices of websites on the internet, or choices of stations on cable tv, or choices of boutique stores in malls, but more deeply, choices of values and beliefs and lifestyles. Judgement within choice, how to choose, is a real challenge for those of us charged with forming the young.
It was five or six years ago, that Allen Close wrote an article in the weekend Australian that still gives me food for thought. He was reflecting on his generation, then just touching forty, and was struck by the childlessness of so many of his social circle and of the failure of himself and others from his circle to have established sustained relationships. He wrote

And this made me reflect again on the questions I ask myself of my generation. What happened that so many of us have ended up entering middle age the way we have, on a grim treadmill of hope and disappointment. Our marriages ending, our families are split asunder, our assumptions about life devolving into confusion and loneliness?

We had choice, is my answer. More, I would suggest, than most of us knew how to handle. We got selfish, or greedy, or something. We left our partners because we could. We terminated our babies because we could. We discarded the rules, loosened the ties that bind, stretched the limits of the allowed, and this left us dependent on instincts, on our untutored human frailty. In the fight for freedom which we considered our right we lost the quiet skills of commitment and relationships. We lost the gentle wisdom of putting our own needs second. Too many of us, we lost the art of love.

Choice makes possible the diversity of life. Nevertheless, when the choices are so manifold at so many levels of life, then we cannot simply expect that external structures and family traditions alone will support our young people in their beliefs or values. Our narrative makes no sense if we do not have reflection. There will be no depth of knowledge, and no learning from a depth of experience, arriving at a depth of conviction, without such reflection. Who teaches our students how to do that? Who teaches our teachers to do that? Do we help them to look in the depth of their hearts to seek the answers for difficult emerging questions in a world of such seductive voices? Do we get them to recognise superficiality for what it is? To ponder, one must in the first place read, not just watch a programme, and one must pause during one’s reading, and reflect, and ask whither or why, and bring matters home to oneself.

A work by American lay Theologian William Cavanaugh has the arresting title “Torture and Eucharist” and it relates to education for depth and choice. He wrote “…the secular state cannot be expected to limit itself to the body; it will colonise the soul as well. A secular faith will not stay long confined to some temporal sphere; the secular god is a jealous god”. As Australians we are probably more at home with secularism than many other cultures, as our European Australian society has been secular for several generations, but I see a truth in Cavanaugh’s remarks about the secular god not wanting to stay confined to the secular sphere. That phrase – “colonising the soul”; who is the more effective in that? Ourselves or the secular state? What do we do to convey the Word of Life as the Voice of Life in such a Babel of noises occupying the ears and minds of our young?
The use of imagination to help deepen religious affectivity is an ancient tradition in the Church. Ignatius commences meditations with a “composition of place”. He concludes them with a conversation, a colloquy. William O’Malley SJ has a challenging article “Plough before you plant” where he makes the observation that most students leaving Catholic schools, he believes, “have never been told to look attentively at a Crucifix”. That is an impoverishment if it is true, and contrasts sharply with a method that Ignatius proposes in one of the colloquies in the Spiritual Exercises:

“Imagine Christ our Lord hanging on the cross before me, and begin to speak with Him, asking how it is that though He is the Creator, He has stooped to become a man, and to pass from eternal life to death here in time, for thus He might die for my sins. Then turning to myself I will ask:

What have I done for Christ?

What am I doing for Christ?

What ought I to do for Christ?

Then seeing the state Christ is in, nailed thus to the cross, let me dwell on such thoughts as present themselves.

There are many such imaginative exercises that could be done in the context of an RE classroom – the Good Samaritan, the repentant thief, the lad giving all he had, his loaves and fishes. There is a rich young man whom Jesus gazed on and loved, but who went away sad, carrying himself and his sadness with him, perhaps, for the rest of his days. There is Zacchaeus, called down from out of his sycamore tree. There are the three glances of Christ – how He looks at the rich young man, how He looked at Judas, how He looked at Peter, and how do we respond when Christ looks at us.

Experience without reflection is simply a moment of chronos, an instant of time with scarce significance. It is reflection that turns chronos into kairos, a moment of significant time. To teach reflectiveness we must be teachers of silence. Peter Steele wrote once, the rolling stone gathers no moss, and nor does it gather any other form of life. “Be still, and know that I am God”. Without this pausing for reflection, we will not ponder and if we do not learn to ponder, there will be no wisdom, no seeing of the traces of God’s presence in our lives.

Contrary to what some may think, the opportunities to enable Experience of their spiritual nature abounds in schools, I suggest. It is a question of what exercises we include in our days of recollection throughout their schooling, especially in Years 10 to 12; do we have imaginative exercises or meditation periods for one-third of one RE period a week from Year 7? Lord, teach us to pray. Do we structure a Class Mass with moments of celebration and silence, and what climate do we establish after Communion has been received, and how do we teach them to approach Communion; with reverence and recollection as an explicitly
stated ideal, even if the practice falls short in a multi-purpose hall? Or do we simply give up and condone an exercise that looks like bored young people queuing up to collect little white tokens that are slotted away with what scarcely seems a thought, let alone a prayer of thanks or adoration.

A meditation on a Gospel story, like the Ten Lepers or the Blind Bartimaeus, guided properly by a teacher, allows for the individualization of personal application that Taylor’s analysis demands. Also, Jesus constructed His parables so that His listeners could enter the story at their own level of appreciation.

Along with this we need a distinct approach to Religious Knowledge, and I use the former term deliberately. In a Year 11 or 12 course of three periods a week the treatment of content – the story of the gospels, the story of the major moments of the history of the Church, the Theology of the Eucharist, the growth of the Church’s social teachings, the Thinkers of the Church, moral teachings, models of the Church, a summary of the Creed – what and why a teaching is in the Creed – and so on, could be treated and assessed like any secular subject, for perhaps two of those periods. The other period could be one of prayer exercises and dialogue, issues close to them as teenagers. “Spirit education” David Tacey calls it.

Whatever way we adopt, it is worth recalling in conclusion that Jesus drew people to Himself through the power of His presence, through talking with them, through stories and parables. The Road to Emmaus (Luke 24) is a classic model for us. Two disciples were walking away from faith in the Christ who had failed their hopes, who had been smothered by the world, and they were moving on to find other purposes. A stranger (like an adult to our teenagers, one not of their world) joins them. He asks them their story. They tell their stories, expressing the deeper movements of disillusion and dejection that now occupied them. The stranger does not admonish them for their failure to understand, or dispute their experience. He challenges their interpretations, and gives them other lights and lenses through which to view their experience. He says things that make their hearts burn with them, and He throws light on what was happening to them as they journeyed along their road. He seemed about to move off, but having experienced something deep in His presence, they invite Him to come back and stay with them. For a moment they recognise Him in the breaking of the bread. And then He disappears again. Because He is faithful, He will certainly come back if they stay open and listening.

Religious educators and Principals are the prophets of the age in our time. Of all the baptised they are called in a special way to speak and break open the Word of God to the most needy of people, our growing young. They are called to live their baptismal vocation to a degree beyond their fellow Christians. They must be people of prayer and sacrament, and we must pray earnestly for them in their ministry. Their challenge in our age is to provide properly for the Catholic religious literacy of their students, the rediscovery of
Religious Knowledge, or else we will never grow a committed lay presence in our Church leadership, a ministry of the baptised. But the heart must also be thrilled if grace is to enter, and men and women are to rejoice to be active instruments of peace, givers of light and healing for our world.
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