



3 2042 00081817 3

Box 54

CHURCH AND EMPIRE

BREAKING:

"FEAR GOD. HONOUR THE KING."

MICHAEL J. F. McCARTHY,

Author of "*Priests and People in Ireland*," &c.

The English Church, as we all know, was merely a department, or province, of the International Church, or Empire, ruled from Rome, before the Reformation; and the Reformation's most practical achievement was that it gave England a National Church independent of Rome, with an English Book of Common Prayer as its liturgy, instead of the Latin Missal, or Book of Priestly Sacrifice, made compulsory by the Papal International Church. Archbishop Davidson, in the *Life* of his father-in-law, Archbishop Tait, tells us how "Tait's training and temperament combined to lead him to take a view of the Church's life, less ecclesiastical, MORE NATIONAL AND COMPREHENSIVE. He seems to have set before himself THIS NATIONAL POSITION, as the one which needed all the emphasis he could give to it."

From the moment of the birth of its National Church, England grew in power and world-influence, while those countries whose Churches remained, and remain, departments of the Papal International—notably Spain, so long the chief rival of England—neither prospered nor expanded. Human history does not record an instance of continuous national growth and prosperity to equal England's record during the four centuries beginning in 1535, when Henry VIII. broke off communion with Rome.

The directors of England's National Church, like all human institutions, have made many mistakes, and not least frequently when they were smitten with zeal for self-improvement, but their serious errors will always be found associated with a tendency to revert to Romanism or Internationalism.

TAIT'S NATIONAL IDEAL.

Bishop Blomfield, who preceded Tait in London, said his aim was "to put fresh incense into our censers and to stand between the dead and the living," and Bishop Wilberforce, a famous High Churchman, said this meant "to increase the moral and spiritual efficiency of the Church of England." Both favoured a reaction to the Papal-Roman ideal of moral and spiritual efficiency, which is that the true ecclesiastic is not merely an active member of a Christian Ecclesia, or Church, like Paul and Barnabas, but a priest, resembling Caiaphas and Annas, or the priest of Jupiter, types which afterwards developed into an army of Papal sacrificing Mediators eager to be retained professionally by the living to influence the fate of the dead.

English patriotism, since the Reformation, has been the antithesis of Romanism or Internationalism. If the English clergy are to be law-abiding and not law-breaking, the "national position," which Tait emphasised, must be first of all undivided allegiance to the national Sovereign, who has been so successfully now for nearly 400 years, by virtue of the Supremacy Act, Supreme Head of the National Church's organisation, Christ always being the real, the Divine Head. This combination of exemplary reverence for Christianity with undivided allegiance to the acknowledged civic Head or Government has been the dominant factor in England's expansion and prosperity. Englishmen have been able to play the social game with a fairness and thoroughness which have won world-wide admiration, largely because they were saved from the exasperation of allegiance divided between religion and patriotism, between the Roman Pontiff and the National King or Government, which has been the ruin of Roman Catholic countries, notably of my own country, Roman Catholic Ireland.

I do not pose as a praiser of Archbishop Tait, but one cannot avoid being impressed by his national ideal of efficiency, if only by contrast with the International and Romanising policy of his biographer, Archbishop Davidson, who has done so much to make Tait's ideal impossible. "Tait regarded the Church of England's efficiency rather as a means than an end," writes Dr. Davidson, "a means of raising the Christian tone of the whole nation, whether in her legislature, her jurisprudence, or her social life. It was his aim to make the Church, in fact as well as in theory, a National Church, in a sense quite other than as embodying or expressing the Official Creed." Tait's concept of a "national position," his

CHURCH BREAKING.

regret at the Church's "increasing isolation from the kindred influences around," and his desire "to utilise for the nation's good the various Christian forces which were actively at work independently of her system or her support," now seem almost sublime, when compared with the International policy of Rites, Revenues, and Reversion to Romanism, which we see pursued to-day.

The Church's attitude towards British Nonconformists had radically changed from that of King James I. and Archbishop Bancroft, of King Charles I. and Archbishop Laud, who, following the Papal-Roman exemplar, had hunted them down as heretics. But Tait longed to advance to a "national position" sufficiently Christian to permit co-operation with those kindred Christian forces still holding aloof because the Church retained forms of government, creed, and worship, savouring of the Internationalism which was overthrown at the Reformation as contrary to Scripture and primitive Christian usage. Any reversion to Romanism must necessarily widen the breach and make the realisation of Tait's "national position" hopeless.

When appointing Tait to London, Lord Palmerston bound him down to a stipend of £10,000 a year, vesting the surplus revenues of the see in the Ecclesiastical Commission for allocation elsewhere. "Tait had no desire," says Dr. Davidson, "that the Church of England, with all her high claims, her unquestionable orthodoxy, and her admirable business habits, might merely become the richest, best-managed, and most powerful of the English sects." He had none of those house-breaking proclivities characteristic of the promoters of the Disposal of Churches (Metropolis) Bill (1926) who wanted to break up venerable City churches by the score and realise the money value of their priceless ground sites, in order to make the Church the richest English sect, for the ultimate benefit of the Papal International.

Those church-demolishers rushed the National Assembly, especially the House of Laymen, into passing that Bill and submitting it to Parliament, according to rule, for total enactment or total rejection. But, despite the theatrical passion of Lord Hugh Cecil and Sir Henry Slessor, a typical pair of Internationals in double harness, trying to force it through the House of Commons after midnight, it was rejected by a majority of 124 to 27 at 2 a.m. on November 26, 1926. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Mr. Ronald McNeil, M.P.,

SLAVE PRIESTS OR FREE MEN.

said rightly that "those churches are the property of the people, and the money from their sale could not be appropriated by the ecclesiastical authorities." It would have been regrettable to see those fabrics sold at a fancy price for re-erection in America and the sites let at enormous rents for new buildings; but, if such things must be, it ought to be as the result of well-considered policy by Churchmen imbued with Tait's lofty ideal of the National Church, and not in compliance with the feverish outbursts of the Cecil-Slesser Internationals.

The defeat of the City Churches Bill will doubtless put the National Church Assembly on its guard against several measures of wider scope and more sinister import now being pressed upon it by Anglo-Papal propagandists with no love for the "national position" of the Church of England, but steeped in admiration for Religious Professionalism as practised by sacerdotal slaves wire-pulled by the Papal International at Rome. We use the word "slaves" advisedly. No matter how rich and fat and domineering the compulsorily-celibate Roman ecclesiastics may be, no matter how high they may lord it over the credulous rich and poor, and flaunt themselves in their jewellery, multi-coloured robes and millinery, whether they be Cardinals of England, Ireland, New York, Mexico, or Spain, they are only slaves sworn to blind obedience and evasion of their primary responsibilities as men and citizens of the country in which they happen to reside—and therefore they are not fit exemplars for the free men and, I shall add, gentlemen, who are the clergy of the Church of England.

This is a question not only for the House of Laymen but, even more so, for the House of Clergy, in which the parochial incumbents, the pillars of the English Church, are constantly effaced by self-advertising sinecurists who are often journalists and are always skilled to catch the reporters' ear by praising Romanism as proof of their "catholicity of taste." Catholic, a Greek word stolen from the Greek Church by its enemies, the Roman plagiarists, means primarily something general or widespread, with the applied meaning of liberal or broad-minded. In Roman hands, it has come to stand for the opposite of this, just as Jesuit means the reverse of Jesus-like, and as Ecclesiastic, another Greek word, means the very reverse of a member of a free ecclesia or church assembly. Admirable things, like virtue, learning, fresh air, spring water, sky, sea and sunlight, are general and therefore catho-

CLERGY'S WIVES AND DAUGHTERS.

lic; but detestable things, like vice, ignorance, superstition, darkness, bad air, putrid water, and the prison system, are also general and catholic. To admire and support the Roman religion does not prove catholicity of taste in the true sense any more than to admire and support ignorance, superstition and the prison system.

The unpardonable lengths to which intimacy with and imitation of Romanism have gone under Archbishop Davidson amply justify the use of what Saint Paul calls "great plainness of speech" (II. Cor., iii, 12) towards those who are tempting the English clergy to desert the noble "national position," emphasised by Tait. That position is their rock and heritage as free clergymen and citizens of a great nation which has established and possesses many cities not only immeasurably greater than Tarsus, of which Paul boasted himself a citizen, but than all the cities of Imperial Rome at the zenith of her power.

The Church of England clergy, if they but knew it, occupy a "national position" as important as that for which Archbishop Tait yearned—a position not only unsurpassed but unequalled by any clergy or by any particular profession of men anywhere in the world. Look where you will over the vast and growing Empire or Commonwealth of British Nations, you will find that the married English clergy and their admirable wives are the parents, to a greater extent than any other class, of the men who are the backbone and motive power of that Empire, not only in the learned professions and in the navy and army but nowadays also in business and all kinds of pioneer work. The Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Inge, was able recently to state in public without fear of contradiction that, while his gross income is £2,000 a year, his net income is only £1,500, and out of that he spends £1,000 on the education of four sons!

One cannot imagine a more deadly blow to England's world-position, and therefore to world-civilisation, than the transformation of the English married clergy into celibates, after the Roman fashion, and the disappearance of that most potent and humanising force represented not only by the wives of the clergy, who discharge such important duties in the rectories and vicarages and amongst their fellow-women in the parishes, but also by the daughters of the clergy who marry and carry into ever-widening spheres the great gospel of piety and loyalty to the State and its acknowledged Head.

MURDER AND MALINES.

How barren a substitute for this Evangel of Married Life and nation-building would be the arid reign of such typical celibates as the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Truro, and many other supporters of the sacerdotal movement with its rites and vestments, reversion to Romanism, and encouragement of monastic communities male and female! The native common sense of the Church of England clergy should be sufficient to save England and the Empire from such a calamity, even if the lay churchmen should prove so spineless, or be so misinformed, as to let the Church drift to disloyalty and destruction.

“Fear God. Honour the King.” There can be no safer guide in this tortuous business than to test every act and proposition of the Roman Party in this country by the Apostle’s words. Did the Roman Party fear God or honour the King, when they made war upon the British Commonwealth at Easter 1916, in the blackest hour of the Great War, by their Dublin Rebellion, hatched and fomented and led by the students and paid employees of the Jesuit-governed National University? Or, when they justified and urged the slaying of Kings in the official theological publication of the Maynooth Hierarchy in October 1920, followed immediately by the Sunday slaughters of British officers in Dublin and near Macroom? Or, when they waged the inhuman Murder War of 1920-21 for the expulsion of the English King and Government, openly sanctioned by Pope Benedict XV. and his Irish Hierarchy, enraged at the salvation of Northern Ireland from their rule by the Act of 1920?

It was at the height of the Murder War of 1921, just when a brief prolongation of firmness would have saved Ireland from the Pope and for the Empire, that Archbishop Davidson allowed the Malines conferences with Cardinal Mercier, an avowed supporter of the Irish Republic and enemy of the English in Ireland! Those conferences have now lasted over five years and are not yet wound up. And, as an integral part of the policy represented by those unpardonable direct negotiations for reunion with Rome, we have seen the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1926 passed into law, on the joint motions of a Church of England M.P. (Mr. Denis Herbert who sits for Watford) and a Roman Catholic M.P. (Mr. Blundell who sits for Ormskirk and is a Chamberlain at the Vatican) in the House of Commons; and on the joint motions of Viscount Fitz Alan, the English Papal leader, and Archbishop Davidson of Canterbury in the House of

EMPIRE BREAKING.

Lords! Pope Pius XI. has conferred gold medals, through Cardinal Bourne, upon Messrs. Herbert and Blundell; but the Papal honours conferred on Lord Fitz Alan and Archbishop Davidson have not been published.

In our *Wiping the Reformation off the Statute Book*, we laid it to the charge of that Bill that its real objective and result would be, not to liberate English Romanists from laws which they systematically broke and were never enforced against them, but to allay the anxiety of their allies, the episcopal leaders of the Anglo-Roman movement in the Church of England, who feared lest the statute of Edward VI. for the destruction of Missals should be a bar to their introduction of a Missal or, as they plausibly call it, an alternative Prayer Book. The Roman Catholic Relief Bill with its repeal of the old Reformation Acts was meant to clear the way for a big revival of Roman practices in the English Church without fear of legal prosecutions.

Re-union with Rome means the overthrow of the King’s Headship of the Church by virtue of which English patriotism built up the Empire, and the substitution of the Headship of the Roman Pontiff who decorates our Members of Parliament and whose chamberlains represent English constituencies. In plain words, the Anglo-Roman Party, who are responsible for this Missal policy, are against our King and for the alien Pope, and would debase the English clergy by re-establishing the odious trade in rites and sacraments got rid of at the Reformation. The common sense view is that they are not only Church-breakers but Empire-breakers, and behind the apparent silliness of Lord Halifax, Bishop Frere and Lord Hugh Cecil, and the culpable weakness of Archbishop Davidson, there is a deliberate attempt to deprive the English Church of its unique national position and embarrass the British Empire for the benefit of the Empire of the alleged “Vicar of Christ.”

Trying to defeat the Anglo-Catholic treachery without taking cognisance of this was a mere idle beating of the air. Cardinal Mercier’s death-bed testimonial to Archbishop Davidson’s work for re-union with Rome had been flaunted before the public by its recipient:—“Brussels, January 21, 1926. Lord Halifax has told me of the abiding desire for Re-union by which you are animated. I am made happy by that assurance. *Utinam sint!* That is the supreme desire of Christ. It is also the desire of the Sovereign Pontiff; it

“HONOUR THE KING.”

is my desire ; IT IS ALSO YOURS. MAY IT BE REALISED IN ALL ITS FULLNESS. Accept the assurance of my religious devotion. Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines.”

Knowing what the realisation of this single desire of the Pope, Mercier, and Dr. Davidson would mean for King and Church, for England and Empire, we sent the following representation to His Majesty direct on November 17, 1926, receiving two gracious acknowledgements, one from the Palace, the other from the Home Secretary :--
“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,

“Your devoted subjects in this Christian Defence Effort, uneasy for the safety of the Throne, NOW INSIDIOUSLY ASSAILED FROM THE MOST UNSUSPECTED QUARTER, humbly exercise their old-established privilege as British citizens by laying this loyal and earnest representation before you.

“The Roman Catholic Relief Bill (1926) now before Parliament proposes the repeal of Reformation statutes, including 3 and 4 Edward VI., ch. 10, declaring Missals illegal. . . We humbly point out that there is no restriction on the use of Missals by the R.C. Church here, and that Church possesses the fullest freedom in England and exercises the same to the fullest degree. The plea advanced by Lord Fitz Alan, the R.C. spokesman, that this Bill is meant only to redress inequality of income tax now paid by R.C. charities, is not in accordance with fact. We have no wish to deny such redress, if the inequity exists.

“We note with alarm that this Bill to remove prohibitions against Missals, religious orders and images, synchronises with and is corollary to (1) well-known negotiations between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Roman dignitaries, begun in 1921 and still proceeding, for a union of the Church of England (of which Your Majesty is Supreme Head by British Law) with the Church of Rome, (2) the impending production of a Missal instead of the Book of Common Prayer for use in the Church of England, (3) the setting up of English religious orders on a big scale, and (4) other Anglican changes in a Romeward direction. We apprehend that this Bill is the result of co-operation between those in the Church of England who want union with the Church of Rome and the Roman Catholic leaders in this country ; and is a preliminary to AS GREAT A REVOLUTION AS WAS EVER

ROYAL HEADSHIP ASSAILED.

BROACHED TO PARLIAMENT under the most deceitful pretence. The Anglo-Catholics fearing to embark openly on full R.C. practices while the Reformation Statutes make such illegal, and shrinking from proposing the repeal of those statutes ; the Roman Catholics, who have consistently ignored those laws with our Government's assent, COME TO THE RELIEF OF THEIR ALLIES WITH THIS BILL ! If it be passed, the way will be cleared legally for Roman ritual and practices by all the HIGHEST DIGNITARIES of the Church of England NOW ENGAGED ON A TREATY FOR UNION WITH ROME !

“Both parties to this Bill are openly opposed to Your Majesty's supreme headship of the National Church, and any scheme of re-union must of necessity SUBSTITUTE THE POPE OF ROME, who thus described his own position in his own *Osservatore Romano* on Oct. 5, ult :--“Vicar of Jesus Christ, August Head of a Divine Association, Perfect, Sovereign, counting hundreds of millions of spiritual subjects throughout the world !” We regard such an eventuality as A TERRIBLE CALAMITY. We submit that it is due to the Supremacy Act of 1535, by which Your Majesty is Head of the National Church, that the Church of England became, as it remains, the GREATEST OF NON-ROMAN or PROTESTANT RELIGIOUS BODIES, and that ENGLAND became the LEADING NATION of the world.

“IF THE ROYAL HEADSHIP WERE TO GO, which God forbid—and go it must under any scheme of Union with Rome—OTHER HEADSHIPS WOULD FOLLOW SUIT, and the WHOLE PROTESTANT SETTLEMENT, to which England owes all her greatness, would be DESTROYED. We submit that there is NO PUBLIC DEMAND whatever for this Revolution, and that it ought not to receive legislative sanction without at least a MANDATE FROM THE ELECTORATE of this Country. The THRONE of England is the nation's most precious political possession—that THRONE which Your Majesty adorns—and we submit that our most vital institutions are therefore IMPERILLED by this Bill, because it derogates from the importance of the British Throne.”

Our specific charge of collusion and co-operation with the Romans was met by the most complete admission of guilty intent in the form of the following new clause inserted at the last moment in the Roman Catholic Relief Bill by the

ANGLO-ROMAN DEFEAT.

promoters:—"Nothing in this Act, nor the repeal of any enactments, or parts thereof specified in the schedule thereof, shall in any way alter, add to, or abridge the law relating to SERVICES, ACTS, matters or things performed or done IN ANY CHURCH OR CHAPEL OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF ENGLAND, or relating to CLERGY or MINISTERS of the said Established Church of England, or relating to any BENEFICE or other ecclesiastical LIVING or OFFICE in the Established Church of England."

This clause, expressly depriving the Established Church of any benefit from the repeal of the Anti-popery laws, is a record in British statute law—a stigma on the good faith of the National Church, a muzzle, inflicted upon it by the bad faith of its Anglo-Roman stipendiaries. The Church of England is STILL SUBJECT TO ALL THE LAWS AGAINST POKERY, while the Roman law-breakers gain no new liberties! The Church Assembly and Parliament should now remember:—

(1) That the R. C. Relief Act was the first practical outcome of the Mercier-Davidson conferences;

(2) That the origin of those conferences synchronised with Mr. Lloyd George's negotiations for surrender to the Papal Murder War in Ireland—of whose enormities, including heinous massacres of Protestant Loyalists, Archbishop Davidson issued no condemnation, while an Anglo-Roman Bishop and others were denouncing the British soldiers as Huns and demanding the withdrawal of the Crown forces from Ireland—the latest achievement of the leaders of that war, now masters of Dublin Castle, being to secure at the recent Imperial Conference the removal of the expression "United Kingdom" from the King's official title;

(3) That the proposed Missal or New Prayer Book or Revision measure is undoubtedly the second outcome of the Malines Conferences, which are still continuing.

After the date of our Memorial to the King in November and their exclusion from the R.C. Relief Act by the New Clause in December, the Anglo-Romans entirely changed the tone of their public utterances. Archbishop Davidson issued an official statement dated Jan. 15, 1927, but only published on Jan. 17, in which in stock-exchange parlance he asked people "to discount inflated speculations as to the scope and

PAPAL DOLE FOR ANGLO-ROMANS.

nature of the proposed variations." Father Woodlock, the Jesuit, preaching at Farm Street on Jan. 16, by a remarkable coincidence, as if he knew, said (*Morning Post*, Jan. 17, 1927):—"Whether or not we see the disruption of the Church of England into two or three new Churches, we can be sure that, as one united party of Anglicans, it will never approach the Pope with the assurance that all its members accept the whole Catholic faith. The Bishops should wisely yield to the demands of the strongest party in their Church—the Anglo-Catholics. COMPLETE DOGMATIC AGREEMENT IS THE ESSENTIAL FOR RE-UNION WITH ROME." We may infer from this, but there is ample evidence besides, that "complete dogmatic agreement" is the official policy of the Anglo-Romans. The Bishops have yielded so far to the Anglo-Romans as to hold a secret conclave at Lambeth in the Roman fashion to settle the new liturgy, and, according to Bishop Burroughs of Ripon, their decision "will take final and irrevocable shape on March 5," after being reconsidered on its return from the Clergy Houses of Convocation.

If the Bishops do not take Father Woodlock's advice and yield, what then? The following prominent announcement in a widely-circulated London paper (*Evening News*, Feb. 3, 1927) may enlighten us:—"Among the advanced Anglo-Catholics there is a growing view that Viscount Fitz Alan, who returns this month from the Continent, will have a difficult task, if revision of the Prayer Book means an exodus of Anglo-Catholics. He is in charge of the Converts' Aid Society for Anglican clergy on reception into the Roman Catholic Church. In a Roman Catholic paper it is stated that some 200 grants were made last year." We are not alarmed at the prospect of this rush to Lord Fitz Alan for the dole, despite the slump in "inflated speculations," inspired at Malines, of obtaining a regular MISSAL, that is, a Book of the Mass or *Missa*, which is the Latin for a thing sent, a sacrifice sent to God by the priest for the people, with his back to the people, and therefore the antithesis of a Book of Common Prayer, in which the minister makes joint prayer with the congregation as one of them!

It was not Revision, but a new Missal that the Anglo-Catholics wanted. We are told that "a group of London Anglo-Catholic incumbents" met on Jan. 28, after which Rev. Lord Victor Seymour is reported as saying (*Morning Post*, Jan. 29, 1927):—"A considerable body of Anglo-Catholics hold the view that the Revision of the Book of Common

NO EVANGELICAL SECESSION.

Prayer, SHOULD FORTHWITH BE WITHDRAWN. We did not ask for revision. The Book of Common Prayer, with all its limitations and compromises, is a workable book for both Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics and we are not sufficiently united to-day to come to any satisfactory conclusions!" Canon Blakeney of Peterborough (*Morning Post*, Feb. 3, 1927) asked: "Would it not be the safest course to vote in Convocation for its indefinite postponement?" Rev. G. G. Forse, Vicar of Southbourne, wrote (*Morning Post*, Feb. 4, 1927):—"Very few of us Catholic clergy want the Prayer Book revised. I do not believe the House of Commons will pass the Book when it appears. To establish an alternative norm of loyalty would do more for disruption than our Bishops have realised."

Needless to say, the Evangelicals never asked for revision of the Prayer Book, and have no intention of seceding from the Church founded by Evangelicals at the Reformation, to which they are intensely devoted and whose perversion to Roman and International uses they oppose to the death. Evangelicals may leave a particular church where the Prayer Book is disobeyed or perverted and go to a church where it is loyally followed; or attend a Nonconformist church; or, where no loyal church is available, they may start a church for themselves, as happened in the well-known case of Emmanuel Church, Wimbledon, which I have attended for twenty years and which is now a parish church. But they have no intention of deserting the Church and the King, its Head, and so handing over Church property to Anglo-Catholics in "complete dogmatic agreement" with the Papacy which would be the ultimate gainer by the betrayal.

Neither will loud Anglo-Roman depreciations of a Revision scheme falling short of what was expected from Malines deceive Evangelicals into supporting or accepting changes dictated *ex cathedra* by a conclave of Bishops notoriously controlled by Anglo-Romans. Mr. Athelstan Riley, constituting with Lord Halifax and Lord Parmoor (Cripps), the subordinate lay triumvirate who manage the Anglo-Popery campaign, truly says (*Morning Post*, Feb. 5, 1927), "the Anglo-Catholics are not likely to oppose the Bishops' proposals!"

When the Vicar of Southbourne, who calls himself a "Catholic," speaks of "loyalty," we give him credit for all sincerity, but the loyalty of the "Catholic clergy" in the

ANGLO-ROMANISM IN INDIA.

Church of England is not loyalty to the King, as statutory Head, but to the pre-Reformation ritual and *regime* of which the Pope is the Head. Where is the loyalty to the King-Emperor in the Indian Church Measure, printed and circulated with the *Nihil obstat* of the Governor-General of India and Archbishop Davidson, which the National Assembly is also asked to pass this session? It comes to England with the full flavour of Anglo-Romanism. The Governor-General is Lord Irwin, son of Lord Halifax and holding the same religious views! His appointment was unintelligible to the British public, who asked in vain for his qualifications, and I can find no explanation except the pending production of this measure, which follows the R. C. Relief Bill by seeking in its first clause to repeal part of the fundamental Government of India Act and cancel the letters patent granted by the King to the Indian Bishops, so that they may be freed from the obnoxious allegiance! The next clause is to abolish the King's right of patronage! Nothing could be more subversive of royal authority than this action on the part of clergymen of a Church which owes its existence to the Crown? The barefaced disloyalty of the proposals becomes evident, if we suppose that the Indian Army and Civil Service proposed a measure to cancel all commissions granted by the Crown and to abolish the King's right of appointing officers; and that the Indian Princes called for the removal of the British Residents at their Courts!

The specious plea advanced for this revolution is that there are now 400,000 Indian Christians—a mere drop in the ocean of a population of over 300,000,000. We are not told what fraction of this fraction belongs to Anglo-Romanism, but we are told that the Act of Uniformity "prohibits the development of forms of worship more helpful and congenial to Indians," and, to develop those forms, the King's Headship of the Church must be got rid of! The Romans notoriously inculcate idolatry amongst their Indian converts; as why should they not, when it is the foundation of their system everywhere? The Anglo-Romans, not being legally free to follow the Papal exemplar, are apparently taking advantage of a sympathetic Governor-General of India and Archbishop of Canterbury to free themselves from British law and allegiance! We sincerely trust the National Church Assembly will not pass this item of the Anglo-Catholic programme as a measure to be submitted to Parliament. To our mind, having regard to the present position of the British in

AN ANGLO-ROMON ROTA.

India, the promoters of such a measure set a pernicious example to the native army, native civil service, and native Princes, and are Empire breakers in the worst sense of the word.

Another pending Anglo-Roman measure aims at the destruction of the Ecclesiastical Courts, dealing with Church teachers, matrimonial cases, Church services, use of crucifixes, holy-water stoups, images and Tabernacles for Reserved Sacrament, hitherto conducted by lay Chancellors and other lawyers. Bishop Knox, late of Manchester, says: (1) it enables a Bishop to delay justice indefinitely and set aside the rubrics of the Prayer Book as to heresy, ritual and church ornaments; (2) substitutes the Archbishop for the lay judge in appeals to his court; (3) replaces the existing Supreme Court of Appeal, which is the Privy Council, by a new court bound to accept the ruling of the Bishops on doctrine or ritual and debarred from taking cognisance of the Prayer Book and XXXIX Articles. "THE KING CEASES TO BE SUPREME IN CAUSES ECCLESIASTICAL," says Bishop Knox, "The effect would be to ABOLISH LAW in the Church of England!" It is just an attempt to set up an Anglo-Roman Rota here to over-rule the British King and law, as the Roman Rota was recently reported to have done in the Marlborough and Marconi marriage cases!

The most impartial study of the Anglo-Romans convinces one that, however well-meaning they may be, they are enemies of the National Church which their Jesuit friend, Father Woodlock, truly says they are bound to break up, if they get their way. By their support of the outrageous policy of their Roman allies in Ireland, they inflicted irreparable injury on the Throne and National Government, helping to destroy the United Kingdom by setting up a hostile independent State in the British Isles, always looking for inspiration to the Papal International. Their policy of replacing the Book of Common Prayer by a Missal, and re-establishing by means of the Reserved Sacrament the old Papal trade in private confessions, pardons and masses, is just a preliminary to ousting the King from the Headship of the Church and putting the Roman Pontiff in his place. What may be called their Malines Policy had its origin in a Roman orgy of murder and arson in Ireland. And it is a curious coincidence that the Premier of the Cabinet which surrendered to the Irish Murder War also broke up the Church of England by disestablishing the Church in Wales, and, having abolished the

ABUSE OF ENGLISH WORDS.

Royal Headship there, sent a telegram of fulsome congratulation to the Pope on the appointment of a Roman Archbishop of Wales!

Their Indian Measure and their Ecclesiastical Courts proposition are both on the lines of their regular policy to get rid of the Royal Headship and substitute the Head of the Papal International with whom they are in "complete dogmatic agreement." The best that can be said of them is that they are mad rather than wicked, but they need to be kept in control; and it was to control such people that the National Church Assembly was established as a defensive barrier against popery. If they have rigged the Assembly, owing to the misdirection or indifference of the parochial clergy and laity, if the Bishops have stampeded to Anglo-Catholicism, the Parliament will serve as a final barrier against their unwisdom, as it did against their City Churches Bill.

Archbishop Davidson's speech to Convocations, launching his Revised Prayer Book on Feb. 7, 1927, makes lamentable reading for patriotic Churchmen. He used the honest words "inventions," "enrichment and reconstruction" to describe his alterations and permissions, in the contorted sense associated with the words Catholic and Jesuit, his "inventions" being slavish imitations of discarded Romanism, his "enrichment and reconstruction" being impoverishment and destruction of a Book which, next to the Bible, is the noblest in the English language.

He tried to justify the changes on these grounds: (1) the Prayer Book has not been revised for over 200 years; (2) inventions are the order of the day; (3) England has become an Empire; and (4) he has now been Archbishop of Canterbury for 25 years and has made "friendships rich and varied!" The answer is: (1) this is not revision in the sense in which the Bible was revised, but Romanisation; (2) it is not invention, but plagiarism and reaction; (3) if England has become head of an Empire, we are not going to let the Anglo-Catholics break up that Empire for the benefit of the Papal Celibate International by the disintegrating process so successfully begun in Papal Ireland and now to be continued in British India; (4) Dr. Davidson has held office *ad annos Petri*, as the Romans say. his richest friendships have been probably those of Cardinal Mercier, Pope Chiesa (Benedict XV.) and Pope Ratti (Pius XI.), but we shall not on that account gratify the Anglo-Catholics by displacing the King

NO MERCIERISED LITURGY.

as Head of the Church and taking this first official step towards "complete dogmatic agreement" with Rome. His mention of "the eventide of public life" suggests retirement. If any Bishop has got a promise of the succession on condition of supporting this Romanisation scheme, that Bishop is not an Evangelical, and the use of his name shall not mislead or divide the Evangelicals.

This new book, says Dr. Davidson, is "alternative" and "permissive" only. Yes: it is a Papist alternative to the Book of Common Prayer, and gives official permission to practice Popery in the National Church, by authorising (1) a new transubstantiation prayer in the Communion service; (2) the wearing by clergymen of a Papist "white alb with a vestment or cope" at Communion; (3) the reservation of the Sacrament in a tabernacle for carrying to the sick in home or hospital, which is just the Roman *viaticum*, and bound to be used for the obtaining of fees; (4) prayers for the dead "for those we love but see no longer, let light perpetual shine upon them," a translation of the Roman *lux perpetua luceat eis*, and bound to develop into masses for money! We have not a word to say against Archbishop Davidson in all his personal relationships, but his plea for this Book as the crown of his twenty-five years tenure of Canterbury should secure its rejection, because under Dr. Davidson were held the unforgivable Conferences with Rome at Malines, which evoked the Mercier testimonial claiming an Archbishop of Canterbury as a fellow-worker in a common cause under the "Supreme Pontiff." We agree with the *Morning Post* of Feb. 8, 1927:—"All things considered, we cannot believe that either the Church, as a whole, or Parliament will accept the revised Prayer Book."