

Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.

- 1) *Union Churches:*
 - a) *Modern Transport impacting Union churches & other churches in rural NSW.*
 - b) *Double dedication: A Piano for the 1912-2012 Centenary of Mangrove Mountain Union Church.*
- 2) *The Establishment Principle (Isa. 49:22,23):*

A Christian State, not a secular state.

 - a) *General.* b) *Some principles of the Protestant Christian State.*
 - c) *The Secular State: Types 1 & 2.*
- 3) *Red and Black Letter Days.*
- 4) *The 350th anniversary of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (1662-2012).*
 - a) *St. Paul's College Sydney University Symposium;*
 - b) *Other matters.*
- 5) *Accession Day Principles.*
- 6) *60 Regnal Years - Only three monarchs: George III, Victoria, & Elizabeth II.*
- 7) *The Royal Visit to Australia in October 2011.*
- 8) *An Englishman, an Irishman, & a Scotsman, at a NSW Union Church.*
- *9) Accession Day – 60th anniversary: Diamond Jubilee.**

- 1) *Union Churches:*
 - a) *Modern Transport impacting Union churches & other churches in rural NSW.*
 - b) *Double dedication: A Piano for the 1912-2012 Centenary of Mangrove Mountain Union Church.*

Union Churches: 1a) Modern Transport impacting Union churches & other churches in rural NSW.

I own a unit / flat at Nowra which I formerly lived in, but for years I have now been a Landlord who rents it out. If the Lord tarries, at some point in the future, though I am presently uncertain as to exactly when I shall do so, the Lord willing, I intend to move back to this flat from Sydney, possibly before, and if not before, then certainly by the time of, either my retirement or semi-retirement from school teaching. The area of Nowra and its environs is part of the City of Shoalhaven, and Shoalhaven has some beautiful beaches and bushlands, and is a mix of rural and urban areas. Nowra also has a number of Union Churches, *infra*.

Just north of Sydney near Gosford there is also Mangrove Mountain Union

Church, *infra*. Union Churches form an important part of the historic church fabric of New South Wales and other parts of Australia. They are independently owned and autonomously administered. They may be hired out by a variety of persons or groups, subject only to the local rules of a given Union Church e.g., Mangrove Mountain Union Church requires that those using it assent to the *Nicene Creed*. Some of those renting out a Union Church may be denominationally affiliated and others may not. A person or group renting out a Union Church at one point in time is independent from, and has no connection with, or no necessary connection with, with any other person or group renting out the Union Church at any other time. Union Churches have been historically used in more rural parts of New South Wales.

The advent of modern transport and bitumen roads spread rapidly in rural New South Wales in the post World War Two era. Before then, the country had mainly dirt roads, onto which the local council would sometimes throw some gravel, a number of which dirt roads and tracks survived till when I was a boy in the 1960s and early 1970s. Transport before the spread of the car (or automobile) in rural NSW from the 1940s and earlier, was sometimes by horse'n'sulky (one passenger), or horse'n'carriage (two or more passengers), or simply horseback. There were trains, but these were only used by country people for relatively rare long distance journeys. Most commonly, people just walked.

When my father was a boy in 1920s and 1930s rural NSW, he lived in small country towns such as Collector. The plebeian economic "upper class" of such country towns, who were big fish in a small pond, and by broader New South Wales and Australian standards were in fact middle class, consisted of the policeman, school teacher, and post master. With some awe, townfolk might be heard to say, "School teaching is an honourable profession." The country town economic "middle class" consisted of the clergyman, who was held in high social regard, and some shopkeepers – the General Store (which sold most if not all things) was more common, although a town might e.g., have a separate butcher shop, and of course, a publican (i.e., in an alcohol selling hotel). Even in larger country towns that my Father also lived in as a boy e.g., Bega, where he attended High School, this type of social structure (with some additions), generally applied. Moreover, the fact that Police Officers (NSW State Government), school teachers (NSW State Government), and Post Masters (Commonwealth of Australia federal Government) were all government employees, meant that they continued to get paid during the 1930s Great Depression years; a fact that further enhanced their socio-economic prestige, and not just in NSW country towns¹.

¹ Though in general NSW State school teachers were thus highly regarded government employees, by contrast, socio-economic elites in the wider NSW society frequently, although not always, tended to "look down their noses" at "the poor people" who were (and are) educated at government or state schools, rather than at elitist private schools that the wealthy send their children to. Such are the differences of perception among "the rich and the poor." As one who was educated at state schools (and then went to a mix of state and private tertiary colleges / universities), I thank God that I had *the privilege of an education*. I have generally worked i.e., more than 90% of the time,

The people that could afford cars or motor-bikes in such smaller country towns would thus usually be the policemen or school teachers. The clergyman would probably have a horse'n'sulky. Most people would walk, and distances taking two or three hours by foot were more common e.g., from a farm to the town centre. My father was born in 1921, and his father, a Police Officer, had one of the first motor-bikes with side-car (a Harley-Davidson), and some of the earlier cars (an Overland in the 1920s, was replaced around 1927 with a Pontiac, replaced later again in the 1930s by a Hudson Terraplane, which Father sometimes drove when on army leave in the 1940s), although his father still used horses a lot. Odd cars, or odd motor-bikes on these rural dirt roads, were still regarded as largely novelty items for the wealthier people, that few in these rural towns possessed. Indeed, many did not have even horses. *A common form of transport was by shanks' pony* i.e., walking, if necessary, for hours.

When his father, Norman McGrath, had joined the 1st *Australian Imperial Force* (AIF) in World War One (1914-1918), before embarking for active service, his mother, Eliza McGrath, gave him an Authorized Version New Testament, "From his loving Mother," in which she further wrote on the front fly-leaf, "Thou hast made the Lord thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee" (Ps. 91:9,10). He carried that NT in his left breast pocket during the war. Then when my father joined the 2nd AIF in World War Two (1939-1945), prior to his embarking for active service in 1941, his father gave him this same King James Version New Testament, writing on the back fly-leaf. He then carried that NT in his left breast pocket during the war.

Church life was important. E.g., referring to, and quoting from, my father, Norman Keith De Mainson McGrath (b. 1921), (generally called, "Keith" or "Mac,") in his social history of World War Two Australian soldiers, *We Were There* (1987), J. Barrett says, "N.K.D. McGrath ... lived in small towns of fewer than one hundred people, where it was customary to attend church – the *Church of England* in his case. 'Much of the social life was directly or indirectly connected with the church. There was a sort of <clan> feeling which induced most people to gather together whenever possible.' So he accepted the church 'as part of normal routine'.²" (*The Anglican*

(in a casual / supply capacity) as a state school teacher in both NSW, Australia, and London, England; and very occasionally i.e., well below 10% of the time, (in a casual / supply capacity) as a private school teacher. This is my schoolmaster's (school teacher's) testimony, I "taste and see that the Lord is good" (Ps. 34:8), thanking God for the work he provides for me (usually in state schools). "Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty," "Let Israel hope in the Lord from henceforth and for ever" (Ps. 131:1,3). In saying this, I do not decry the work of private Christian schools, and recognize that a good Christian school is a blessing for both those who work in it, and those educated in it. I also recognize that the growth of non socio-economic elitist private schools which profess and call themselves, "Christian," (the Christian standards of which vary,) from the late 20th century on in NSW, relates to the increasing ungodliness found in State schools; which thing was not the case in earlier times.

² Barrett, J., *We Were There*, Australian Soldiers of World War II, Viking

Church of Australia was then known as the *Church of England in Australia*, or commonly known as the *Church of England* or *C. of E.* .) Hence one of Father's life-long prized possessions was a book, "Presented to Keith McGrath," by "All Saints' Sunday School," from the Anglican Church at "Collector" in "[19]29."³

For example, Clarencetown in rural NSW was established as a port town because it was on the Williams River. In times when land travel was slow and economically impractical, shipping from Newcastle to Clarencetown could bring supplies in, and take farming produce out quickly and easily by river boat. One of my matrilineal two-times great grandfathers, was Henry Walsh Gaggin I (1829-1910) of Clarencetown⁴. He was the son of John Gaggin (1802-1859) and Mary Brabyn (1803-1884)⁵.

One of Henry Walsh Gaggin I's children, Bertha Becker (1876-1959), departed from the Christian faith and joined the Christian Science cult (which is neither true Christian, nor teaches true science)⁶. Both Bertha and her husband, Julius (born 1878 in San Francisco, California, USA), belonged to the Christian Science Church, which follows the teachings of their "prophetess," Mary Baker Eddy. One of the places I visited North America in March 2009, was San Francisco and its environs. In deference to my mother's abiding interest in genealogy and family history, when in San Francisco I paid a short visit to both the Christian Science reading room and church two blocks away (which happened to be open for some work being done on the interior,) and took some relevant photos to show my mother. Her interest is *not in the teachings of the Christian*

Penguin Books, Victoria, Australia, 1987 (ISBN 0-670-81627-2), p. 72.

³ *My Picture Book of Soldiers*, Golden Picture Books, Ward, Lock, & Co., London & Melbourne, Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome & London [c. 1928].

⁴ My mother, Betty McGrath nee Davis, is the daughter of Alma Davis nee Goode, the daughter of Sarah Goode nee Gaggin, a daughter of Henry Gaggin and Sarah Gaggin nee Howden.

⁵ Mary was the daughter of John Brabyn, an army officer of the NSW Corps who arrived in Australia in 1796. Mary's sister, Elizabeth, married Charles Simeon Marsden, who was the son of the Reverend Samuel Marsden, an earlier well known Anglican Minister of Sydney, who is sometimes greatly misrepresented in histories of the era. (McGrath, B.G., *The Life & Times of John Brabyn of the New South Wales Corps & his extended family*, Sydney, 1995, pp. 180,222, photographs after p. 325 of Henry Walsh with Bishop Stretch, who became Bishop of Newcastle in 1906; and also myself holding the Church's Offertory Plate given "From the Children. In Memory of Henry Walsh Gaggin 45 years Sunday School Teacher." Copies available in the State Library of NSW, Sydney, Australia, and the British Library, London, UK.)

⁶ See Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 171-221 (Christian Science).

Science Cult, but merely in the family connection to the cult member born in San Francisco. The cult prophetess of the Christian Science Church, Mary Baker Eddy taught that a form of positive thinking spiritual healing was preferable to normal medical treatments, which members of this cult are averse to. Thus when in her 80s, my two times great aunt, Bertha, had gangrene on the remaining part of her left leg (this had been amputated more than 50 year before in 1901), and she refused medical treatment in accordance with her Christian Science beliefs. As a direct consequence of this, she then died prematurely and unnecessarily. Her grieved husband died shortly later the same year. *My mother has sometimes told this story to highlight the follies of the Christian Science Church's "medical" teachings.*

Another of Henry Walsh Gaggin I's descendants, who is in the Free Presbyterian Church, Neita Middlemiss, showed me a 1622 edition of the King James Version of 1611, handed down through her family⁷. Yet another of his descendants in the Presbyterian Church, Ivan Gaggin (b. 1929), served as Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Tasmania (the State branch of the *Presbyterian Church of Australia*), in 1994 (being a ruling Elder of St. John's Presbyterian Church, Hobart, Tasmania)⁸.

Henry Walsh Gaggin I was an Anglican lay-reader and Member of Synod (Diocese of Newcastle), who regularly preached at St. John's *Church of England* Clarendtown. The Church contains a plaque to his memory. A *Testimonial* sketched on Opal Glass and presented to Gaggin in 1900, shows pictures of rural Clarendtown, the Williams River, and St. John's Church. Signed by the Rector, George Hill, and the Bishop, George H. Newcastle, *et al*, it refers to his "long and useful career" "in connection with our church," with his "continuous service of 35 years in our Sunday School," and "labours as a Church Warden and Lay Reader," acting to "mark you out as a Christian example to follow and one worthy of our gratitude and esteem⁹."

⁷ Neita (b. 1927) and her daughter, Jan (b. 1955), are members of the *John Knox Free Presbyterian Church*, Tinonee (congregation founded 1850s, present church built 1880), which is part of the larger Taree *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (Free Presbyterian) (PCEA is a Free Presbyterian Church founded in 1846, derived from another Free Presbyterian Church, the *Free Church of Scotland* founded in 1843). (Neita is the daughter of Ahlean Sawyer nee Alexandria, the daughter of Louisa Alexandria nee Gaggin, the daughter of Henry W. Gaggin.) I first met my Free Presbyterian (Neita & Jan) and Presbyterian (Ivan Gaggin) relatives descended from Henry Gaggin, at a large extended family gathering organized by my mother and held at Norfolk Island in 1996, remembering the 200th anniversary of John Brabyn's arrival in 1796, *supra*, who was then posted to Norfolk Island to look after convicts.

⁸ Ivan is the son of Henry Walsh Gaggin II and Olga Gaggin nee Anderson (of Swedish descent), Henry Walsh Gaggin II was the son of Frederick (Fred) Gaggin and Mary Gaggin nee Yates; Fred Gaggin was the son of Henry Walsh Gaggin I and Sarah Howden.

⁹ This *Testimonial* was handed down from Gaggin to one of his daughters, Amelia Kirk nee Gaggin, and then to her daughter Jessie Day nee Kirk, and then to her

In an era of less sophisticated transport, the Minister might only be able to get to St. John's about once a month¹⁰. Henry Walsh Gaggin I thus preached frequently at this church. A large man, he stood at 6 foot 6 inches (198 centimeters), and every Sunday he would get up before dawn, in order to walk by light as soon as that was possible. He would walk about 20 miles every Sunday, preaching at smaller settlements in the area such as Irishtown, and also at St. John's Clarencetown. Both in his time, and after his death, the Church mercifully lacked various Puseyite ornaments, because even though the Diocese of Newcastle became increasingly Puseyite¹¹, this was one of those small country towns that did not arouse much interest, since it did not have so much as a permanent Rector for the church living in town. Then with the increase of modern transport and better roads, in time a Rector was appointed in the late 1970s, and this caused a great deal of commotion at Clarencetown in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

By this time, the Diocese of Newcastle was strongly given over to that form of Anglican religious apostasy, known as Puseyism. The new Rector and his successors were Puseyites, and finding this old country church looking *too much like* a Protestant Anglican Church, largely maintained by lay-preachers and laymen for over a century, they set about to destroy its witness. Many horrible and idolatrous things happened to it. E.g., the introduction of a "tabernacle" containing "the reserved sacrament" over "the altar," and associated idolatrous genuflecting at the so called "real presence;" the introduction and ringing of mass bells, and associated idolatrous genuflecting at the so called "real presence" of the consecrated Communion elements¹²; elevation or lifting up

daughter Nita Hughes nee Day. It came to my attention through contact between Nita Hughes (1926-2008) of Cronulla (Sydney), and my mother who descended from Gaggin through a different daughter; but following Nita's death it is now in the custody of her brother, Jack Day (b. 1923) of Normanhurst (Sydney).

¹⁰ E.g., Reverend E. Hubbard Smith, who was a Rector at Christ Church, Dungog. His Services records for the period 1869 to 1873 show that he preached on a Parish circuit, holding Sunday Services one week at Dungog, the next at Clarence Town (Clarencetown), the next at Underbank, and the next at Bandolba. His records for the 31st of March 1872 refer to "Mr. Gaggin." THE RECTOR'S SERVICES RECORDS, Christ Church, Dungog, 1858 to 1895 A.D. (Incomplete). (Held in NSW at Newcastle University Archives.)

¹¹ Puseyites Proper call themselves, "Anglo-Catholic" or "High Church," and semi-Puseyites call themselves, e.g., "Broad-church" (although some are every vague and "wishy-washy" and uncertain what to call themselves); whereas the term "Puseyite" for such Anglicans (like "Papist" for Roman Catholics,) is a more hostile term.

¹² The Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, says in the Final Rubric of *The Communion Service*, "That ... *no adoration ... ought to be done*, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances, and therefore must not be adored; (*for that were idolatry*, to be abhorred

of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper¹³; a picture of Mary with a candle in front of it, and associated idolatrous Romish notion of invocation of Mary and other saints; and in the sermons, Mary was referred to as "co-mediatrix" (meaning a co-mediator with Christ)¹⁴. Now the Bible clearly condemns both idolatry (I Cor. 10:14; I John 5:21); as well as any form of communication with the dead, as found with invocation of saints (Deut. 18:9-12). And that invocation of saints is one form of witchcraft or sorcery is evident from the story of the witch of Endor, who through invocation of saints, invoked Samuel (I Sam. 28). For we true Christians acknowledge only "one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2:5).

The good Anglican parishioners of Clarendon were strongly opposed to, and horrified by, all these Puseyite changes to their church. The first Puseyite priest, who called himself, "Father" Pringle contrary to Matt. 23:9, was an idolater, engaging in e.g., Mariolatry, and was also known to be a drunkard who would go to the local pub and be "drunk with" alcohol, "wherein is excess" (Eph. 5:18). Now what saith the Word of God about such things? St. Paul says, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither ... idolaters, ... nor drunkards, ... shall inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9,10). "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; ... idolatry, witchcraft, ... heresies, ... drunkenness ..., and such like, of the which I tell you before, and I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:19-21). And St. John says, "... sorcerers, ... and idolaters," are "without" "the gates into the city" of God (Rev. 22:14,15); for "... sorcerers, and idolaters ..., shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8).

But even though the alarmed and concerned Anglicans of Clarendon had the

of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one" (emphasis mine).

¹³ Article 19 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which *the pure Word of God* is preached, and the sacraments be *duly administered according to Christ's ordinance* in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same;" and Article 38 says, "... The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was *not by Christ's ordinance* reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped" (emphasis mine). Hence in Anglican Ecclesiastical Law, Article 38 was interpreted to mean, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was "not to be reserved, lifted, up, &c." (Gibson, E., *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, or the Statutes, Constitutions, Canons, Rubrics, & Articles of the Church of England, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2nd edition, 1761, Vol. 1, p. 394, Title XX, cap. 10).

¹⁴ Article 22 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, "The Romish doctrine concerning ... worshipping and adoration, as well of images ..., and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

Bible and Biblically sound teachings of the Anglican *39 Articles* on their side, the people were given no relief by those in power; for the Diocese was far gone in Puseyism, and St. John's Clarencetown had escaped the earlier Puseyite inroads of Anglican Churches in the Diocese of Newcastle, essentially, as they would see it, by accidental oversight, since it was a remote rural church that no-one had been much interested in. (And I heard of another such story occurring some years earlier than this, also in the Puseyite *Diocese of Newcastle*, in which large numbers of Anglicans wisely exited to the local Presbyterian Church, in order to escape from a Puseyite clergyman and remain Protestant. I have also heard accounts of how Evangelical Anglicans moving from the Diocese of Sydney to the Diocese of Newcastle, have simply gone to another church, e.g., a Presbyterian Church.) Thus we find that while modern transport and bitumen roads has brought with it many good things, including the opportunity for good men to access more remote areas in order to faithfully proclaim the gospel of Christ, it has also facilitated a situation in which rural Anglicans who had sought to maintain their earlier Reformed practices in Anglican Churches that were essentially maintained by laymen and lay-preachers, have been subjected to the horrors of centralized Diocesan Puseyites crippling their churches, and destroying in them the wonderful gospel truths of the Protestant Reformation, which truths are to be found in the Anglican Church's *Thirty-Nine Articles*, which no Puseyite truly believes in.

Places of worship that were used in the country included local town halls, often referred to in rural NSW as a *School of Arts* (this is a general hall that may serve a variety of religious and secular functions), or a Union Church. Union Churches are part of the historic church fabric of New South Wales and Australia, and though it is not usually the case, a given Union Church may have an associated Union Church cemetery¹⁵. E.g., about or 4½ miles or 7.3 km on the main road out of Clarencetown, southward towards Sydney, just over Tumbledown Bridge, one finds the *Glen Oak School of Arts* (established 1899). Or not far from Gosford, one can find in rural NSW, *Mangrove Mountain Union Church* (established 1912)¹⁶, *infra*. Or not far from Grafton, there is the *Coutts Crossing Union Church*, (12 miles or 20 km south-west of Grafton); and between Lithgow and Mudgee on the Castlereagh Highway is *St. John's Union Church* at Running Stream. But one should not assume that any given Union Church has an internet homepage; and many Union Churches have not fared so well in more recent times e.g., *Windeyer Union Church*, an old weatherboard Church built in 1860, fell down in 1996. Windeyer then had a population of less than 50 people, and its story of a closed Union Church is certainly not unique¹⁷.

¹⁵ E.g., *Caloola Union Church Cemetery* is about 15 kilometres or 9 miles south of Bathurst, on the Bathurst to Goulburn Rd, in Central New South Wales. Outside of New South Wales, for instance, the *Goulds County Union Church* in Tasmania (RSD 2150 Goulds County, Tas., 7215) also has an associated cemetery; whereas the *Gympie Union Church* in Queensland (37 Redhill Rd, Qld, 4570) does not.

¹⁶ Cnr. Bloodtree Rd & Wisemans Ferry Rd., Mangrove Mountain, N.S.W., 2250.

¹⁷ The *Coutts Crossing Union Church* and *Windeyer Union Church* were so

Historically, in times before modern transport, i.e., about pre-1950s, Union Churches were far more important in rural parts of NSW than they now are, although a diminishing number of them still continue to exist. In smaller towns, both then and now, although more so in the past when church members' transport was often by shanks' pony, and Ministers came around on a circuit of churches in a horse'n'sulky, it made sense to build a Union Church. The Union Church was maintained by the local community, and used at different times by different independent individuals booking it or representatives of specific denominations booking it. A Church cemetery was also sometimes attached to the Union Church, for instance, *Caloola Union Church Cemetery* (9 miles or 15 km south of Bathurst, on the road to Goulburn).

Though they are becoming increasingly rare in NSW, a Union Church is simply a church building, that may be owned by a variety of different bodies e.g., the local council, and designated by the local council for usage as a church i.e., it is not an inter-faith "worship place," so those using it must make some profession of being Christian. It is then used by whoever hires it out subject to that Union Church's rule. E.g., the Constitution of *Mangrove Mountain Union Church* requires that those who are hiring it out both profess to be Christians, and believe in the *Nicene Creed* (so that hiring access is thus denied to e.g., Jehovah's Witnesses or Mohammedans¹⁸). However, each person or group that hires the church is entirely independent, and gives no intrinsic religious support, recognition, nor endorsement to, any other person or group that hires out this, or any other, Union Church. E.g., there might be an 8.00 am Anglican Service, then a 9.00 am Presbyterian Service, then a 10.00 am Roman Catholic Service (although historically, Roman Catholics have not used Union Churches very much). A group might then independently hire out the Union Church for a marriage service at 2 p.m., with the Religious Minister of their choice conducting the service.

Historically, Ministers or lay-preachers could not always get to a given church every week, and so e.g., at a given Union Church, on the first Sunday of the month, there might be an Anglican Service at 9.00 am, and no other Anglican service for four weeks;

reported on in the Travel section of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 Feb 2004. This paper said the *Coutts Crossing Union Church* was being regularly booked by the Anglican Church and Uniting Church. It is also reported that the font, pulpit, and two pews from *Windeyer Union Church* had been relocated in the Windeyer Caravan Park.

¹⁸ E.g., in discussions with Jim Benhim who is a member of the Mangrove Mountain Union Church Committee, he told me that e.g., hiring access was denied to a Seventh-day Adventist (SDA), and I told him I agreed with that decision since the SDAs do not believe the words of the *Nicene Creed* with regard to there being "one catholick and apostolick Church." (E.g., official SDA teaching does not see the "one catholick and apostolick Church" as "the remnant" church in Rev. 12:17, but claims the SDA Church is this "remnant" church. This connects to a cult mentality that seeks to deny SDA cult members any option to "legitimately" go outside of the cult i.e., to a non-SDA Church that is not under their cult leaders' centralized control and administration.)

then at 11.00 am on the second Sunday of the month, a Presbyterian Service, and no other Presbyterian Service for four weeks; then at 3 pm on the third Sunday of the month, a Baptist Service, and no other Baptist Service for four weeks; and then at 9.00 am on the fourth Sunday of the month, a Congregationalist Service, and no other Congregationalist Service for four weeks. The different Ministers may be on a church circuit in which their congregations met in e.g., 15 to 20 different places, and the Minister might get to 3 or 4 of them every Sunday, but might have some weeknight services at others of them between Sundays. Alternatively, a Minister might e.g., have only four or five congregations, but they might be of such distance from one another, that he could only get to one of them each Sunday by the transport available to him.

E.g., *Greenwell Point Union Church* (Nowra), *infra*, had its foundation stone laid in 1890, and the first recorded service is a marriage service in 1892 (records incomplete). Unlike some Union Churches, this is a well built brick structure. When I last checked the Church Services there¹⁹, they were for 8.00 on Sundays, 1st & 5th Sundays of the month Baptist, 2nd Sunday of the month Presbyterian, 3rd Sunday Uniting Church, and 4th Sunday Anglican (Diocese of Sydney), with Anglicans also booking it for 7.30 am on Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Protestant Ministers might sometimes try and co-ordinate their circuits, so that they deliberately went to different towns on the same Sunday, in order that Protestants could get to more services. In such circumstances, it always helped if a Protestant believer had a broad Protestant sentiment, which in days gone by when these churches had many more religiously conservative Ministers who believed in the authority of the Bible, was a much easier thing for a good Christian to be, than it subsequently became as Protestant church after Protestant church was tragically and horribly white-anted by religious liberals, who were themselves deceived, and went forth to deceive others. Of course, lay-preachers such as Henry Walsh Gaggin, *supra*, were also more important in these circumstances, and so e.g., a lay-preacher might also go on a circuit to different Union Churches and / or other meeting places of a local congregation.

An interesting story about one such Union Church came to me from the Reverend Mr. Norman Fox (1902-92). I first met Mr. Fox in the 1980s, when I used to attend weekday services at St. Philip's, Church Hill (inner city of Sydney, near the Harbour Bridge). He was then retired, and acted as an Honorary Assistant Minister of the Church. The services I attended that he conducted were in the *Richard Johnson Chapel*, and we used only the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* with readings from the *Authorized (King James) Version* of the Bible (1611).

¹⁹ This Union Church is located at Jervis Street, Greenwell Point, NSW, 2540, which is in a picturesque area I sometimes have lunch near the seaside at when I go down to Nowra to do a Landlord's inspection of my flat. I last checked these Service times when on such a trip from Sydney on a weekday in January 2008.

Reverend Fox liked to reminisce about his life as Minister, and while I would not agree with him on all things, we had a number of interesting and informative conversations over the years at his Killara flat. Reverend Fox was a graduate of Moore Theological College, Sydney. As a young Minister, he was appointed to be Rector in what was then the Parish of Shoalhaven from 1932 to 1937²⁰. (It was later divided into the three Parishes of Nowra, Bomaderry, and Huskisson.) Though living in Sydney at the time, I later bought a flat at Bomaderry in Nowra, and so I later became more familiar with some of the places he used to talk about in this region. Greater Nowra is inside, and close to, the southern extremity of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney. A better built Union Church, made of brick, still exists on the main road between Nowra and nearby Berry.

When the Reverend Mr. Fox was appointed Rector of Shoalhaven, this Parish contained sixteen relevant places of worship. Some of these were Union Churches e.g., those at Tomerong²¹, Cambewarra, Meroo Meadow, and Greenwell Point. Meroo Union Church (established 1889²² and Greenwell Point Union Church, *supra*, are well built identical brick churches of the Nowra region. When I inspected Greenwell Point Union Church in Jan. 2008, I was shown an old King James Bible still kept and used as the pulpit Bible. Built before the time of air-conditioning, the church has a removable trap-door under one seat near the back of the church, to help create a draft in the hot weather. The hymnal cabinet contained Anglican Hymnals on one side, and Presbyterian *Church of Scotland Psalters* (1928 & 1929) on the other side. The guide told me that when the Union Church first opened in the 1890s, the Roman Catholics used it for a very short time, before building their own church.

The Union Churches in the area were used on successive occasions by clergymen from the Anglican, Presbyterian, and Methodist Churches²³. Mr. Fox told me that they were only occasionally used by the Roman Catholic clergyman, so that while there was a monthly meeting to work out a roster for usage of the “Union Churches” in the forthcoming month, this meeting was rarely, if ever, attended by a Roman Catholic clergyman. Other places of worship were facilitated by the local *School of Arts* (Town Hall), though such services were usually conducted on a weeknight. Thus on a given Sunday, the Reverend Mr. Fox might conduct Sunday Services at 1.30 p.m. at Falls

²⁰ Though I had spoken with him about these things on previous occasions, I recorded these relevant details in November 1990, at Killara, Sydney.

²¹ There is a now a group called, “Friends of Tomerong Union Church,” C/O Post Office, Tomerong, N.S.W., 2540 or www.shoalhaven.nsw.gov.au/region/visitors/churches.htm.

²² Cnr. Princess Highway & Boxsells Lane, Meroo Meadow (5-10 minutes out of central Nowra).

²³ The Methodist Church, together with some of the Presbyterian and some of Congregationalist Churches, later amalgamated to become the Uniting Church of Australia in 1977.

Creek in a paddock (which later became St. Andrew's Church); 3 p.m. at Holy Trinity, Huskisson; and then return to All Saints' *Church of England* Nowra for Evensong²⁴.

Due to issues of distance and transport, a regular weekly Service by the Rector was not always reasonably possible. Hence, a number of places of worship were only visited once a month. Furthermore, the logistics of the situation meant that this could frequently not be a Sunday, and thus had to be a week day. For example, one Wednesday night per month he would conduct Evensong at St. John's, Shoalhaven. Likewise he would conduct a church service once a month at Bomaderry. The furthest away of such places was Nerriga, which was about 50 miles or 70 km away. Here, church services were conducted once a month on a Tuesday afternoon, originally in a room at the local pub. However these services were somewhat unpredictable since a nearby bridge would sometimes be covered by flood water, making access impossible. There was no form of rapid communication to convey such information to the Reverend Fox, who could only know upon arrival if the bridge was flooded on a given monthly visit. A Church was later built there whilst he was Rector, called the *Church of the Good Shepherd*, Nerriga.

Frequently such Union Churches and other small churches, would include a special vestry, where the Rector could sleep overnight, and a lady of the area would organize breakfast in the morning. This circuit included monthly night-time visits to certain churches only on what was known as, a "moonlight week" e.g., Pyree, where the church service was usually Evensong, although occasionally Communion. In these rural areas, the lack of gas or electrical lighting, coupled with the large and remote distances, meant that the congregation could only get to a weekday service on a *moonlight week* i.e., when the moon was full and so they could travel by the light of the moon. The Reverend Mr. Fox would walk to these type of places on a *moonlight week*, carrying a hurricane

²⁴ The *Church of England in Australia*, commonly called "Church of England" or "C. of E.," was renamed the *Anglican Church of Australia* on St. Bartholomew's Day (24 Aug.), 1981. But the old name continues with some usage, e.g., a sign at St. Matthew's Windsor still reads, "St. Matthew's Church of England WELCOMES YOU," although most things there read "Anglican Church" or "Anglican Church of Australia." And particularly some of the older clergy may still use the two terms interchangeably. For instance, the Reverend Mr. Stuart Abrahams, an Honorary Assistant Minister at St. Matthew's Windsor, *infra*, is most interested in, and on a number of occasions before or after 1662 BCP Services there on the 5th Sunday of the month has spoken to me about, what he rightly calls the "apostasy" of the Anglican Diocese of Vancouver which passed a resolution to bless homosexuals unions and allow homosexual clergy. In opposition to this wicked support of sodomy (Gen. 18 & 19; Lev. 18:22,24,27; I Tim. 1:9-11), he told me St. John's Shaunessy in Vancouver sought episcopal oversight from outside of that Diocese and was ultimately evicted from their church grounds in 2011. But in telling me about these things, (the greater details of which I here omit,) he refers to either "St. John's Shaunessy" or "St. John's *Church of England* Shaunessy," although they too would presumably call themselves "St. John's Anglican Church Shaunessy."

lamp²⁵.

The Reverend Mr. Stuart Abrahams is a retired Anglican clergyman who helps out at St. Matthew's Windsor as the Honorary Assistant Minister. After attending a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Service at St. Matthew's on Sunday 31 July 2011, I was speaking to Mr. Abrahams about a number of things including the 400th anniversary of the King James Version. Then he happened to mention that he had been a Rector at All Saints' Nowra (1977-1984). I asked him about his contact with the Union Churches there, and he told me he held a monthly Anglican Service at both Meroo Union Church and Greenwell Point Union Church, and others such as Presbyterians held services on other Sundays, so that the Union Church roster was rotated in order that there would be one service per Sunday there. (He said Meroo Union Church has since been moved to the jurisdiction of the Berry Anglican Church for the purposes of any Anglican Services there.) He also referred to two other Union Churches, which he later advised me by email were Tomerong and Cambewarra. He said Cambewarra Union Church had a mid-week Anglican Service which he occasionally took, but which was usually taken by a lay preacher; and Tomerong Union Church which he said had Anglican Services exclusively by laymen (i.e., lay readers and /or lay preachers,) during his time from the timber-cutting region of Wandandian. I mentioned the Reverend Mr. Norman Fox (d. 1992) to him, whom he had known, and he said the Union Church Mr. Fox would have walked to on a *moonlight week* would have been Meroo Union Church.

And with both the Rector and Bishop Smith away at St. Philip's Church Hill, York Street, City, on Trinity 11, Sunday 4 Sept. 2011, an Honorary Assistant Minister at St. Philip's, the Rev. Dr. David Duchesne, took the 1662 Book of Common Prayer Service. Reverend Duchesne is a long standing Honorary Assistant Minister at St. Philip's whom I recall from the 1990s when I was a regular parishioner there in the 1980s and 1990s. He first became an Honorary Assistant Minister at St. Philip's in 1992, and he is a French Huguenot by descent and sentiment, and so at the Benediction e.g., on Sunday 4 Sept. 2011, he raises both his hands, but not his arms, i.e., from the elbows up only, as part of the blessing, a tradition which he tells me is a Huguenot custom for blessing each other, derived from Luke 24:50 where Christ "lifted up his hands, and blessed them." But when I spoke to the Reverend Doctor Duchesne that Sunday, for the first time ever he mentioned he was a Curate at All Saints' Nowra in 1957-1958; and he too referred to the large number of worship centres at Nowra.

Though the Union Churches may have declined in usage due to the impact of modern transport in the post World War Two era, they remain as an interesting and important part of the religious history and ongoing church fabric of rural New South Wales. The historic importance of the Union Churches to rural NSW, cannot be

²⁵ This issue of night-time travel, might help us to better understand *one* of the relevant factors in the new moon festivals of the OT. This factor was also brought home to me when, as an undergraduate student, I was on night operations in the *Sydney University Regiment*. As any such soldier knows, night vision is considerably increased on moon lit nights

doubted.

Union Churches: 1b) Double dedication: A Piano for the 1912-2012 Centenary of Mangrove Mountain Union Church.

One of the books in my library is Martyn Lloyd-Jones' *Knowing the Times* (1989 & 2001). This is a compilation of addresses he delivered on various occasions between 1942 and 1977, and while I do not agree with everything in it, I agree with the greater part of it, and consider that its general good greatly outweighs the bad in it. Only the Bible is infallible, and so when reading books such as *Knowing the Times* we must by God's grace learn how to "refuse the evil, and choose the good" (Isa. 7:16), being "of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil" (Heb. 5:14). Chapter 12 in this book was an address Martyn Lloyd-Jones (d. 1981) gave in 1965 on "The Centenary of Westminster Chapel 1865-1965"²⁶. In this sermon, among other things he refers to "the seventeenth century" "Puritan movement," with its "reaction ... against cathedrals and ornate buildings and painted windows," with "the Puritans going for simplicity and plainness in buildings" and worship." E.g., he refers to a "Puritan ... who ... used to denounce those 'steeple houses' as he called ... the Church of England" churches, saying "That was in general the tendency of all the Puritans."

To Lloyd-Jones, "a 'Nonconformist cathedral' is a contradiction in terms," and he was opposed to any "attempt to produce a 'cathedral' that can stand comparison with" the Anglican "Westminster Abbey" in London as a "Nonconformist cathedral." He contextually identifies with a position that is broadly speaking against Anglican "cathedrals and abbeys," and in favour of "little Bethels, the plain unadorned conventicles" in which, for instance, 17th century Puritan Protestant Non-Conformists or Dissenters from the *Church of England* held prohibited and thus clandestine meetings; although Lloyd-Jones further says, "I do not want to press this too far." Rather, in a somewhat back'n'forward and not entirely consistent bid to support Evangelical Puritanism while still holding out some form of olive-branch of fraternity to Evangelical Anglicans as fellow Evangelical Protestants, he says, "there is no absolute rule in these matters You get two extremes in this matter, but I feel that both extremes are wrong. All we can safely say, I think, is this, that there is a danger always in externalizing our worship I am simply saying that it behoves us to be careful. We can go wrong at both extremes because the Holy Spirit of God can work anywhere, and He has worked in places that some of us with a Puritanical outlook would be amazed to hear about. There is no limit to God's power and to what is possible with Him"²⁷.

In response to these type of comments by Lloyd-Jones, let me say with regard to

²⁶ Lloyd-Jones, D.M., *Knowing The Times*, *op. cit.*, An address given at the Congregational Church's *Westminster Chapel* in London, UK, 6 July 1965, pp. 222-245.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 224-5,229.

the “Puritan ... who ... used to denounce those ‘steeple houses’ as he called ... the Church of England” churches; that I for one see great value in traditional type Anglican architecture of e.g., sandstone churches with stained-glass windows, as pointing to the grandeur of God in worship. I think such an elevating architecture as one finds in such traditional Diocese of Sydney Anglican Churches as, for instance, St. Matthew’s Windsor (brick built with stained-glass windows), St. Swithun’s Pymble (sandstone with stained-glass windows), or St. Philip’s York Street (sandstone with stained-glass windows), helps create appropriate atmospheric aesthetics, so that when coupled with a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer Service* in a Low Church Evangelical Anglican tradition, there is an act of “worship” “done decently and in order” (I Cor. 14:25,40), which “worship” is to “a great God, and a great King above all gods” (Ps. 95:3,6), Almighty God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I think this type of architecture helps the humble worshipper think in a dignified manner of “a great God” (Ps. 95:3), but I concede that such grand architecture may produce unwarranted resistance in the heart of the obstinate. I have seen the shocking effects of not combating these type of anti-Anglican and pro-Puritan sentiments here entered into by Lloyd-Jones, in the semi-Puritan trends of the Diocese of Sydney over the last 30 years which has moved away from traditional Anglican church architecture, the BCP, and AV. *I do not want it in the Anglican Church!*²⁸

Moreover, I note that in this address Lloyd-Jones refers to the fact that before becoming a Congregationalist Minister in London, he was in “the Presbyterian Church of Wales,” “ministering in South Wales²⁹.” It is also clear from his 1960 address on the Scottish Reformation that he identifies more strongly with the Scottish Reformation than with the Lutheran or English (Anglican) Reformations³⁰. Yet he fails to mention that the Presbyterian Puritans of the Established *Church of Scotland* saw no necessary tension between their Puritanism on the one hand, and their usage of traditional church architecture on the other hand, including e.g., such cathedrals as St. Giles’ *Church of Scotland Cathedral*, Edinburgh.

Thus e.g., far from sharing the phobias of certain Puritans about church steeples, I recall with spiritual fondness being taught in an Evangelical Anglican Sunday School to interlock my fingers downward and say, “This is a church,” and then putting my two little

²⁸ Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Dedication: The Anglican Calendar, section 2) subsection “c) Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s.”

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 236,238.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, “Remembering the Reformation” a somewhat misnamed chapter 7, since “the Reformation” without qualification refers by convention to the Protestant Reformation wrought under Luther. E.g., “The Preface” of the 1662 BCP refers to “several Princes of blessed memory since the Reformation.” This chapter 7 is an address in Usher Hall, Edinburgh, Scotland, on 5 April 1960 in memory of *the Scottish Reformation*, pp. 90-105.

fingers together in an upwards direction, to say, “this is a steeple,” and then turning my hands over with the interlocking fingers pointing up, to say, “open the door, and see all the people.” But though our views and sentiments are sometimes at variance, Lloyd-Jones and myself are in fundamental agreement that, “there is a danger always in externalizing our worship I am simply saying that it behoves us to be careful.”

I also note that traditional Anglicanism condones things like “week-day lectures” in churches, which are longer sermons of the type I preach at Mangrove Mountain Union Church. This type of thing broadly approximates what Puritans would always do, i.e., not only in such week-day sermons (Anglican or Puritan), but in the case of the Puritans, *also in the main Sunday Service*. Indeed, in her better days when the Anglican Church was unashamedly *Protestant* and upheld the 39 Articles in their *plain and full meaning in the literal and grammatical sense*, allowing e.g., no Puseyite, semi-Puseyite, or religiously liberal interpretations to be foisted upon them, the Protestant emphasis on preaching meant that there were Anglican clergymen who with a Protestant doctrinal spirit held the parish church office of Lecturer. This entailed no pastoral duties, but only preaching, and e.g., facilitated the possibility of preaching a weekday sermon, as well as Sunday sermons. E.g., the great Protestant hagiologist who wrote *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (Latin edition, 1554, 1st English edition, 1563), John Foxe (1516-1587), was ordained as an Anglican clergyman in 1560, and was such a Lecturer at St. Giles’ *Church of England*, Cripplegate, London.

Like other such Parish Lecturers, John Foxe was not the Vicar or Rector of his church. As part of the de-Protestantization of large sections of the Anglican Church, this office of Parish Lecturer was sadly abolished in 1844. But in its day it wisely recognized that God calls different types of “teachers,” and not all “teachers” are simultaneously called to be “pastors” (Eph. 4:11), although some are. Hence a certain type of man, who once became an Anglican clergyman and was attached to a Parish as a Lecturer, was given a certain degree of freedom and a good deal of free time during the week. Whether he chose to use it wisely or foolishly was his choice. Without such freedom of choice, the great things cannot be accomplished; although those who do not understand or care about this, such as those who abolished the office of Lecturer, might prefer to point to the slackness that may simultaneously occur with certain Lecturers. Thus if he so chose to put himself under God’s directive will, a Parish Lecturer might do many things, but if to a large extent he chose not to, he might simply have a relatively easy life. *It was his choice!* It was his life, and in the end, he would answer to God for it (Eccl. 12:7,13,14; II Cor. 5:10; Heb 9:27). In the case of John Foxe, he chose to produce some very good work on hagiology, found in e.g., *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* which includes some excellent research and detail into the Marian confessors and martyrs³¹.

I am not an Anglican clergyman, and the office of Parish Lecturer no longer exists. Rather, I am a school teacher, or what the Authorized Version calls a

³¹ See also *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, with the life of the martyrologist and a vindication of his work by George Townsend (1788-1857), Seeley, Burnside, & Seeley, London, UK, 1843-49 edition.

“schoolmaster” (Gal. 3:24,25). But in a way ideologically connected with the old Parish Lecturers when they gave a weekday sermon, as a lay preacher I now sometimes preach sermons which are recorded and placed on the internet with Sermon Audio (<http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible>). (I hope this better helps the good reader to understand how to understand my weekly sermons in a wider Anglican theological context i.e., I regard them as supplementary to, not a replacement of, a Sunday Church Service.) And through reference to this type of Anglican dichotomy in which some preaching is done in the Sunday Service, but in which the longer more detailed preaching that the Puritans tend to prefer may be left to a week-day lecture sermon, I think we can find a point of intersecting agreement between what I as a Low Church Evangelical Anglican do, and what Martyn Lloyd-Jones with his “Puritanical outlook” calls “God’s power ... working in ... little Bethels³².”

I recall on one of my trips to London how a fellow Evangelical friend that I was walking the streets of London with, pointed to Westminster Chapel as we went passed and said to me that this was Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ old church. Like my fellow Evangelical Protestant, Martyn Lloyd-Jones in July 1965, I too will be preaching a sermon in connection with a church centenary on Accession Day, Monday 6 February 2012; although unlike Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ centenary sermon, at Mangrove Mountain Union Church (1912-2012), I will not be chiefly focusing on the church’s centenary in my address, but on other matters, and at the end of it I shall be dedicating this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) of my textual commentaries to God.

Coming up Wiseman’s Ferry Road from Sydney, Mangrove Mountain Union Church, is about 17 kilometres or about 10 miles from Mangrove Creek. Mangroves growing along the creek gave rise to its name of “Mangrove Creek.” The land from the creek moves up to a higher plane, while simultaneously falling away at the sides of the road, so as one goes up Wiseman’s Ferry Road, this creates the optical illusion and apparent sensation of going up a mountain. Thus as white settlers opening up rural New South Wales moved “up the mountain” from Mangrove Creek, they called the new area, “Mangrove Mountain.” The designation also “seems to make sense” if e.g., one is coming down the Wiseman’s Ferry Road from Gosford “up to” Mangrove Mountain Union Church, since the road first goes down, and then up a long incline to the Church.

It was only much later, when the whole area was properly surveyed by white settlers, that it was discovered that like “sunrise,” the belief that they had climbed up a mountain was in fact an optical illusion. But they decided to keep the name, “Mangrove Mountain,” anyway. Thus on the one hand, Mangrove Mountain has no mangroves and no “mountain;” but on the other hand, it is *higher ground* and only about 10 miles or 17 kilometres from the place of the historic mangroves of Mangrove Creek.

Mangrove Mountain Union Church is just north of Sydney, near Gosford. It is a typical Union Church of the type and kind that forms part of the historic church fabric of New South Wales in general, and beyond that, other parts of Australia. It is

³² Lloyd-Jones, D.M., *Knowing The Times, op. cit.*, p. 225.

autonomously owned and independently administered by a Union Church Board. I sometimes preach at this church as a lay preacher. (See Mangrove Mountain Union Church, at <http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible> .)

With the 100 year 1912-2012 centenary in the year of the Dedication of this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28), in conjunction with my mother I have made a gift of a piano to this church. The plaque on this reads as follows.

This piano was presented to
Mangrove Mountain Union Church
on the occasion of its
1912-2012 CENTENARY
by
Gavin McGrath.

A school teacher by profession, Gavin is an independent lay preacher and Evangelical Anglican who sometimes preaches here. It was bought for his matrilineal grandmother, Alma Davis (1890-1986) around 1900, after winning 1st prize at a Sydney Exhibition. It was the first German iron-frame piano put in a Beale piano case. Alma Davis was an Evangelical Anglican Sunday School teacher & church organist at St. Bede's Drummoyne in Sydney in the early 1900s. She gave this piano to Gavin (b. 1960) and his mother Betty (b. 1924) in the early 1970s.

“The will of the Lord is ... singing and
making melody ... to the Lord”
(Eph. 5:17,19; 1611 Authorized Version);
“Praise him upon the strings”
(Ps. 150:4; 1662 Book of Common Prayer).

2) *The Establishment Principle (Isa. 49:22,23):*

A Christian State, not a secular state.

- a) *General.* b) *Some principles of the Protestant Christian State.*
c) *The Secular State: Types 1 & 2.*

2a) *General.*

This Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) of my Textual Commentaries is Dedicated to Almighty God on the *Accession Day* of the reigning monarch, Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952), Mon. 6 Feb. 2012. The Anglican remembrance of *Accession Day* spans different historical eras, starting in the time of the Protestant Christian State, and going into the era of the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State from the 19th century to post World War Two Era, during which time most, though not all moral laws, broadly agreed with Biblical Protestant morals, but were justified in the legislatures and courts on the basis of some form of reason; and then the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State from the post World War II era, or in Australia, post 1965 era, where such Christian morals were removed and replaced with so called “human rights” or libertine laws which are antithetical to the Biblical Christian morals of traditional Protestantism. In the Protestant Christian State era the church and state were one. In the Type 1 Secular State Era, the Church was generally regarded as “an ally” of the State in the area of morals. In the Type 2 Secular State Era, the Church is generally regarded as an enemy of the State in the area of morals, or at least, religious conservatives who believe in traditional Biblical morality are so regarded.

Under the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State, white race based nationalism (Gen. 9 & 10) was harnessed to a specifically Christian culture, so that even among large numbers of spiritually non-religious people, whose religiosity would not go much, if anything beyond, “hatches, matches, and dispatches” i.e., baptized in a church, married in a church, and buried in a church, nevertheless, they were bound by Christian morals and values and simply accepted them as part and parcel of the society. I.e., many of such persons would not even have consciously known about the Biblical origins of the values they adopted, since they were part of the fabric of the society (for “they are not all Israel, which are of Israel,” Rom. 9:6). Thus the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State attack on such white race based nationalism, was an attack on part of the God-given mechanism for the creation of a Christian society, since under God, such racism was part of the cultural “glue” that “held it all together.”

The Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State uses “human rights” ideology to make people “celebrate” their lusts, and regard themselves as justified in opposing their intellectual superiors and moral betters. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the universities and colleges (just look at the academic journals which will ONLY publish such “politically correct” rubbish), as well as the media, so that e.g., the “academic stereotype” that is “lived up to” involves the adoption of “human rights” values against e.g., racists and sexists, which then in turn emboldens arrogant feminists etc., to inhibit those opposed to the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State agenda.

In this context, the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State has also greatly inhibited discussion of issues like homosexuality, since it now filters everything through a “human rights” ideology that does not consider or care for the adverse affects of minority groups such as homosexuals on the wider community, and which e.g., even sets about to create new minority groups with the introduction of ethnic minorities under the immigration policy, much to the hurt and harm of the wider white community whose fraternity is thus wickedly attacked with connected community values permanently undermined. Consider, for example, the issue of the criminalization of sodomy or polygamy. If one were to decriminalize polygamy it would create a culture in which woman were more generally devalued (not that I endorse the feminist’s perverted concepts of womanhood,) even if only a relatively small percentage of men had two or more wives. So too, decriminalizing sodomy is a way of saying to people that there is such a thing as a legitimate forum for sexuality outside of a marriage, whose heterosexual nature generally relates, among other things, to procreation and rearing of children in the society. Personally, I am deeply concerned with the effect on the thinking of the wider heterosexual community when they consider that there is such a legitimate forum for sexuality outside of heterosexual marriage, as seen in the decriminalization of sodomy; just as I would be deeply concerned with the effect on the thinking of the wider community if they were to consider that there is a legitimate forum for polygamous sexuality outside of monogamous marriage, as would occur with the decriminalization of polygamy. I am concerned for the flow on consequences of the wider heterosexual community in divorces and dysfunctional families and children emotionally scarred for life. (This is a Sir James Fitzjames Stephen type utilitarian argument, and / or a Lord Patrick Devlin type social cohesion argument, in both instances used for restraining one group in order to benefit the wider society, *infra*³³.) Of course, for most people this is

³³ Narrowly defining the concern for sodomy *exclusively* in these terms, as opposed to those who like myself see wider concerns, (e.g., I see a homosexual orientation as a Divine Judgment on an antecedent sin of denying the Creator by, for instance, agnosticism, atheism, or Darwinism, Rom. 1:18-22; or idolatry, Rom. 1:23-27; which God may visit, but does not necessarily visit, upon such a person,) led *some* Type 1 Secular State jurisdictions to issue a policing directive for Police to only prosecute for sodomy where there was a public element. Such a policy generally applied to a large city but not the more rural areas of a State, so that “the covert message” to homosexuals was: “Move to the big city where there are buggers’ bars;” “Don’t flaunt, advertize, or reveal your homosexuality in the work-place or in public;” and do not commit homosexual (or unnatural) acts in a public place e.g., oral sodomy (or a gross indecency) in a public toilet; or engage in forcible (non-consensual) sodomy; or sodomy with a minor; and there will be no prosecution. But “the overt message” to the general public was: “Sodomy is wrong and a criminal offence.” In those Type 1 Secularist jurisdictions that had this type of policing policy, the events of Stonewall Inn could not have, and did not, happen. I.e., this policy evidently did not apply in e.g., New York as seen by the events of Stonewall Inn in 1969 when about 200 homosexuals fought against Police enforcing anti-sodomy laws in a buggers’ bar. But all Type 1 Secularists would still publicly condemn the actions of those homosexuals who fought against Police enforcing

not something they really think through at a conscious level, but something they just pick up from the law and society in which they live. (This is a Sir Garfield Barwick type argument on the benefits of a culturally Christian society even for those not consciously aware of such interconnections, *infra*.) Therefore to reduce issues like polygamy or sodomy, as the contemporary secular society tends to (more so for sodomy than polygamy), to simply an individual's sexual preference, whether for sodomy or polygamy, is therefore to radically misunderstand the salient issues. It debases people's minds to a very short chain-of-logic, in the words of Romans 1:22, "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

For those who like myself believe in the Establishment Principle with a Protestant Christian State, the Protestant Christian State era is regarded as a model that should be studied for the future return of a Protestant Christian State, if, by the grace of God, this is

anti-sodomy laws, *since in resisting arrest they were attacking the rule of law*. But paradoxically, Type 1 Secularists who in private would criticize Stonewall Inn as "a bad policing action," if it happened in their jurisdiction would also direct the Police "to drop the charges;" and in a limited media release may cite some vaguely defined "technical concerns about the way the Police gathered evidence on this occasion." If pressed further by the media, they might say something like, "There were certain irregularities in the way the Police gathered the evidence, and on the basis of those irregularities we do not think that it would be safe to proceed with charges, and so we've directed the Police to drop all charges. But in doing so, it should be understood that we support the Sodomy Act in this State; but it's necessary to ensure that we obtain a *satisfactory* prosecution in any given case. To that end, we've taken corrective action to ensure that in future Police gather evidence on this offence in a way that meets those objectives. We support the Sodomy Statute because we believe in, and uphold family values, Christian values, as part of the fabric of our society" (in the case of the USA the specific reference to "Christian values" would not be publicly made). Thus e.g., in 1961, St. John-Stevas found law enforcement practices against sodomy in the USA showed that "nearly all" "cases" of "prosecution" for "sodomy" "involved some public element" (St. John-Stevas, N., *Life, Death and the Law*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, UK, 1961, p. 201). However, the military which in e.g., combat conditions is a 24 hour a day lifestyle is different because e.g., "a poofter in the pack" subverts and destroys fraternity with many, though not all, heterosexual men; and this is counter-productive to military *esprit de corps*. Thus the military offence of sodomy was strictly enforced and offenders removed from the military. But in the non-military context, this enforcement policy of *some* jurisdictions with regard to requiring a public element for prosecution under the sodomy statute(s) of a State, would not be advertized to the general public for the obvious reason that it would be counter-productive to the purposes of such a Sodomy Act, which on this secularist ideology exists for the benefit of the heterosexual community. Hence when Type 2 Secularists depicted the statues of such jurisdictions as prosecuting all and any sodomites, any such Type 1 Secularists of such jurisdictions, did not want refute this inaccuracy publicly. This Type 1 Secular State enforcement policy of *some* jurisdictions led homosexuals to engage in "legally safe" oral sodomy "in a closet," and this in turn gave rise to the Type 2 Secularists call for homosexuals to "come out of the closet."

at all possible, even if some modifications and improvements to it are made. The Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State era is generally regarded as “bearable” or “tolerable,” but bad in that many spiritually, morally, and intellectually corrosive seeds were laid in the 19th century under the secular state’s religious liberty and anti-supernaturalism. E.g., the rise in the Anglican Church of the Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals. Or the teaching of macroevolution as “science,” with the progressive removal of old earth creationists from colleges and universities. Moreover, the very finest Protestant Christians found themselves increasingly locked out of key positions in law, academia, politics, and elsewhere, even though they were, by the grace of God, still able to have some positive impact on the wider society, especially in the area of morals. Certainly more positions were open to them in the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State than are in the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State.

The Type 1 secular state proved to be a transition device, which moved to break down resistance in society among those who wanted a Protestant Christian State. It sought to lull people into a false sense of security about the possibility of somehow working with secularists. But once the secular state was well and truly established for over a century, once the people had become accustomed to celebrating political figures and values of the secular state, the secular state’s carefully loaded “spring-trap” was then “sprung” in the post World War II Era. Now the Western lands would be flooded by coloureds and non-Protestants, and every vestige of Biblical Protestant Christian morality that could be removed from the law and society would be so removed. Sex role perverts, commonly called feminists, pornography, abortion, fornication, adultery, cheap divorce³⁴, homosexuality, and a whole range of such things were now promoted by the secular state, and under “anti-discrimination” legislation, Christians who resisted were increasingly persecuted in the work-place and elsewhere. *For the godly, life in the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State now became something like life under Communism in the old Soviet Union. To keep a job, a number of people had to “pretend” to go along with such things, speaking in secretive corners of the workplace about their real hatred of it. Freedom was taken from the righteous man, and given instead to the ungodly man.* The images of those glorified in e.g., movies or the TV, were those of the ungodly and unsaved, not those of the righteous man. Thus the children of Satan now smile at the hurt and misery they can inflict on the righteous man. “Therefore the law is slacked, and

³⁴ A number of these things inter-relate in different ways. E.g., the fifth commandment, “Honour thy father and mother” extends to a wider area of lawful authority (Eph. 6:1-9). As the AV’s “thy” rightly conveys, this is an individual (singular) commitment, found in the Greek “*sou* (‘thy,’ 2nd person singular genitive personal pronoun, from *su*).” Of course, this is a patriarchal family structure (Eph. 5:23), and from this are taught wider structures of patriarchy that should exist in the society. Thus feminist ideology has sought to create dysfunctional families in which there is cheap’n’easy divorce with custody going to the mother, or many bastard births with single woman on a social welfare benefit, so as to rear as many such children as possible in a non-patriarchal environment; and also to pervert as many males and females as possible, so that those who are reared in a father and mother environment will see perverted non-patriarchal structures in operation as much as possible.

judgement doth never go forth; for the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth” (Hab. 1:4).

Against this deplorable backdrop, there is thus a need to once again consider the issue of the Establishment Principle, and where Protestant Christians should set their political goals, before, by the grace of God, they seek to achieve them.

In his 1760s commentaries on the *Laws of England*, Sir William Blackstone refers to “Charles the First,” and while supporting certain “grievances” against him in the earlier part of his reign, he also notes that the “redress when sought, was also constitutionally given: for all these oppressions were actually abolished by the king in parliament, before the rebellion broke out, by the several statutes for triennial parliaments, for abolishing the Star Chamber and the High Commission Court,” and other such laws. But then came what Blackstone calls “the trial and murder of” “Charles the First,” in which the king “went down in blood, and left the whole kingdom in darkness” (4 Bl. Com. 438).

Sir William then says, “I pass by the crude and abortive schemes for amending the laws in the times of confusion which followed,” that is, under the English Puritans’ revolutionary republic (4 Bl. Com. 438)³⁵. “I am next to mention,” he then says, “after the Restoration of King Charles II.” Though not uncritical of Charles II, Blackstone nevertheless notes that “in his reign,” “the concurrence of happy circumstances was such, that from thence we may date not only the re-establishment of our church and monarchy, but also the complete restitution of English liberty, for the first time, since its total abolition at the” Norman “Conquest.” Among other things, Blackstone notes that in this Caroline reign, “was obtained” “an additional security of” a “person from imprisonment,” with “that great bulwark of our constitution, the *Habeas Corpus Act*.” Referring to this and another Act of Charles II, Blackstone says these two Caroline “statutes, with regard to our property and persons, form a second *Magna Carta*, as beneficial and effectual as that of Running-Mead.” “*Magna Carta* only, in general terms, declared, that no man shall be imprisoned contrary to law,” whereas “the *Habeas Corpus Act* points him out to effectual means, as well to release himself, though committed even by the King in Council; as to punish all those who shall thus unconstitutionally misuse him” (4 Bl. Com. 438-9).

I think the most significant thing that Blackstone here points out, is that under the Restoration of 1660, there was a return to law and order. So notable, in fact, that under Charles II came laws like the *Habeas Corpus Act* of 1679, which are as significant to English liberty as the *Magna Carta* of 1215, which was thrice reissued up to 1225. Thus legal history especially remembers and celebrates the memories of King John for the *Magna Carta* and King Charles II for the *Habeas Corpus Act*.

And when we think about something like King Charles II’s *Habeas Corpus Act*, we are reminded of the words of Romans chapter 13, verses 1,2, & 4a, “Let every soul be

³⁵ I.e., the common abbreviation for Sir William Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (4 volumes published in the 1760s), Volume 4, p. 438.

subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” “For he is the minister of God to thee for good.”

Of course, it is important for us to go about, in the words of II Tim. 2:15, “rightly dividing the Word of truth.” And we are also told in Acts 5:29 that we are to “obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29). Thus e.g., New Testament Christians rightly refused to engage in emperor worship, for which some were martyred. But this did not involve them overruling God’s Word by e.g., trying to kill even gruesomely tyrannical Roman Emperors like Nero. And so one cannot properly use this verse to, e.g., engage in sedition against the Crown, the way the English Puritan revolutionaries did.

Neither I, nor other traditional Reformed Anglicans, have been historically uncritical of either Charles I or Charles II. But we have been less critical of both than the stereotypical English Puritan; and unlike them, we have also had something positive to say about both of these Caroline kings. Most fundamentally, we have maintained that under the Bible’s teachings, it was seditious to oppose their rule, and that we should, in the words of St. Peter 2:17, “Honour the king.”

Certainly when I think of a model for the Protestant Christian State, I look to something like the Anglican Protestant State that preceded the secular state, both with the Establishment of the Anglican Church in England and Ireland, and the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. Thus I do not, like e.g., Rousas Rushdoony’s (1916-2001) “Christian Reconstructionists,”³⁶ look to such models as Calvin’s sixteenth century Geneva (Switzerland), John Cotton’s seventeenth century New England (Massachusetts, USA), or the Puritans’ seventeenth century New Haven (Connecticut, USA)³⁷. Moreover, I entirely repudiate Rushdoony’s desire to do what neither Calvin nor the Puritans ever did, and claim that Jewish civil laws are *binding of necessity* in the Christian era.³⁸ Thus what he calls “Christian reconstruction,” is in fact the semi-reconstruction of the Jewish state that ceased to exist about 2,000 years ago, with a heavily Judaized “Christian” overlay. It has never existed, and so cannot truly be called “Christian reconstruction.”

Rushdoony’s Judaizing is contrary to Scripture. E.g., in the Book of Ephesians a distinction is made between the OT “law of commandments contained in ordinances”

³⁶ In 1965 Rousas Rushdoony founded the *Chalcedon Foundation* in California, USA; and his son, Mark Rushdoony, later become President of it and Editor of the *Chalcedon Report*. Rousas Rushdoony’s daughter, Sharon, married Gary North (b. 1942), another prominent figure among Rushdoony’s “Christian Reconstuctionalists.”

³⁷ Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, USA, 1973, Vol. 1, pp. 1-2,9-10,790-1.

³⁸ See e.g., *Ibid.*, pp. 377,381.

which are now “abolished” (Eph. 2:16), i.e., Mosaical ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts; as opposed to the moral law of the Decalogue which continues to bind Christians; for instance, the 5th commandment (Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16), “Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth” (Eph. 6:1-3). Jewish ceremonial and civil laws no longer bind Christian men (Eph. 2:15,16; Col. 2:14,16,17; Heb. 7:12; 9:10), but the moral law of the Ten Commandments written on stone does (Rom. 7:7; 13:9; Eph. 6:2,3; Heb. 8:10 – see Jer. 3:16 & 31:33 where the Decalogue written on stone is abolished under the new covenant in order for it to be written on the tablets of human hearts; Jas. 1:25; 2:7-12; Rev. 11:19). Rushdoony’s Judaizing is contrary to Article 7 of the Anglican 39 Articles, “... Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.”

Rushdoony was a Presbyterian Minister, yet his Judaizing is contrary to the Presbyterian’s *Westminster Confession* chapter 19, “Of the Law of God.” He freely admits this, specifically claiming of these anti-Judaizing sections, that the “Westminster Confession” “chapter XIX, ‘Of the Law of God,’” contains “errors³⁹.” For example, Westminster Confession 19:3 first refers to “the people of Israel,” and 19:4 then says, “To them also, as a body politic,” God “gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the State of that people; not obliging any other now, further than the general equity thereof may require” (Eph. 2:15). Rushdoony refers to “Westminster Confession” “chapter XIX, ‘Of the Law of God,’” and claims of this “paragraph IV,” in which “it is held that the ‘judicial laws’ of the Bible ‘expired’ with the Old Testament,” that, “At this point, the Confession is guilty of nonsense⁴⁰.”

Thus e.g., because under OT polygamous civil laws (Exod. 21:10; Deut. 21:15-17), Lev. 18 & 20 were interpreted under Mosaical judicial laws to require that under the unpopular Levirate marriage rule (Gen. 38:8-10; Deut. 25:7,9,10), a brother was meant to marry his deceased brother’s wife (Deut. 25:5-10; cf. Matt. 22:23-33), Rushdoony refers to “the law of the levirate (Deut. 25:5-10),” and says that in his desired model state, “the levirate [marriage rule] will quietly take its place in that framework of law⁴¹.” This is contrary to NT Christian monogamy law which specifically repeals OT polygamy laws (e.g., Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:2,12); and so when Lev. 18 & 20 are then interpreted through NT Christian monogamy, the degrees of affinity (i.e., in-law relationships by marriage) are the same as those of consanguinity (relationships by blood). For instance, they extend to parents and children including those of the half-blood (Lev. 18:7,8), brothers and sisters including those of the half-blood (Lev. 18:9,11),

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 550-1.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 550-1.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 377,381.

grandparents and grandchildren including those of the half-blood (Lev. 18:10), aunts, uncles, nephews, and nieces including those of the half-blood (Lev. 18:12-14); and thus in affinity e.g., sisters-in-law or brothers-in-law (Lev. 18:16,18 – “in her lifetime” thus repealed under monogamy so as to equate in degrees the unfettered requirements of verse 16, cf. Gen. 30) or parents-in-law and children-in-law (Lev. 18:15,17).

The correct table of Consanguinity & Affinity for Christian monogamous times is found in Parker’s Table, printed in the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* before 1946. It is also found in Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4 which rightly refers to Lev. 18 & 20 and says, “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own.” But Rushdoony’s Judaizing thus means that he sets aside this Christian monogamous recognition of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* that to be “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24) now includes an incest component in which e.g., sisters-in-law and brothers-in-law are in the same position as sister and brothers, and so, for instance, a man can now no more marry a deceased brother’s wife, or a deceased wife’s sister, than he could marry his own sister. Thus Rushdoony’s Judaizing here leads him to attack a plank of New Testament Christian monogamy⁴². It is also surely notable that at this point, Rushdoony’s Judaizing not only leads him to say that incest with a deceased brother’s wife *may* be committed; but rather, in saying that in his desired model state, “the levirate [marriage rule] will quietly take its place in that framework of law,” he goes further and says the pressure of law should be used to try and ensure that wherever possible such incest *actually is* committed!

At this point I would also remind the good Christian reader, that at the time of the English Reformation, God unleashed his holy power, exercising his reserve right of Leviticus 20:21, “And if a man shall take his brother’s wife, it is an unclean thing: he hath uncovered his brother’s nakedness; they shall be childless.” And so King Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547) was asked to choose between Biblical authority which says, “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18), and Papal authority in which “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) did “think to change ... laws” (Dan. 7:25) by claiming he could set aside the very law of God itself and grant a Papal “dispensation” to allow such incest between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. In this battle of *Biblical authority verses Papal authority*, King Henry VIII chose Biblical

⁴² On this issue of incest, the Protestant Christian States of the British Isles historically encountered similar problems with some English and Irish Puritans, but Presbyterian Puritans were guarded against such incest by their Westminster Confession. However, Rushdoony is a minister of the *Orthodox Presbyterian Church of America* (OPC), which left the *Presbyterian Church in the USA* (PCUSA) in 1936; but in doing so retained a 1903 PCUSA amendment to *Westminster Confession* 24:4, removing the words, “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own,” and thus conforming their views to the morally ambiguous views on incest found in the Congregationalists’ *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and *Baptists’ Confession* 25:4.

authority with the annulment of his incestuous union, and thus at the political level the English Reformation was started in its early stages. *Therefore those who now seek to condone such incest are attacking the manifest work of God in the English Reformation, and so bringing upon themselves an even greater condemnation!*

When he came to Sydney in 1992, I twice met Rushdoony (d. 2001), and my copy of his Volume 1 of *The Institutes of Biblical Law* is signed by him about 20 years ago in the front as, “Rousas John Rushdoony Sydney, September 26, 1992”. (I also met at that time, Otto Scott, another prominent figure for Rushdoony’s “Christian Recontructionalists.”) On the one hand, I cannot agree with him on his Judaizing claims which includes e.g., a proposed over use of the death penalty, paradoxically including “incest” and “propagation of false doctrines” (so that such a society would surely have to execute its architect, Rushdoony, whose works promote both!)⁴³, nor his promotion of incest, nor his Puritan glorifying models of “Christian reconstruction” such as John Cotton’s seventeenth century New England (Massachusetts, USA). But on the other hand, I most assuredly do agree with him that the secular state needs to be replaced with a God honouring, Bible upholding, Protestant Christian State. Hence amidst e.g., all his very bad Judaizing heresies, and immorality in promoting incest, or his proposed over usage of the death penalty; Rushdoony is still to be commended for his very good recognition of one very big thing, namely, that the secular state is a failure, and we need to advance forward to a specifically Protestant Christian State which is based on, and openly upholds the authority of, the Holy Bible.

It must be clearly understood that Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law* show little to no accurate information on the historical Protestant Christian States of e.g., England (Anglican), Scotland (Puritan Presbyterian), or Protestant Germany (i.e., in its Lutheran parts). He shows little to no understanding of the Anglican Protestant Christian State era (e.g., Coke, Hale, & Blackstone⁴⁴); the modern history era of the Type 1 Secular State (e.g., Edmund Burke, Stephen, Devlin, & Barwick⁴⁵); and then the post World War

⁴³ Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 235. I do however, support the death penalty e.g., for murder (Gen. 9:6; Rev. 13:10). We fallen, frail, men, lack the perfection of God, and so for a human government in Christian times, with e.g., incest, I would only support execution where there was the added element of the public interest. E.g., when Henry VIII’s second wife engaged in incest with her brother, this added element of the public interest meant that to simply divorce her for adultery would leave a former queen around as a bad example, and also a focal point of disloyalty and possible rebellion against the Crown, so that after her conviction according to law, the execution of Anne Boleyn for incest was a fair usage of the death penalty. But the absence of this element of the public interest in most cases of incest, would mean that in the Christian era, in general a lesser penalty would be appropriate.

⁴⁴ See Edward Coke’s (1552-1634) *Institutes of the Laws of England*, Matthew Hale’s (1609-1676) *History of the Common Law*, and William Blackstone’s (1723-1780) *Commentaries on the Laws of England*.

⁴⁵ See Sir James Fitzjames Stephen (1829-1894), *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*,

Two era of the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State which did not come to Australia till after c. 1965 (e.g., Thomas Paine, John Stuart Mill, Hart, & “human rights”). As previously noted, Rushdoony also exhibits a great lack of caution on the appropriate use of the death penalty in the Christian era, and associated lack of caution in steering clear of Judaizing views of OT law e.g., the difference between an OT polygamous and a NT monogamous reading of the incest laws of Lev. 18 & 20 on the issue of marriage with a deceased brother’s wife.

Rushdoony further fails to understand the historical Protestant concept of natural law, found e.g., in Blackstone, as opposed to Roman Catholic or various secular concepts of “natural law.” E.g., Blackstonian jurisprudence considers that Natural Law (or reason) and the Bible’s Divine Law run in parallel thought streams and thus e.g., Blackstone says: “Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these” (1 Bl. Com. 42). Thus the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State considered that it could generally retain Christian morals from the Protestant Christian State era, but justify them in the legislatures and judicature on the basis of natural law alone. (Although in wider political discourse reference might be made to the Bible or Christianity.) Hence Blackstonian jurisprudence on natural law acted as an intellectual bridge of legal concepts spanning between the Protestant Christian State era and Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State era, with the consequence that even though he came from the era of the Christian State, the Type 1 Secularists generally thought highly of Sir William Blackstone.

By contrast, while claiming to be a “Christian Reconstructionist” seeking the “reconstruction” of the Christian State, Rushdoony attacks both this era of the Protestant Christian State and also the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State when he says of “natural law,” “For the Bible, there is no law in nature Moreover, the source of law is not nature but God. There is no law *in* nature but a law *over* nature, God’s law⁴⁶.” Though Rushdoony makes little reference to, and shows little knowledge of, jurists such as Coke (pronounced “Cook”) (1552-1634) or Blackstone (1723-1780), he speaks negatively of both, saying that “the influence of Sir William Blackstone on law” “into the United States,” came from the earlier influence of “Chief Justice Edward Coke, a calculating opportunist⁴⁷.” Given that Rushdoony’s theoretics are at such clear variance with both the era of the Protestant Christian State and the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State, results in the conclusion that his claim to be a “Christian Reconstructionist” will not withstand strict scrutiny. *What he is advocating is something*

1873, 2nd ed. 1874; Reprint: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967; Lord Patrick Devlin (1905-1992), *Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford University Press, UK, 1965 Reprint: 1970; Sir Garfield Barwick (1903-1997), *A Radical Tory*, Federation Press, Sydney, Australia, 1995, pp. 119-122.

⁴⁶ Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 10.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 349-350.

quite different to a “reconstruction” of anything mainline in Common Law legal history! And even if the “Christian Reconstructionist” reply is that they want a society on the models mentioned by Rushdoony of, for instance, Calvin’s sixteenth century Geneva (Switzerland), John Cotton’s seventeenth century New England (Massachusetts, USA), or the Puritans’ seventeenth century New Haven (Connecticut, USA)⁴⁸; the reality is that these societies never extended beyond relatively small geographical areas with relatively small populations of people who generally were committed to laws that contemporary Protestants in, for instance, England, regarded to be in a number of instances overly repressive; and yet even these selected examples lacked e.g., Rushdoony’s highly developed Judaizing views which repudiate his own Presbyterian *Westminster Confession’s* anti-Judaizer teachings of chapter 19, entitled, “Of the Law of God.”

Nevertheless, Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law* advocating the Christian State have enjoyed a wider level of circulation than any other such work has for quite some time. They have thus had a beneficial effect in drawing attention to the issue of the desirability of a Christian State over a secular state, and thus helping to break down some of the ingrained prejudice against the Christian State that has been generated by the secular state’s propaganda machine for about 200 years now. Such views have thus in some degree, helped to pave the way for alternative views on the Protestant Christian State that show a good deal more matured wisdom than those advocated in Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law*.

Rushdoony’s *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* of 1976 was about a “Symposium of Christianity and the American Revolution.” Among other things writers make such assertions for “the War of Independence” in “the American experience” as the claim that, “The historic and religious origins of the war were distinctively Calvinistic – covenantal Far more important than Locke was the Great Awakening, the religious revivals that swept over the colonies for decades after 1740. ... This ... helped to foster resentment against the expanding power of the British Parliament. Without [Puritan] Christianity, ... the War for Independence would not have been fought” (Archie Jones)⁴⁹. Archie Jones puts his support for the American Revolution in the context of “Samuel Rutherford” who “had published *Lex Rex* ... , in which he stressed ... kings to rule under God, bound in covenant with him and with the people, and the right of the people ... to resist authorities who break the covenant. Moreover, Locks himself was the direct heir of Puritan political thinkers, as well as the son of a Puritan ...⁵⁰.” And Rushdoony himself claims access to some kind of secret “British intelligence” (whose source he does not give), and says, “the War of Independence ... was ... a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2,9-10,790-1.

⁴⁹ Gary North, “Editor’s Introduction,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. III, No. 1, Summer, 1976 “Symposium of Christianity and the American Revolution,” pp. 1-5 at pp. 2-3.

⁵⁰ Jones, A., “The [Puritan] Christian Roots of the War for Independence,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. III, No. 1, Summer, 1976 “Symposium of Christianity and the American Revolution,” pp. 6-51, at p. 32.

rebellion It was the nexus of the Puritan-Calvinist faith with the Scotch-Irish hostility to England which dominated the resistance and provided its troops⁵¹.” Of course, what Rushdoony is here calling the “Irish hostility” was, HE DARE NOT SAY, the *Roman Catholic* “Irish hostility” of places like Boston.

While I can accept that *Puritans such as Rushdoony have a point, it must BE QUALIFIED with the comment that those who were running the American Revolution exploited such sentiments in order “to play the Rutherford type Puritans for suckers,” in their grand design for a secular state. Part of that deception was the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State, which e.g., fooled Edmund Burke, and gave these Puritan types a feel that they were still in some kind of Divine-Law regarding republic, something like what they wanted, but with religious freedom and thus e.g., no laws against idolatry or witchcraft. BUT THE REALITY WAS THAT IN THE SECULAR STATE’S JURISPRUDENCE, ALL SUCH DIVINE LAWS WERE RETAINED ON THE BASIS OF “NATURAL LAW,” AND ONLY BY STATUTE LAW AND JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION, ALL OF WHICH COULD BE, AND EVENTUALLY WAS CHANGED, UNDER THE TYPE 2 SECULAR STATE. IT IS SURELY NOTABLE THAT EVEN THOUGH RUSHDOONY LIVED IN AN ERA WHEN THIS HAD HAPPENED, HE STILL DID NOT WAKE UP TO THE FACT THAT THE DEISTS AND VAGUELY DEFINED THEISTS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION HAD “PLAYED FOR SUCKERS” THOSE IN RUSHDOONY’S SO CALLED “SCOTCH-IRISH PRESBYTERIAN REBELLION”!*

The sad truth is that in the late 18th century the American republican revolutionaries managed to do what others had not. They fused together the ANTI-ANGLICAN PROTESTANT sentiment of Roman Catholics such as those in Boston’s Irish-American community, the place of “the Boston Tea Party,” (this sentiment is remembered in *Papists’ Conspiracy Day & Irish Massacre Day*); together with the ANTI-ANGLICAN Protestant sentiment of pro-Cromwellian Puritans (this sentiment is remembered in *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*), under their ANTI-Anglican Protestant REVEALED RELIGION CHRISTIAN STATE and ANTI-SUPERNATURALIST theoretics for a SECULAR STATE. They thus dismantled the Anglican Protestant Christian State. The unifying mechanism that the American Revolutionaries brought these two seditious strains of Papists and Puritans together with in sedition against the Anglican Christian Crown, was *the secular state* that made reference to “Nature’s God” in a Deistic or vaguely defined Theistic manner, but which in form, though not in constitutional word, agreed to broadly, though not absolutely, adhere to Christian morals in the law and society of the Type 1 Secular State. This commitment to broadly but not absolutely keep Christian morals would, in round terms, last about 150 years till the end of World War II. Those so involved in this process known as “the American War of Independence” with the USA’s constitutionally secular state from the 1789, did “receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:2); so that in this life, many became Deists or vaguely defined

⁵¹ Rushdoony, R.J., “The Myth of an American Enlightenment,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. III, No. 1, Summer, 1976 “Symposium of Christianity and the American Revolution,” pp. 69-73, at p. 72.

Theists, (often though not always connected with the Freemasons,) unable in many instances to even utter support for the Christian's Trinitarian and one true God. And as for their condition in the next life, being told that "they which do such things" as "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21), we cannot doubt that they have now been burning in the pits of hell for about two centuries.

And so the Devil first used the Type 1 Secular State to cut the State's anchor ropes with Protestant Christianity and the Divine Law of the Bible. By the mechanism of "religious liberty" he opened up countries like the USA and Australia to Popish idolaters whose numbers were greatly increased via immigration. Once this, and the precedent of setting aside Divine Law on a smaller number of instances had first been firmly established with, for instance, idolatry and incest with a deceased brother's wife; then came the Type 2 ("human rights" & libertinism) Secular State of post World War Two times, the ugly horrors of which are known to all and any saved person in the Western World. Fundamental to this Type 2 Secular State was the destruction of white race (with English linguistic cultural) nationalism in countries like the UK, USA, and Australia; and patriarchy in the family and wider society. To help give these secularists' anti-racist, anti-sexist, and multi-faiths objections some support, the Devil organized for suchlike to be a part of the utterings of the old "false prophet" (Rev. 16:13;19:20; 20:10) of Romish "ecumenical councils" (Rev. 13:11-13). Thus the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5) pronounced the Devils' edicts against racism and sexism, together with facilitation of the inter-faith movement. Hence this Council spoke against "any discrimination against people ... on the basis of their race, color, ... or religion" ("Declaration on the relation of the Church to non-Christian religions," section 5); claiming, "discrimination ... on the grounds of sex, race, color, ... language or religion, must be ... eradicated" ("Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the modern world," section 29)⁵². This was done, in part, to simultaneously use immigration to destroy the racial and religious unity of white Protestant lands.

An important point to understand about the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secularist mind and technique, is that there was something of an insiders-outsiders distinction. On the one hand, they would ensure that legislation was consistent with Biblical Protestant morality in most areas, though not on issues of religious liberty, nor matters related to supernatural acts of God e.g., they would not be prepared to make laws with regard to incest with a deceased brother's wife jurisprudentially connected with the idea of God slaying the children of the union of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon (Lev. 20:21), nor execute sodomites engaging in unnatural acts with man or beast on the basis of the Story of Sodom (Gen. 18 & 19; Lev. 20:15,16). While in private they may say to Christian electors, "Vote for me and I will uphold the morality of the Ten Commandments," in the legislatures or judicature they would justify such laws on the

⁵² Flannery, A. (Ed.), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Costello, New York, USA, 1977, p. 742 ("Declaration on the relation of the Church to non-Christian religions," 28 Oct. 1965); & p. 929 ("Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the modern world," 7 Dec. 1965).

basis of some form of natural law, such as Blackstonian natural law (Blackstone's Commentaries), utilitarianism (Fitzjames Stephen), or social cohesion (Devlin).

While the Type 1 Secularists might make general references to "Christian morals" or occasionally cite a Bible verse, this type of thing was done either at a low level, or not at all *in public*, although *in private* they might develop this with Christian supporters. However, the "key" to seeing the Biblical morality in law was twofold. Firstly, some of the terminology of the statutes / judgments would be cross-referable to the King James Bible, Book of Common Prayer, or English Ecclesiastical Law of the Protestant Christian State era. Secondly, the morality would conform to Protestant Biblical values. E.g., the *Barwick Act, infra*, retained terminology from the old English Ecclesiastical Law such as, "adultery," "desertion," "cruelty," or "sodomy." And in this sense, they often liked keeping old Acts from the Protestant Christian State era, such as a *Sodomy Act*. But a Type 1 Secularist would never say publicly that he supported white race based nationalism with an English cultural usage "on the basis that this is what the Bible says in Genesis 10 and 11;" although he might pick some words from Genesis 10 & 11 such as "tongues" (Gen. 10:31), or "nations" (Gen. 10:31), or "language" (Gen. 11:7), or "babel" as derived from "Babel" (Gen. 11:9), and in supporting white race based nationalism, further say something like, "Our unity as a *nation* requires we have a common *tongue*, which for us is the English *language*; so we don't want a *babel* of *tongues* in Australia."

Thus on the one hand, those with a Biblical knowledge would be able to relate statutes or judicial findings to relevant Biblical morality, but non-religious persons who were ignorant of the Bible, may think the Type 1 Secular State was essentially operating the same way as the later Type 2 Secular State was, with natural law or reason determining everything in a manner unguided by any relationship to the Divine Law of the Bible. I have read the works of Type 1 Secularists such as Sir James Fitzjames Stephens and Lord Patrick Devlin, and spoken to a number of Type 1 Secularists, e.g., Jim Cameron – a former Speaker of the NSW Assembly (lower house), or Sir Garfield Barwick – a former Commonwealth Attorney-General and former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia. This was long before the issue of Alabama's monument of the Ten Commandments; but I would say on the basis of my knowledge of how the Type 1 Secular State operated, that they would not e.g., like the Alabama Chief Justice, Roy Moore (b. 1947), have been prepared to erect a monument of the Ten Commandments at the State's Court House, an action for which he was removed from the bench in 2003⁵³. They would consider this *against the rules of a secular state*, even though they would say in private that they would not put a piece of legislation through, or make a judicial finding, that was contrary to the Ten Commandments, subject to the qualification that they wanted religious liberty (contrary therefore to elements of the first and second commandments).

To give the reader a better idea of Type 1 (Christian morals) Secularists, I take e.g., the issue of the decriminalization of sodomy in the State of Tasmania, which was

⁵³ See "Roy Moore," *Wikipedia* (Aug. 2011) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roy_Moore).

opposed at the time by the Legislative Council (upper house) member, The Honorable Mr. Schulze. He and I were in contact with each other around this time, and he said he had some material of mine that I sent him which he told me he was prepared to use in Committee stages if necessary. In 1991 the Tasmanian Parliament considered the *HIV / AIDS Bill*. The Bill proposed that sodomy be decriminalized by an amendment to s. 122 & s. 123 *Criminal Code Act*, 14 Geo. V, No. 69 (as amended) (Tas.). This Code used natural law language, in which sodomy / buggery was described as: “against the order of nature” and “unnatural.” At the time the Parliament rejected the proposed amendment⁵⁴, although sodomy was decriminalized some six years later in 1997.

Though not himself a Christian, Peter Schulze did make reference to Christian morality opposing sodomy in the Parliamentary debates. He thus made reference to the Bible and what he called “the religious view⁵⁵.” He referred to the words of the Anglican Dean of Hobart in a Parliamentary Church Service earlier that year who said, “God wills that all men should be saved and in response to his call we acknowledge our sins. He pardons those who humbly repent and truly believe the gospel⁵⁶.” He said that therefore on “the religious view,” “forgiveness is conditional upon being sorry,” and that “the homosexual lobby” lacked “that component” of repentance. Schulze said it was necessary to “forgive the sinner but condemn the sin.” He referred to “the Gospel according to St. John” and said that in Christian teaching “unrepentant perpetrators of sins” should be excommunicated, but that “repentant sinners” should have “mercy and forgiveness” extended to them⁵⁷.

I wrote to Peter Schulze in September, 1991, asking him for elucidation on his meaning of “the religious view” with special reference to any presence of the idea that “the AIDS plague” is “the wrath of God.” (At the time there was no cure for AIDS, and now it can be medically treated. But in the same way that Venereal Disease / VD can be cured, but may still be seen as exhibiting God’s wrath against unchastity, so likewise AIDS may still be seen in these type of terms.) In his reply letter of October, 1991 he sent me photocopies of two sample letters from constituents, and two open letter newspaper advertisements by Church groups. He said that these were “typical of dozens [of letters] received” by him. His letter to me stated in part that, “The letters enclosed tend to focus on ... ‘the wrath of God’ against buggery.” These letters made reference to various

⁵⁴ This was due to an independent, Legislative Council (Upper House) acting to inhibit a libertine, House of Assembly (Lower House of Government). Thus this action did not bespeak of any such more general legislative trend by the said Parliament.

⁵⁵ *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard)*, Legislative Council, No. 8, 2 to 4 July, 1991, Govt. Printer, Tasmania, *The Hon. Mr. Schulze*, p. 1270.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, Reading the first three lines in the Declaration of God's Forgiveness, “Another Order of Service for Prayer and the Hearing of God’s Word,” Anglican *An Australian Prayer Book*, 1978, for use together with *The Book of Common Prayer, 1662*.

⁵⁷ *Id.* .

Biblical passages, including: Gen. 19:1-28; Lev. 18:22; and Rom. 1:21-32. E.g., one letter said in part, "... To repeal the law against homosexual acts will ... spread AIDS. We appeal to you ... not to allow this Government has a responsibility to educate and warn people against this behaviour. 'When I say to the wicked thou shalt certainly die, and thou givest him not warning that he may live; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thy hand' [Ezek. 3:18]. And in a telephone conversation with me in October, 1991 he stated that "the wrath of God" notion was *one amongst many* views that constituted "the religious view" that he had in mind.

But importantly, as with other Type 1 Secularists who might use such terminology as "the Christian view," Schulze himself did not say that he was part of this "religious view," but simply that it formed *one* of the views that he took into account when he acted as a spokesman for "the religious view." Indeed, Schulze's own religious belief, which he did not state in the public debates when he gave the Christian "religious view," but which he did state in his letter to me, *supra*, was antisupernaturalist. He said that, "To me God and nature are near synonyms. Within the Grand Design is the survival of the species and an evolutionary process that works toward the survival of the fittest, taking care in various ways of non useful deviations." Schulz's belief in a "Grand Design" of "nature," *may* indicate some kind of vaguely defined Theistic or Deistic transcendental quality to certain laws of nature, resulting in the view that sodomy is *an unnatural act*. But *no such transcendental quality is necessarily present* in his thinking. His belief in a "Grand Design," near equation of "God" and "nature," and "an evolutionary process" (i.e., macroevolution) which seems to involve as its principle or exclusive mechanism Darwinian "survival of the fittest," are a long way removed from the Christian "religious view" he was prepared to put in Parliament, but which he himself did not embrace in those terms. Nevertheless, his desire to keep sodomy as a criminal offence, his preparedness to state the Christian "religious view" and identify with its anti-sodomy moral values, and his belief that the Christian Church was *an ally* in the cause of morals, is very typical of the Type 1 Secularist.

On the one hand, like Alabama's former Chief Justice, Roy Moore, I too have suffered for my opposition to the Type 2 ("human rights" & libertinism) Secularist State⁵⁸. But on the other hand, as one who knows and understands the jurisprudence of

⁵⁸ E.g., at the time, my work on Peter Schulze, *supra*, was part of a Master of Laws (LL.M.) thesis degree I was undertaking at the Sydney University Law School which was completed and dated in the Preface on *Thomas Cranmer's Day*, 21 March, 1992. It was on, and in support of, Type 1 Secularism (and also included some reference to the Barwick Interviews). In those days my known advocacy of the Christian morals of the Type 1 Secular State and associated opposition to "human rights" and libertinism, made me a most unpopular figure at the Law School with both many staff and students. E.g., my thesis supervisor, (Alex Ziegert), told me of how a delegation of feminists, whom I shall call "the feminazi," had gone to him pressuring him to get rid of me as a post-graduate student due to my Type 1 Secularist views. There were two thesis markers required for an LL.M. thesis and so two were appointed. When one marker

Type 1 Secularism, as one who has “walked the second mile in the shoes of the Type 1 Secularists,” for indeed I was formerly a Type 1 (Christian morals) Secularist in antithesis to Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secularism, (although I now support a specifically Protestant Christian State,) I would have to say that the Type 1 Secular State would not want Roy Moore’s monument of the Ten Commandments at the State’s Court House either. That is because while some of the Type 1 Secularists believe in a spiritual world and identify as Christians (e.g., James Cameron, *supra* or Sir Robert Menzies, *infra*), others of them do not (e.g., Peter Schulze, *supra* or Sir Garfield Barwick, *infra*). The ones that do not, tend to be intellectual elitists, in which they consider the masses lack the intelligence to understand the benefit of morals such as those of the Ten Commandments, and so “require the Christian religion and Bible because they are stupid.” I.e., they see the value of Christianity purely in moral terms, since their “ally” of the Christian Church helps them as “a moral policeman” to get people “to do the right thing.” Paradoxically, as a Christian, *on one level* I agree with them (Jonah 4:11); but I do so on the basis that the Devil and man’s sinful nature with its sinful lusts can blind him to suchlike (II Cor. 4:4; Jas. 4:1-10), and that any men, including these intellectual elitists, only know what is right and wrong in those areas where they discern the right because of God’s common grace (which is not unto salvation, Rom. 1:19-28; as opposed to God’s special grace which is unto salvation, Rom. 1:16,17).

Whether a given Type 1 Secularist identifies as a Christian or not, their commitment to religious liberty is very real, and unlike myself, they do not support the Protestant Christian State’s concepts of an ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction⁵⁹;

recommended first class honours, and the other second class honours; the horrified Law School powers moved quickly to appoint a hostile third marker whose appointment was opposed from the outset by both myself and my thesis supervisor on the basis he was clearly inappropriate. To cut a long story short, this third marker was predictably very hostile to my thesis work which never reached a successful graduation conclusion. On the one hand, it might be argued that the Type 2 Secularists of the Law School “overreacted” to my Type 1 (Christian morals) Secularist thesis work since I was clearly advocating what in the academic world of the time was a minority “politically incorrect” position that people had generally been moving away from, not towards, for some years. But on the other hand, as seen by the unsuccessful attempt to decriminalize sodomy around this time in 1991 in Tasmania, there was also a more general sentiment by some persons in parts of Australia (and elsewhere) for a return to Type 1 Secularism, and so the existence of a cogent ideological position in favour of Type 1 Secularism in antithesis to the “human rights” and libertinism of Type 2 Secularism meant that the “feminazi” *et al* had something to potentially fear from my work at a political level, since it could increase the possibility of lawmakers and judges choosing such an option. It is thus a paradox, that though I was considered to be “an arch conservative,” and “a dangerous” one who had to be eliminated in order to maintain the fiction of an academic consensus in favour of Type 2 Secularism; when after about 20 years I look back at the matter, I consider I was actually *too liberal*. That is because I now support the Protestant Christian State! Such are some of the curious turns and twists of life!

⁵⁹ See Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles on “Civil Magistrates” with

although they are happy for general references to “God” in e.g., a National Anthem, or the terminology of “Christian name” (or possibly “Christian name or Given name”) on government forms for a person’s first name, in the culturally Christian Type 1 Secular State they support. And unlike the USA type Type 1 Secularism, the UK, Canadian, or Australian type State 1 Secularists are happy for the monarch to retain both a spiritual realm as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, and a temporal realm as Head of State, which on both church and state is largely titular or ceremonial. But while the Type 1 Secularists would not want Alabama’s former Chief Justice to erect a monument of the Ten Commandments at the State’s Court House, they *might* be prepared to put up some monuments entitled something like, “Four notable historic jurists,” with Moses – holding the Ten Commandments, Hammurabi – with Hammurabi’s Code, Cicero - with the Law of the Twelve Tables from Roman times, and Sir William Blackstone holding the four Volumes of Blackstone’s Commentaries. But it must be said, that *this is quite different to what Roy Moore wanted.*

But lest the good Christian reader think that I am thereby opposed to what Alabama’s former Chief Justice did, let me say that as one who believes in a specifically Protestant Christian State, I for one would be quite happy to see such a monument, even though it would require a lot of changing in the jurisprudence of the last 200 years or so to get there first. That is because I have formed the view that the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secularist State “skates on thin ice” in those areas where it generally follows Christian morals, because it requires a high level of political organization and success to ensure that “the right people” get e.g., key academic positions, key media positions, get elected as lawmakers, and become judges. But if something goes badly awry, as happened with the rise of the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State, (or the rise of Nazism in the secular state of Germany leading to World War II,) the thing can unravel rather badly, as has presently occurred. In short, it lacks the necessary safety checks and balances to keep in place the greater part of Christian morals that it supports.

I should also mention, that in terms of a “Type 1” and “Type 2” secular state, I consider that the dangers posed by the Type 1 secular state tend to make something like the “Type 2” secular state an inevitable outcome of the Type 1 Secular State, all the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secularists that I have known would strongly disagree with this assessment, and would claim the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State need not necessarily collapse, just because it so did in the post World War II era. But it seems to me, that if something goes badly awry, as happened with the rise of the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State, there is a lack of safety mechanisms to preserve even that part of Christian morals that are part of the fabric of such a society, since jurisprudentially, various forms` of natural law and reason underpin it, rather than specific Divine Laws from the Bible, and so ungodly and wicked men can therefore make perverse interpretations of what is “best” on the basis of such “reason.” Thus Type 1

reference to both an “ecclesiastical” and “civil” “realm;” or the Presbyterian Westminster Confession on the “civil magistrate” with both “civil” and “ecclesiastical” “power” in 20:4; 23:1,2,3,4. But as per the post 1689 religious tolerance of the Protestant Christian State in the British Isles, I think Protestants must tolerate each other.

(Christian morals) Secularists would consider the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State should be “bitten off, chewed up, and spat out” into oblivion, with the resuscitation of a Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State. Hence among those who understand the legal and social theoretics of the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State, my own judgment that any attempt to resuscitate it should be jettisoned in favour of an attempt to move to a specifically Protestant Christian State, is a minority dissenting opinion. But I maintain it is the correct one!

2b) Some principles of the Protestant Christian State.

With regard to a Protestant Christian State under *The Establishment Principle* (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23),” it is important not to err in one of the many areas that the Puritan republic of the 1640s and 1650s erred in. Put simply, one must have a realistic assessment of the fact that while for the elite group in the power positions of such a society, and a wider but still relatively small group beyond that who are the recipients of God’s special grace, there is a regenerated Protestant core of Christians in such a society; for most people the most they may receive is God’s common grace which is not unto salvation, but through which they may recognize the Creator and live moral lives (e.g., Ps. 19:1; Rom. 1 & 2).

The art of running a state church under the establishment principle is rarely, if ever, ideal. Even as the established church of OT times had a national election by God which was distinct from an inner group with whom the covenant of grace was made on an individual basis with God, and so “they are not all Israel, which are of Israel” (Rom. 9:6), so likewise in a Protestant Christian State, *they are not all Christian, which are Christian*. To a lesser extent, this problem will also beset a non-established church (Matt. 13:24-43). The basic art of an established church, requires that spiritually minded and regenerated persons are appointed to hierarchical positions under some kind of centralized control i.e., in the Anglican Church, bishops, priests, and deacons, all of whom one must ensure be saved men, regenerated men, who are subject to the Word of God and possess a basic level of required intellectual giftedness. There is then some kind of back’n’forth check and counter-check between church and state in which, e.g., the church should come out and condemn immorality and vice in the state, as e.g., it did when the Anglican Church condemned the Popish Duke, James II (Regnal Years: 1685-8), for failing to meet his obligations to the legally Protestant throne by e.g., not upholding the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and Anglican 39 Articles.

Thus e.g., Anglican Church clergy are to be excommunicated and defrocked if they are ungodly according to broad standards such as one finds in the Anglican 1662 Book of Common Prayer and 39 Articles. E.g., on the one hand, Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals should not be tolerated; and on the other hand, nor should semi-Puritan clergymen such as Dean Philip Jensen of Sydney. In short, one should seek and procure, the traditional type of Low Church Evangelical Anglican, and nobody else, to be an Anglican clergyman. Under God, these godly clergymen then do the best they can in their parish churches, and they and the state try to make things as best they can for

the saved ones. The unsaved in the congregations will generally not advance theological spiritual heresy e.g., denying the virgin birth, since they do not much think about heresy and tend to accept the broad spiritual truths of Christianity such as those of the *Apostles' Creed*. But if perchance they do wander into such heresy then they must be excommunicated e.g., denying some teaching of the *Apostles' Creed* or *Nicene Creed*, including the correct Protestant understanding of “I believe ... in Jesus Christ ... he rose again from the dead” (*Apostles' Creed*), or “I believe in ... one Lord Jesus Christ ... He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again” (*Nicene Creed*), which relates the “I believe” to such Scriptures as Rom. 1:16,17; 10:8,9 i.e., justification by faith (see Article 8 of the Anglican 39 Articles which understands the three creeds on the basis of the authority of Scripture). More commonly among both saved and unsaved the issues for excommunications revolve around morals. (This is part of the reason why the Roman Church can so easily palm itself off in these terms as “a Christian Church”, even though its understanding of “I believe in Jesus Christ” in the *Apostles' & Nicene Creeds*, *supra*, is in fact the dead spiritual form of belief in the existence of Christ, found also among devils, Jas. 2:19; rather than the Protestant's saving faith of e.g., Rom. 10:8,9.)

Since all men, both saved (via special grace) and unsaved (by common grace), can keep good morals, this is more likely the focus of church congregation excommunications. As with ancient Israel, a racial fraternity (Gen. 10) connected with God's common grace leading to a good moral life (Rom. 1 & 2), is thus promoted for both the unsaved and saved; but still better things again, dealing with spiritual matters and the pure Word of God, are great treasures that the established Protestant church seeks to safeguard for the smaller number of saved ones. With such thoughts in mind, I here note that even though the Established *Church of England* and Established *Church of Scotland* are both now greatly apostate, for the tares have been allowed into hierarchal positions for more than one and a half centuries, and church discipline has greatly broken down; nevertheless, the average white Englishman is still an Anglican, and the average white Scotsman is still a Presbyterian. (I do not say the average white Englishman or Scotsman is saved.) It seems that in general terms, Puritan Presbyterianism better suited the national character and sentiment of the Scots, whereas Reformed Anglicanism better suited the national character and sentiment of the English. Yet while such differences of perception underpin the general English rejection of Puritanism, and intensified to their senses the horrors of the Puritan republic of 1642-60, even as such differences of perception underpinned the earlier Scottish rejection of Anglicanism in 1637-40, I think it would be wrong to simply reduce these matters to ethnic differences among white Protestants of Britain. They were a factor, but ultimately, the fight was largely between two groups of white Protestant leaders, both of whom had control in Anglican England (and Anglican governed Ireland) and Presbyterian Scotland, so long as in broad terms the natural order was in place.

At the heart of a Biblical Church is the purity of God's Word, found in the *Textus Receptus* of the King James Bible; and emanating from this, purity of doctrine, such as is only found in orthodox Protestant Christianity. At the heart of a Biblical State is the racial purity of a race based nationalism with a cultural tongue (Gen. 9 & 10), and in the case of the white Caucasian Japhethite lands this includes the mandate of Gen. 9:27 to

“enlarge Japheth” into such lands as North America, Australia, and New Zealand. Seeking God’s blessing on a church that lacks purity of the Word and doctrine, or seeking God’s blessing on a nation that lacks such race and linguistic cultural based nationalism, asks God to “bless this mess,” and is a prayer he will not hear (Prov. 15:29; 28:9; Isa. 1:15). “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” (Ps. 11:3).

At Matt. 17:15 (“Preliminary Textual Discussion”), I discuss the similarities of the Greek and Latin tongues. Both the Latin and the Greek are members of the Aryan Linguistic Family, and Aryan or Japhetic tongues were given by God to the sons of Japheth, the great progenitor of the white (Caucasian) race (Gen. 9 & 10). And here I note with great sadness, the loss of Aryan creative genius and the Caucasian racial mind granted in Gen. 9:27, in those parts of the world, most especially in southern Europe and parts of Eastern Europe and West Asia such as Asia Minor, where generalized miscegenation has occurred. “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap” (Gal. 6:7).

Oh how greatly I admire the Biblical figures of the King’s Counsellor, Holy Ezra (Ezra 7:14; 9 & 10), and the King’s Governor, Holy Nehemiah (Neh. 5:14; 13)! And believing as I do in the Christian church establishment principle (Isa. 49:22,23), commonly called, “the establishment principle,” which is endorsed in e.g., the Protestant Confessions of Anglicanism and Presbyterianism⁶⁰, (but not in e.g., the Protestant

⁶⁰ See “nursing father” (Isa. 49:23) applied to King James I, in the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version, adopted as the Authorized Version when “ordered to be read” in Anglican Churches in the Preface of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (and 1666-1800 C. of I. Book of Common Prayer); and Articles 36 & 37, Anglican 39 Articles. (Historically manifested in the established *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*. After being united to the C. of E. from 1801, the C. of I. was wickedly disestablished in 1871 by Act of 1869; the Kingdom of England was absurdly divided so as to horribly disestablish the Welsh part of the old Kingdom of England (the Kingdoms of England and Scotland being united in 1707,) from the C. of E. in 1920 by Act of 1914. Alas, all these Anglican Churches are now largely apostate e.g., having sex role perverted women priests and deacons, Isa. 3:12; I Tim. 2:8-3:13; or since 1946 the C. of E. allows certain forms of incest, including that which Henry VIII broke with Rome over, and which is rightly prohibited in both the Anglican *Parker’s Table* of 1563, canon 99 of the 1603 A.D. *Ecclesiastical Canons*, and Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4). Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 20:4; 23:3; 31:2. (Historically manifested in the established *Church of Scotland*. Alas, this Presbyterian church is now largely apostate e.g., condoning sodomite unions, Isa. 3:9; Rom. 1:16-32.) These two once great Protestant Churches of the British Isles historically worked together in Christian unity from the latter part of the 17th century, recognizing as valid each others ministries. (Article 34, Anglican 39 Articles. Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 27:4, sacraments dispensed by “a minister of the Word,” not e.g., some denominationally specific term like “presbyter;” and 28:2, again a general inter-denominational term, “by a minister of the Gospel,” thus recognizing Anglican baptism notwithstanding Puritan objections about the *sign of the cross* used in *crossing* the forehead at Anglican baptism.)

Confessions of Congregationalists and Baptists⁶¹), I do hope and pray, that following in the godly examples of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Lord may yet raise up righteous and holy Christian lawmakers and judges in harmony with Ps. 2:10-12. I hope and pray that there be appointed Christian “magistrates and judges, which may judge all the people” (Ezra 7:25), and “judgment be executed speedily;” “unto death,” such as for murder of unborn children in abortion (other than where an abortion is necessary to save the mother’s life, for then it is morally lawful as the least force necessary in an act of self-defence)⁶². “Or to banishment” (Ezra. 7:25), such as in ethnic cleansing of coloureds out of the white man’s lands, or those of false religions such as Mohammedanism (including some relatively small number of white Mohammedans) (Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13). What a tremendous privilege it is for a godly man to be remembered by this epitaph, “Thus cleansed I them from all strangers.” “Remember me, O my God, for good” (Neh. 13:31,31)⁶³. (Notably, white Christians have historically regarded the Jews as a special

⁶¹ E.g., references in the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* to the “civil magistrate” (23:3) or “magistrates” (20:4; 31:2), are removed in the Congregationalist’s *Savoy Declaration* chapters 21 & 24; and Reformed *Baptist’s Confession* chapters 21 & 24; both of which also removed chapter 31. But *Savoy Declaration* 24:3, though susceptible to different interpretations, may on one interpretation, achieve many of the same ends as when the Establishment Principle is administered as I believe it should be, and certainly was after the Toleration Act (1689), i.e., with religious freedom to other Protestants (although religious tolerance was given to Lutherans before this time; and Jews were rightly regarded as a one-off exception to the Christian religion, but were properly subjected to certain restrictions). Anti-Establishment Principle persons sometimes cite John 18:36, but this misses the point that at his First Advent, Jesus came for a specific purpose, and that purpose precluded political activity. By contrast, at his Second Advent he will deal with political figures as a judge (Ps. 110:5-7). The question then is not, Is there a transition between the First and Second Advents? Rather, the question is, *When* between the First and Second Advents is there a transition into political matters? We Protestants of the Establishment Principle (historic Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Lutheranism,) say it is *between* the two Advents, whereas other Protestants opposed to the Establishment Principle (e.g., the Baptists, *supra*) say it is *at* the Second Advent. I consider the former view is demolished by e.g., Ps. 2:10-12.

⁶² The wide scope of abortion in the Western world makes execution of all those involved now impractical. But the ring leaders should be executed, including any who continue in prominence in favour of this mass murder; and once the law is established, thereafter, any woman procuring an abortion or any person assisting in the procuring of an abortion (other than as an act of self-defence where it is necessary to save the mother’s life,) should be liable to prosecution for abortion murder, and if found guilty, subject to execution in the same way that any murderer should be.

⁶³ In violation of God’s racial laws (Gen. 6:1-4; 10 & 11), Western countries have been flooded by coloureds in the post World War II era. In part this acts to break down a God-given mechanism designed to inhibit one world government. It is no comment on the personal value of a person to have them removed under godly xenelasia laws, since this would mean e.g., we would be releasing some coloured persons of worth,

case⁶⁴). “Or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment,” such as those who in the

and retaining some “white trash.” Ethnic cleansing of these persons and their descendants should be carried out *with the least force necessary*. I would recommend that a threefold option be given to all such coloured persons, white-coloured mixed race persons, or non-Christian white persons such as a small number of Mohammedans from parts of the Balkans or Turkey. 1) Leave the county (“banishment,” Ezra 7:26) under something with a name like, “The Repatriation International Programme - Helpful Orderly Migration Exit” (acronym, “TRIP-HOME”), with a smattering of terms such as “repatriation” and “orderly departure programme.” 2) Placement in segregated areas coupled with sterilization (I do not say castration, which in less medically advanced times was one solution, Isa. 56:3; Jer. 38:7; Matt. 19:12 – there are “some which were made eunuchs of men” e.g., the Ethiopian eunuch of Acts 8:27). I think it should be a capital crime for a person to either refuse to go into a segregated area or to refuse sterilization; and so if, after a reasonable time, this requirement is not met, then for their heinous crime they should be 3) executed. Thus no person needs to be executed, but any person not complying with either 1) or 2), *supra*, would be executed *as a legal penalty* for failing to comply with these just and reasonable laws. “For ... he beareth not the sword in vain” (Rom. 13:4); & “... The laws of the realm may punish ... with death, for heinous and grievous offences ...” (Article 37, Anglican *39 Articles*). Only if a group of them sought to resist as a group, and *the least force necessary* required wider military style action, could this be undertaken. But any such actions should be publicly known, and both before and after this, the earlier three options should then be reverted to as much as possible. “Ezra 7 ... v. 25. And thou Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, ... set magistrates and judges, which may judge all the people v. 26. And whomsoever will not do the law of thy God, and the law of the king, let judgement be executed speedily upon him, whether it be unto death, or to banishments, or to confiscations of goods, or to imprisonment” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 20:4 at “the power of the civil magistrate” & 23:3 on “The civil magistrate”). “Neh. 13:25. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. Ezra 10:5. Then arose Ezra, and made the chief priests, the Levites, and all Israel, to swear that they should do according to this word. And they swear” (*Westminster Confession* 22:2 on “a lawful oath, being imposed by lawful authority, in such matters [as] ought to be taken”). “Thus cleansed I them from all strangers” (Neh. 13:30; see reference to “Neh. 13:15,17,21,22,25,30” in *Westminster Confession* 20:4 at “the power of the civil magistrate”).

⁶⁴ The Jews are a difficult case. Some Christian Kings preferred no Jews in the land e.g., James I & Charles I. But Oliver Cromwell brought Sephardic Jews over under the republic in 1657; and following the Restoration, later Christian Kings decided they could stay under restricted conditions that protected the white Christian integrity of the country e.g., Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685) & William III (Regnal Years: 1689-1702, ruled jointly with Mary II, 1689-1694). Thus in the historic Jewish Quarter of London (sadly desegregated after World War II), in April 2003 I proceeded down Jewry Street to view the old Jewish Quarter,

passing by the Saracen's Head Yard (reminding both Jews and Christians that while the Christian State will not tolerate infidel Mohammedans in the land, it will with qualifications tolerate infidel Jews). Among other things, I inspected the Bevis Marks Sephardic Synagogue, built under William III (Regnal Years: 1689-1702) in 1701. It was built in a discreet manner so as not to appear like a synagogue from the outside as one walks past it in the street, thus wisely protecting the Christian architectural character of London. Such was the great *Christian charity* and magnanimity of William III towards these Jews. The historic "Jewish problem" has two elements. The *religious element* is the fact that on the one hand, they are religious apostates who rejected Christ (Matt. 27:25; Rom. 2:28; II Cor. 3:13-16); but on the other hand, God "committed" "unto" "the" "Jew" the OT "oracles of God" (Rom. 3:1,2), and "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). Thus even as apostates they have performed God's will in preserving the OT oracles over time. The *racial element* relates to the fact that in post NT times, most persons of the Jewish religion came to be persons not of the Jewish race. A large number of essentially Caucasian Jews, formerly known as Khazars, converted to Judaism in the 8th or 9th centuries in the regions of Asia Minor, the Slavs, and Hungary. These are called Ashkenazi Jews, after Japheth's son, Ashkenaz (Gen. 10:3). The other group of European Jews are of the Jewish race and come from Spain and Portugal (the Iberian Peninsula). These are called Sephardic Jews from "Sepharad" (Obadiah 20). But these two groups have sometimes intermarried, producing mixed-race Jews e.g., a "white Jew" (Ashkenazi element) with "a hooked Semitic nose" (Sephardic element), hence "the Jewish *racial* problem." The Jewish race isolated in Rom. 9-11 includes the Sephardic Jews but not the Ashkenazi Jews, nor the mixed race Jews, since the Bible uses a racial definition of a Jew (e.g., Acts 18:24; Rom. 9:7-13). But mixed-race Jews can be found in both Jewish communities. Any persons seeking to harm the integrity of the Jewish racial group (Sephardim and any other Semitic Jews), attacks the law of God itself which calls for their preservation and protection in Rom. 9-11. (A further complication factor is that Eastern / Mizrahi Jews from various African and Asian countries, generally use the Sephardic liturgy. Though some such Jews may be of the Semitic Jewish race, certainly not all are. But they are sometimes called "Sephardic" because of their liturgy, rather than their race.) When dealing with the European Sephardim, white Christians would do well to follow the example of William III. But with respect to the preservation of not just the Hebrew OT, but also other important Hebraic and Aramaic works relevant to both a better understanding of the OT languages and also the OT Received Text, *we are thankful to God for the work of both "Jews and proselytes"* (Acts 2:10). E.g., the Christian Flemish printer, Daniel Bomberg (d. 1549), who used the Ashkenazi Gothic script in the Bomberg Hebrew OT (Venice, 1516 & 1517), also published the first complete Talmud 1520-1523 (and other Hebraic works). This was the Talmud of the Ashkenazi Jew, Asher ben Jehiel (d. 1327, Spain), who was born in Germany. Thus both "Jews (Sephardim) and proselytes (Ashkenazim)," have historically been given a special status in white Christian lands under Protestantism (although some abuses have occurred under Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy). Hence I would support the policy of segregation into a Jewish Quarter, allowing there both Sephardim and Ashkenazim (but wanting inter-marriage between these two groups stopped, and so some level of internal segregation between them), such as the one that

universities and media have suppressed the truth and taught their minions to hate the truth and God's leaders, rather than to love the truth and hearken unto God's leaders (Ezra. 7:25). For they promote so called "human rights" which be nought but *human wrongs*, rather than God's Holy Decalogue. And having removed their intellectual superiors and moral betters, by e.g., marking them down, or in other ways keeping them out, e.g., their control of academic journals, they have the audacity to say they believe in "freedom of speech," which thing in fact they more commonly use for libertinism. The media and universities etc. that they control allow for "diversity" at heart only inside the hyper-normativity of their base and carnal value system, whose artificial appearance of "intelligence" and "thinking" requires the more general suppression of truth and godly men. For their base and carnal brains delight in all manner of sensual filthiness and evil, which thing they "put the academic polished gloss on" under such misleading and false names as "human rights." (The fact that occasionally, much to the chagrin of these programmers, a racist or sexist somehow manages to procure e.g., such an academic position, in no way invalidates the accuracy of the overview that they are generally kept out of these positions.)

Personally, I am sick'n'tied of hearing about how this or that action discriminates against non-whites and non-Christians, as though that were in itself bad. *I am deeply concerned for the wider white Christian communities of the Western World, which without such protections are far gone into all manner of sexual immorality, family breakdown, drug-problems, spiritual degradation, enjoyment of fleeting pleasures focusing on gratuitous sex and violence in e.g., movies, debased musical tastes, and other matters. Even many in the churches lack the spiritual insight, intellectual capacity, or moral*

existed in London, and other restrictions necessary to protect a white Christian society, such as formerly applied in the UK under such kings as William of Orange. On the one hand, judged by contemporary secular libertine "human rights" values, I would thus be regarded as "anti-Jewish," and I accept that some level of anti-Jewish sentiment is necessary to protect a white Protestant Christian society. But on the other hand, judged from the traditional paradigm of white Christian society, my view is also quite kind and generous to the Jews, giving them a position and privilege throughout the Western World I would give to no other non-white (Semitic Sephardim) or non-Christian (Sephardim & Ashkenazim) group. Furthermore, I expect such Jews to show gratitude and respect to white Protestant Christians such as myself, NOT negative criticisms on the basis that we would deny them equality with the main population group of white Protestant Christians. Moreover, I support the existence of the modern State of Israel, which I see as relieving white Christian lands of much of the historic "Jewish problem." And since we live in an era when those holding my traditional views are greatly misrepresented in the media, universities, etc., I here state that, *of course*, I am opposed to the mass murder of about 6 million Jews under the World War II Nazis; and though this same media, universities, etc., do not like to mention it because e.g., it upsets the powerful Roman Catholic Church which was implicated, also about 750,000-800,000 Serbs in the *Greater Croatian Inquisition* under the Nazi Ustashi, of which between 600,000 and 700,000 were killed at the Nazi's third largest concentration camp (after Auschwitz & Treblinka in Poland), Jasenovac in Croatia (Exod. 20:13).

strength, to oppose such damaging things as white-coloured mixed marriages, various forms of sex role perversion, or other matters. As e.g., touching upon race, they lack the perception to understand the higher intensity of creative genius in the white race which is destroyed by miscegenation, or the generally lower basic intelligence among Negroids. They lack understanding of how God has told us in Genesis 9 & 10 to unite our people under a white racial and (in our instance) English linguistic fraternity as part of a Christian nation (in which not all Christians will be true Christians). They are sufficiently foolish to actually believe the secular “human rights” propaganda about race, and think that racists are in fact “bigots,” and of course, “Nazis.”

The truth is, they greatly benefit from godly governors setting the broad tone and parameters of society for them through the legal system. Without it, they are all too easily turned by societal programmers and brainwashers against their natural leadership into many destructive and foolish ways. Even as the ear implies the existence of sound, or the eye, the existence of sight, the needs of these people, both inside and outside the church, implies the proper existence of such godly and paternalistic Christian rulers. Ones who care for their people as “nursing fathers” (Isa. 49:23), knowing that the masses “cannot discern between their right and their left hand” (Jonah 4:11) and require protection from those who have gained control of society first under Type 1 secularism (pre World War II), and even more so under Type 2 secularism (post World War II). But even as there can be literal deafness or blindness, so too there can be spiritual, moral, or political deafness and blindness, such as tragically occurred in more recent historical times.

In the absence of such godly governments, the church must do what she can. Nevertheless, I believe our goal should be set in upholding the doctrine of the Establishment Principle. The reality is that a substantial percentage of professed Christians always seem to conform to societal values in varying degrees on a whole range of issues. They tend to compartmentalize religion to the church. They do not like to resist the world’s pull. They ought not to be conformed into the image of the world (Rom. 12:2), and they ought not to need the scaffolding assistance of a Christian society (I John 2:27). And some, I thank God, do not, and function the same with or without such scaffolding. But the greater proportion do not; and the unsaved, who rest entirely on common grace for their morals, in general then spurn God’s common grace and lapse into even further into depravity. Hence the desirability of “kings” as “nursing fathers” of the church, “and their queens” as “thy nursing mothers” in the churches of “the Gentiles” (Isa. 49:22,23), if this be at all possible.

For Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Lutherans, the establishment principle is classic Protestantism. It is to be distinguished from Popery, e.g., we read in the words of Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles, “we give not to our princes the ministering either of God’s Word, or of the sacraments ..., but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers” So likewise, the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 23:3 says, “The civil

magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacraments ... yet he hath authority, and it his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed; all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed; and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed” And 20:4 refers to “the power of the civil magistrate” (judge) “in “the lawful exercise” of “power,” “whether it be civil or ecclesiastical” (cf. 31:2).

God promised Abraham that he would be “a father of many nations,” and that “kings shall come out of” him (Gen. 17:5,6; 35:11). This general promise (cf. Gen. 12:3) is applied in the New Testament to Christians (Acts 3:25; Gal. 3:8,29); and so this naturally creates the expectation that there will be at least some Christian kings.

This interpretation is specifically confirmed in Ps. 2. First there is clearly an identification of a post First Advent Christian context following Christ’s passion, “Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed” (Ps. 2:1,2; Luke 19:14; Acts 4:24-28). Secondly, there is also a post resurrection context, “I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession” (Ps. 2:7,8; Acts 13:33; cf. Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). Thirdly, in this post First Advent (Ps. 2:1,2) and post resurrection (Ps. 2:7,8) context, we read of “kings” and “judges” / magistrates (Ps. 2:10), who are here specifically warned of God’s future judgement following the Second Advent (Ps. 2:9; Rev. 19:15).

Therefore, the “now therefore” of Ps. 2:10, in the words, “Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth;” are necessarily words that are being addressed to “kings” and “judges” in between the First and Second Advents. I.e., the “kings” and “judges” (magistrates) of Ps. 2:10-12 are being specifically addressed *in the Christian era*. The existence of such Christian “kings” and “judges” therefore requires the Establishment Principle. God says to them, “Be wise now therefore, *O ye kings*: be instructed, *ye judges* of the earth. *Serve the Lord* with fear, and rejoice with trembling. *Kiss the Son, lest he be angry*, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him” (Ps. 2:10-12; cf. Pss. 76:12; 110:5).

We are also told that after the Second Advent, “All the kings of the earth shall praise” the “Lord” (Ps. 138:4). Therefore these Christian “kings” and “judges” between the First and Second Advents of Ps. 2:10-12, are prophetic types of these future kings (Ps. 138:4) and judges / rulers (I Cor. 6:2,3; Rev. 20:4) after the Second Advent. The Establishment Principle is thus a foretaste of future things. *It is a little bit of heaven, here on earth*. Therefore the historic Protestant position of Lutherans, Anglicans, and Presbyterians in favour of the Establishment Principle, is surely the Biblical position. For “righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people” (Prov. 14:34).

If “kings” and “judges” heed the command to “serve the Lord with fear” (Ps. 2:10,11), then they must be guided by the Infallible Book, the Holy Bible. This beautiful book once held its proper place in e.g., England, under the Established *Church of England* in her better Reformed Protestant days. E.g., the Bible and the Bible alone was placed in a box in front of the Speaker in the House of Commons. For *the Westminster Parliament was once so fair*. (Alas it is now a most wicked legislature, having greatly departed from Biblical Christian principles).

Among other things, Biblical principles require that lawmakers and judges recognize the mandate given to Noah and his three sons. They should maintain purity of worship (Gen. 8:20), which is now found in the Christian religion, evident in a state Protestant church (even if dissenter Protestants and dissenter Jews are allowed as exceptions to this general rule,) with such doctrinal hallmarks as e.g., the teachings of the Holy Trinity, Apostles’ Creed, and Reformation Motto (grace alone, faith alone, Scripture alone). They should uphold race and cultural based nationalism (Gen. 10); in which the base unit of a society is a man and woman of the same race, which is to be protected for the purposes of procreation (Gen. 9:1), and also of the same Protestant Christian religion (Gen. 8:20). Thus the sanctity of marriage should be upheld in general (Matt. 19:9).

Such a society should recognize the general principles and desirability of patriarchy, as taught by nature (I Cor. 11:14) and Scripture (e.g., Titus 1:6; 2:5)⁶⁵. The central code of God’s law which all such lawmakers and judges should ponder and enact is, of course, the Holy Decalogue (interpreted in the light of the NT).

By contrast, if God’s laws are not so upheld in a Christian state, something else will be. E.g., it might be some kind of “situation ethics⁶⁶,” in which the two major

⁶⁵ Scripture allows for an imperfect patriarchy in some societal structures; although it absolutely prohibits that women should ever hold positions in the church that would allow them to preach the Word (I Tim. 2:11), publicly pray (I Tim. 2:8), or minister the sacraments (I Cor. 4:1, cf. 14:34-37), i.e., the clergy (e.g., in Anglican church government, bishops, priests, and deacons,) are always to be adult males. But there are *rare and unusual* situations in which a godly man may serve a queen (Judg. 4 & 5; Acts 8:27). But *only where it is absolutely necessary*. Such *necessity* should not be stretched to make this normative. One should not look to put woman in such positions, but only do so if and when, on any reasonable analysis, it *occasionally* becomes *necessary* to do so for some reason; in which instance it should be understood as an exception to the general rule. This type of balance is well captured in the succession rules of the English Crown introduced by Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547), in which the eldest son always succeeds, but if there is no son, then the eldest daughter succeeds. Godly English Queens such as Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603) or Anne (Regnal Years: 1702-1714), upheld the general patriarchal structures of society. They were not feminists, seeking some kind of general female equality. (Another view of Scripture to that of Henry VIII, looks to the closest related male outside the immediate Royal Family.)

⁶⁶ For a very bad book recommending suchlike, see Fletcher, J., *Situation Ethics*,

political parties in a secular Western democracy (e.g., the Democrats and Republicans in USA, or the Liberal and Labor Parties in Australia), become the two “beacons” that embrace what is “right,” and some kind of “working together” is deemed virtuous (e.g., this was a key element in the approach of USA Presidential candidate, Senator John McCain in 2008, and both before and after this time, it has been a hallmark of his approach as a USA Senator). In fact, such political parties should be judged by God’s standards, *supra*, and it is clear that e.g., the Democrats and Republicans in the USA are both spiritually and morally putrid parties, which have done great damage to both America and the world, and most especially so in accelerated form in the post World War II era.

Other false “beacons” that may emerge include e.g., libertinism, French Revolution derived “human rights,” fascism (Nazism), socialism, communism, or Mohammedanism. *Somebody’s values must prevail, and if they are not God’s values as set forth in his infallible Bible, then they are somebody else’s. There is no such thing as a “neutral free” society.* If e.g., one “tolerates anything,” then by definition one persecutes many Christians who will not condone the legal protections thereby given to wicked persons. Great pain is also caused to the godly by e.g., pornography, both directly as it results in more and more filthy forms of advertising; and indirectly in the way it affect people’s minds, which obnoxious people we are forced to have some level of contact with in e.g., the workplace, or in a restaurant where they love to manifest their reprobate natures with e.g., coarse and filthy language, or ungodly themes and interests.

The pain caused to me by e.g., women’s immodest clothing, men’s long hair, inter-racial couples, vile adverts, etc., is such, that wherever possible I try to block it out with e.g., my hand in front of my eyes, but this solution is not always reasonably possible. The history of the world since the Fall of Adam has made it very clear that if a society does not uphold God’s laws, then they uphold something which in varying degrees is hostile to God’s law, and which is a mix of the lusts of sinful men and the Devil. For “righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people” (Prov. 14:34). *Oh how greatly I admire the Biblical figures of the King’s Counsellor, Holy Ezra (Ezra 7:14; 9 & 10), and the King’s Governor, Holy Nehemiah (Neh. 5:14; 13)!*

Hence when we Christians pray “For kings, and for all that are in authority” (I Tim. 2:2), even if the form of our prayer does not specifically refer to the second psalm, the substance of our prayers should be that these persons heed the injunction of Ps. 2:10-12. God’s direction in the Christian era is thus unequivocal, being set forth in the second Psalm. Those in authority should seek the “wisdom” that comes from God and “fear” “the Lord.” For only by such “fear” and “wisdom,” do “kings reign, and princes decree justice,” and so thus should “princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth” (Prov. 8:12,13,15,16). While the presence of Christian kings and judges (magistrates / rulers) does not produce perfection, since this side of the Second Advent there will always be lawbreakers who e.g., murder, commit adultery, commit sodomy, rob banks, commit fraud, or peddle pornography (Isa. 26:10); nevertheless, “when” the Lord’s

“judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness” (Isa. 26:9). “Praise ye the Lord,” “kings of the earth, and all people; princes, and all judges of the earth,” “Praise ye the Lord” (Ps. 148:1,11,14).

Passages such as Ps. 148:11; Prov. 8:12,13,15,16; Isa. 26:9; thus create the following paradox. On the one hand, the OT’s Jewish state of Israel is an example to us Christians of kings (e.g., David and Solomon) and judges (magistrates / rulers) (e.g., Ezra 6 & 7; Neh. 2; Esther 8-10). But on the other hand, the OT Mosaic law no longer binds Christians of necessity, but NT law does (Eph. 2:15,16; Col. 2:14,16,17; Heb. 7:12; 9:10)⁶⁷. Where the NT upholds a specific OT Mosaic precept, then it is binding to the extent that the NT upholds it (e.g., Lev. 19:18 & Deut. 6:5 quoted in Matt. 22:36-40; Deut. 25:4 quoted in I Cor. 9:8-10; I Tim. 5:18). E.g., the OT levirate marriage rule exception (Deut. 25:5-10; Matt. 22:23-33), is repealed under Christian laws ending old Jewish laws (Eph. 2:15) and requiring monogamy (Matt. 19:9). Therefore Lev. 18 & 20 is written in such a way that once polygamy is prohibited, this exception being no longer applicable, all such unions with one’s “brother’s wife” become unlawful⁶⁸. Thus for Christians, there is an absolute ban on a man marrying his deceased brother’s wife.

Therefore Christian kings and judges may look to the example of OT kings and judges, but must ensure that they enact those moral laws that continue to bind in the Christian era, found *par excellence* in the Ten Commandments as understood in the NT. E.g., Sunday trading laws should be upheld (NT Christian sabbath), not Saturday trading laws (OT Jewish sabbath); or the monogamy laws of antediluvian times (Gen. 2:24; 4:19; 7:13) should be upheld (NT Christian law, e.g., Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:2), not polygamy (OT Jewish law e.g., Exod. 21:10; Deut. 21:15-17); or the absolute ban on miscegenation of antediluvian times (Gen. 6:1-4), not the later situation of a small scale permissible assimilation because the gospel was only found among Jews (Exod. 2:21,22), should be upheld (Christian law, Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39; Acts 15:20,29; 21:25; I Cor. 7:18-20). They should define a nation Biblically, i.e., by race and linguistic culture (Gen. 10), (recognizing as appropriate, white and Jewish Semite supremacy racial traits,

⁶⁷ See Article 7, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*; Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, 19.

⁶⁸ E.g., Jesus referred to the Mosaic divorce provisions, saying, “It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement” (Matt. 5:31 referring to Deut. 24:1-4). He then interpreted these divorce provisions in Matt. 5:32. Likewise in Matt. 19:7-9, reference is first made to the provisions of “Moses” for “a writing of divorcement,” and then Jesus says that all divorce occurs because of the effects of original sin, that is “the hardness of your hearts” that did not exist “from the beginning” when man was in original righteousness, and then gives the same provisions for divorce in Matt. 19:9 he gave in Matt. 5:32. Therefore, the provisions for a “bill of divorcement” in Deut. 24:1-4, allowing dissolution of the marriage for “uncleanness,” “hate,” or death (“die”) remain binding for Christians, *subject to NT interpretation*. Key NT passages on dissolution of marriage are Matt. 5:32; 19:9; Rom. 7:2,3; I Cor. 7:15,39.

Gen. 9:25-27), and having protected its basic integrity through any necessary anti-miscegenation laws, segregation laws, or xenelasia laws⁶⁹, then enact the Christian moral law of God. E.g., murder should be a capital crime (Gen. 9:6; Exod. 20:13; Rev. 13:10)⁷⁰.

⁶⁹ The noun, “xenelasia,” pronounced, “zenelasia,” has been removed by many dictionary programmers opposed to ethnic cleansing, who have simultaneously also included many filthy, disgusting, and ungodly words, since they seek to promote wickedness and vice. But it may be found in some dictionaries, e.g., “**xenelasia** (Gk. hist.) Spartan system of excluding & expelling aliens. (Gk. ... f. *xenos*, stranger, *elauno* drive)” (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 3rd ed. revised, 1944); or “**xenelasia** (zen-), n. (Gr., the expulsion of strangers.) a Spartan institution which prohibited strangers from residing in Sparta without permission, and empowered magistrates to expel them if they saw fit to do so” (*Webster’s Dictionary*, 1904, 1979 edition, William Collins Publishers, USA, ISBN 0-529-04852-3).

⁷⁰ I also support capital punishment for attempted murder where there is the added element of the public interest. E.g., upon the Royal Visit to Australia of the son of Queen Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901), Prince Alfred, while on a Sydney beach, he was shot on 12 March 1868 by a virulent anti-Royalist, Henry James O’Farrell, a Roman Catholic from Dublin in Ireland. The Prince mercifully recovered, and the NSW Parliament ordered the erection of *Prince Alfred Hospital*, upon which Victoria conferred the title “Royal” i.e., Sydney’s *Royal Prince Alfred Hospital*. But this was no normal attempted murder. The element of the public interest was present since this was additionally an attack upon the Crown as represented by the Sovereign’s son, and so O’Farrell was rightly tried and executed in April 1868. The following Anglican prayer & thanksgiving was issued in connection with this event, “Almighty God, our Creator and Preserver, in whose hand are the issues of life and death, we give Thee humble and hearty thanks for thy late mercy vouchsafed to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and to Her people, in the preservation of the life of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh from the murderous intent of the assassin. Continue, we beseech Thee, Thy watchful care over him; let the light of Thy countenance shine upon him; give him Thy grace and heavenly benediction, that passing the life which Thou hast graciously spared in Thy faith, fear, and love, he may finally attain everlasting joy, though the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*” (“A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God for His merciful preservation of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh from the attack of an assassin in Australia, on Thursday the 12th of March 1868 ...: to be used at Morning and Evening Service, in all Churches and Chapels in England and Wales, and in the Town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, on Sunday the twenty-eighth day of June instant,” Printed by George Edward Eyre & William Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen’s most Excellent Majesty, 1868; British Library copy, shelf mark: 4405.k 1/1). So too, I would e.g., support the execution of the Roman Catholic Guy Fawkes for his attempted seditious murder of the Protestant King and Members of Parliament in 1605. But the absence of this element of the public interest in most cases of attempted murder, would mean that in general a lesser penalty would be appropriate.

Though the Anglican Protestant Christian State rightly regarded John Calvin's Geneva as too strict, and per Article 34 of the 39 Articles preferred more Lutheran type of public worship forms than Calvin's more Puritan forms; it is also the case, that subject to these types of qualification, that e.g., per Article 17 of the 39 Articles, John Calvin was recognized as *the second man of the Reformation*. His succinct articulation of *the doctrines of grace*, sometimes abbreviated as "TULIP," is found in the Anglican 39 Articles, namely, "Total depravity" (i.e., inability due to original sin, requiring enabling to be saved Articles 9, 10, & 11); "Unconditional Election" (Article 17); "Limited Atonement" (Homily 4, Books 1 & 2, Article 35⁷¹); "Irresistible Grace" (Article 17); and "Perseverance of the saints" (Article 17). On the one hand, unlike the Puritans, the Anglican recognition of John Calvin as *the second man of the Reformation* is qualified by the connected recognition that Thomas Cranmer was *the third man of the Reformation*. But on the other hand, unlike Lutheranism or Wesleyan Arminianism, historical Anglican Protestantism still recognizes John Calvin as *the second man of the Reformation*, and so is Reformed or Calvinist.

Against this backdrop in which Calvin is thus held in a generally high regard, albeit one that is qualified, it is to be further noted that the Establishment Principle was as a broad principle also taught by e.g., the Protestant Reformer, John Calvin (1509-1564). Calvin of Geneva asked, "What have judgments to do with a Christian man? And if it be unlawful to kill, of what use are laws and judgment to us?" Calvin rightly first makes the important point, "that this kind of government is distinct from that spiritual and internal reign of Christ." But then he makes the further important point, "so it ought to be known *that they are in no respect at variance with each other.*" Thus he concludes, "*civil government is designed, as long as we live in this world, to cherish and support the external worship of God, to preserve the pure doctrine of religion, to defend the constitution of the Church, to regulate our lives in a manner requisite for the society of men, to form our manners to civil justice, to promote our concord with each another, and to establish general peace and tranquillity*" (Calvin's *Institutes*, 4:20:2)⁷².

⁷¹ In the symbolic type of Leviticus 16:29-34; 23:27-32, Homily 4, Book 2, Article 35, upholds the teaching of a limited atonement, i.e., it was *particular* to "the children of Israel" and did not include the Gentiles outside of Israel. And in its greater fulfilment in the Christian Church which is now God's Israel, limited atonement is taught by reference to Matt. 1:21 in Homily 2, Book 1, Article 35, "Jesus ... is *that high and everlasting priest* (Heb. 7:24-27; 10:14), *which hath offered himself once for all upon the altar of the cross, and with that one oblation hath made perfect for evermore them that are sanctified. He ... paid our ransom to God with his own blood; and with that hath he cleansed us all from sin. ... He is that Saviour which saveth his people from all their sins* (Matt. 1:21)" (emphasis mine). I.e., a limited or particular atonement for "his people" (Matt. 1:21), rather than a general or universal atonement.

⁷² *Institutes of the Christian Religion by John Calvin*, Translated from the Latin and collated with the author's last edition in French by John Allen, 7th American Edition, Revised and Corrected by Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921), in two volumes, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, Philadelphia, USA, [undated], Vol. 2, p. 772, Book 4,

We cannot doubt that the OT contains a number of prophecies of Gentile kings, and these are connected to the key Establishment passage of Isa. 49:22,23. A number of these prophecies have both lesser fulfilments before Christ's Second Advent, followed by a greater fulfilment after Christ's Advent. They are premised upon the fact that after the Second Coming, under "the new heavens and" upon "the new earth" (Isa. 66:22), the Lord will make new race based nations. E.g., the Jewish race will be "born at once" as "a nation" on "the earth" (Isa. 66:8); and as a prophetic type of this, just before the Lord's return, large numbers of the Jewish race (Rom. 9:3,7,10,13), found today mainly among Sephardic Jews, will convert to Christianity (Rom. 11:25,26). So too, the Lord will make many new Gentile nations based around the racial "families of the earth" (Zech. 14:17), e.g., "the family of Egypt" (Zech. 14:18). For the "new heaven and ... new earth" will contain "nations" with "kings" who "shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into" "new Jerusalem" (Rev. 21:1,2,24,26). Thus even as God destroyed the miscegenationists of Noah's day (Gen. 6:1-4), and then by race creation created new nations via Noah's three sons (Gen. 10), so likewise, at his Second Advent, the Lord will destroy miscegenationists and set up his kingdom (Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39)⁷³.

In Scripture, a nation is always defined in terms of race and culture as a "family" (Gen. 10). E.g., the gospel promise is to "all families of the earth" (Gen. 12:3), i.e., "all the kindreds" (racial) (Acts 3:25), or "all nations" (Gal. 3:8). (In Biblical terms, what the new secularists call a "nation," which is spatially defined i.e., anyone living in the space is said to be of that "nation," rather than racially and linguistically defined, is referred to in Biblical terms as an empire, like the type Nimrod built, Gen. 10:9-12; 11:1-9⁷⁴.) Thus

chapter 20 ("On Civil Government"), section 2 (emphasis mine).

⁷³ In the AV, all Christians are called "kings" (Rev. 1:6). While this is definitely a possible translation, and in some contexts this is certainly the meaning of Greek, *basileus*; in this particular context I think the better meaning of *basileus* is that of aristocracy or royalty. I.e., as members of the royal family, all Christians are "princes" or "princesses" etc. . Thus while different interpretations are possible, I think the most likely meaning of this, is that on the new heaven and new earth, in these race-based nations having kings, all of whom will be under the King of Kings, every Christian will be some kind of "aristocrat," or "duke," or "prince."

⁷⁴ Though the matter is one of disagreement, I understand Nimrod to have been Sargon the Great (or Sargon I), king of Accad, who may be dated to the 3rd millennia B.C. . Did Micah refer to "Assyria" as "the land of Nimrod" (Micah 5:6), because he meant by "Nimrod," Sargon I? Or, did Micah refer to "Assyria" as "the land of Nimrod" (Micah 5:6), because the Hebrew "Nimrod" equates the Assyrian "Sargon," i.e., so that Micah is referring to Nimrod II or Sargon II (Isa. 20:1)? Either way, it is clear that Nimrod is here connected with Assyria, a fact consistent with the identification of Nimrod of Babel as Sargon the Great. The Hebrew word in Gen. 10:11 for "builded" (AV) is *banah*. While this can mean "build" / "built," it can also have the sense of "repair," "set (up)," or "be rebuilt." I.e., Nimrod may have *built up* or *rebuilt* pre-existing cities such as e.g., "Ninevah" (Gen. 10:11). I understand "the whole earth"

e.g., Rev. 21 & 22 depict on the “new heaven and ... new earth” (Rev. 21:1) various “nations” (Rev. 21:24,26; 22:2), which under “the everlasting gospel” are drawn from diverse racial and linguistic groups (Rev. 5:9; 7:9; 14:6). Thus God’s perfect programme calls for a preservation of diverse racial and linguistic groups.

There are verses in the Bible that people sometimes partially quote, because to do so suits their fleeting fancies and lusts. For instance, they might say, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” but they then omit reference to the rest of the verse, “who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (Rom. 8:1). A good example of this is Acts 17:26, where the racial desegregationists only cite the first part of the verse. I.e., “all nations” were “made of (from, Greek, *ex*) one blood.” But the verse then goes on to say that God also *segregated* them, determining “the bounds of their habitation” (Acts. 17:26). The verse thus makes the point that God is the author of the segregation of the races. It is thus strikingly similar to those parts of Deut. 32:8 which say, “when the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated (i.e., segregation) the sons of Adam (i.e., originally of one blood), he set the bounds (i.e., segregation) of the people” The races are no longer “one blood,” even though they originally came from / “of one blood.”

This important fact is also recognized in the prophecy of the three wise men, found in Ps. 72:10. Christmas cards (and traditional religious art,) sometimes show the three wise men as three kings, as a white European, brown Asian, and black African. Those who do not understand relevant prophetic principles have sometimes questioned the accuracy of this, since they could not find such details in the Gospels. But this picture is built up from OT prophecy, the *Table of Nations* (Gen. 10), and Matt. 2.

We may conclude that there were three wise men because “*they* presented” three gifts, one giving “gold,” another, “frankincense,” and another “myrrh” (Matt. 2:11). Ps. 72 is largely, though not entirely focused on the Second Advent. In OT prophesy, these three Gentiles of Matt. 2 and Ps. 72:10 were prophetic types at Christ’s First Advent, of those who are to come at his Second Advent. Thus in order to be types, like them they must have been three “kings” of the “Gentiles” from European “Tarshish” (white Japhethite, Gen. 10:4), Asiatic “Sheba” (brown Semite, Gen. 25:3), and African “Seba”

which “was of one language” (Gen. 11:1), to refer to the local Mesopotamian world (cf. Gen. 41:36,56; II Chron 9:22,23), since it is clear that many other tongues existed more widely before this time (Gen. 10:5,20,31,32). Thus the Tower of Babel is an account as to the origins of the divide of, for instance, the Hebrew and Babylonian tongues. Extra-Biblical data is silent on the race of Sargon I’s father, simply saying that “his mother was a priestess” and “his father an unknown wanderer.” (*Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., 1971, Vol. 1, Pt 2, pp. 418-9,425-6,431.) But Sargon’s father was evidently a Negroid (Gen. 10:8), and thus Sargon I was a half-caste. Though this information is absent from extra-Biblical accounts of Sargon I, it helps us understand why he was desirous of integrating different racial groups into his empire.

(black Hamite, Gen. 10:7); and in all likelihood, like them come on “camels” (Isa. 60:6). It was thus also necessary that they bring such gifts as “gold” and “incense” e.g., frankincense (Ps. 72:10,15; Isa. 60:3,6,9), and so also have access to myrrh, a gum resin used in incense⁷⁵.

In the Anglican liturgical calendar found in the Church of England’s *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), this event is celebrated as the *Feast of Epiphany*. January 6 is thus known in the prayer book as, “THE EPIPHANY, or the Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles.” The following Sundays are then known as “The First Sunday after the Epiphany,” “The Second Sunday after the Epiphany,” etc., up to Septuagesima Sunday. (It is also notable in the context of the Establishment Principle’s link to Epiphany, that the Epistle Communion reading for the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany is Rom. 13:1-7, which focuses on government.) This is also found in e.g., John Hopkins well known Christmas carol (1857), “We *three kings* of Orient are, bearing gifts we travel afar,” etc. .

That at his First Advent, Christ was “worshipped” at his birth (Matt. 2:11) by three Gentile “kings” (Ps. 72:10), who type the greater glory that “all kings” (Ps. 72:11) shall give Christ after his Second Advent, is thus a significant statement that the Gospel’s focus includes Gentile kings. The three Gentile “kings” of the First Advent, are prophetic types of, and a first fruits of, those who after the Second Advent “shall fall down before him,” when “all nations shall serve him” (Ps. 72:10,11).

The greater relevance to the Establishment Principle of this imagery of the three kings that came at Christ’s Epiphany, is found in Isa. 60. Isa. 60 is the lynch-pin passage uniting these different ideas about Gentile kings of Christian states, and thus a key Establishment Principle passage. Notably then, the first reading at Morning Prayer

⁷⁵ In Hebrew “Ham” is *Cham* which is like *chom* (heat), that is, being burnt and thus black. In Assyrian (Gen. 2:14; 10:22) *ippatu* means “white” (like Japheth) and *samu* “olive coloured” (like Shem). In Egyptian (Gen. 10:6) Ham is like the word “black” in the Hieroglyphic’s *kem*; Demotic’s *kemi*; Thebes’ *keme*; or Memphis’ *kheme*; and in Arabic, *ahamm*, fem. *hamma* means “black.” The Anglican Canon, Andrew Fausset refers to the classic Hebrew lexicon, “Gesenius” in saying “Japheth” comes “from *yaphah* ‘to be fair,’ from the fair complexion of Japheth and his descendants” (cf. Hebrew *yapha* “shine,” and *yiph’ah* “brightness”), and so e.g., “Japhet” means “father of *fair* descendants” (Fausset, A.R., *Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, pp. 169,328). Likewise, T.G. Pinches says “Shem means ‘dusky,’” “Japheth ‘fair,’” and “Ham ‘black’” (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Orr, Editor, 1929, Hendrickson, USA, reprint 1996, 2:1324, 3:1568, 4:2759). The fact that only some of Ham’s descendants were black, indicates this word-play is a broad-brush impressionistic picture i.e., the white (Japhethites), brown (Shemites), and black (Hamites). Thus while Sunday School children may be given pictures of Noah’s three sons that they colour in white, brown (red), and black, it should be explained to teenage children and adults that this is a God given artistic summary, and in the more detailed picture not all Hamites are black, whereas Australoid Shemites via Elam are.

(Matins / Mattins) for the *Feast of Epiphany* in the 1662 Anglican prayer book is Isaiah 60, and the Gospel reading at Communion is Matt. 2:1-12.

In Isaiah 60, there are three time-classes of Gentile kings, those at Christ's First Advent, those after Christ's Second Advent, and those in between the two Advents. Firstly, those who are present at Christ's First Advent. As in Ps. 72:10, we read of those who "bring gold and incense" from such places as Asiatic (brown) "Sheba" (Isa. 60:6) and European (white) "Tarshish" (Isa. 60:9). We thus have some references here to both the three kings of the First Advent, and also the kings of the Second Advent. Yet it is also clear that we have references to Gentile kings who exist between these two great events of the First and Second Advents. When e.g., we read, "the Lord shall arise, and his glory shall be seen upon thee, And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and *kings* to the brightness of thy rising" (Isa. 60,2,3), we cannot doubt that this is a picture of the Christian gospel age, and includes a focus on "kings" of "the Gentiles" (Isa. 60:3).

Significantly then, we further read in Isa. 60:10, "the sons of strangers" i.e., the Gentiles, "shall build up thy walls, and *their kings shall minister unto thee.*" That Gentile "kings" should "minister" unto the church clearly is an Establishment Principle verse. While it must be said that the greater fulfilment of this will be after the Second Advent, it is nevertheless clear that it has a lesser interim fulfilment between the two Advents (Isa. 60:2,3). So also we read that, "Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob" (Isa. 60:16). Though once again the greater fulfilment of this will be after the Second Advent, it is nevertheless clear that it has a lesser interim fulfilment between the two Advents (Isa. 60:2,3). Indeed, this picture of "kings" of "the Gentiles" (Isa. 60:16), clearly depicts them as nursing fathers of the church (cf. Isa. 49:22,23)

This is also consistent with the fact, that in discussing the Christian gospel, Isaiah says Christ "shall ... sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider" (Isa. 52:25). To "sprinkle" is a Biblical phrase meaning regeneration (Ezek. 36:25) in baptism by "the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 3:11). This is *symbolized* by those who follow the Establishment Principle in Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Lutheranism, by the sprinkling of water in infant baptism in a national church. But the inner truth that the symbol of Christian baptism reveals, as here foretold in prophecy in Isa. 52:15, is that, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean ... A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgements" (Ezek. 36:25-27). Since Isa. 52:13-53:12 is contextually focused on Christ and the Christian era, it follows that these "kings" are part of Christian "nations" whom God promises to "sprinkle" with the spiritual baptism of regeneration, that is symbolized by water baptism (Isa. 52:15)⁷⁶. Of course, just as "not all Israel ... are ... Israel" (Rom.

⁷⁶ Sadly, Lutherans do not have a symbolic view of baptism (consubstantiation). Moreover, Baptists not only have a different view of baptism, in

9:6), so too, not all Christians who have received the sacrament of infant baptism in such a Christian land are true Christians (Acts 2:39; I Cor. 1:16; 10:1,2; Col. 2:11-13).

Thus we find that the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Christian gospel from the time of Christ, is also an inclusion from the outset of Christian kings, evident in the three “kings” who came to Christ at his Epiphany (Ps. 72:10; Isa. 60:5,6,9; Matt. 2:11). This is significant, because it points to the fact, that between the presence of Christian kings at Christ’s First and Second Advents (Ps. 72 & Isa. 60), there are to be Gentile kings who are to be nursing fathers to the Christian Church. Of course, this interim fulfilment between the two Advents will be at best a partial fulfilment over some parts of the globe, and certainly imperfect until the Second Advent. Only after Christ’s Second Advent will there be a perfect fulfilment. Nevertheless, we here find in Scripture the great teaching of the Establishment Principle (Gen. 17:5,6; 35:11; Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23; 52:14,15; 60:3,10), and I thank God for it. *Oh how greatly I admire the Biblical figures of the King’s Counsellor, Holy Ezra (Ezra 7:14; 9 & 10), and the King’s Governor, Holy Nehemiah (Neh. 5:14; 13)!*

The Protestant Church greatly benefited from the Establishment Principle. E.g., under God, the Duke of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, was Martin Luther’s earthly protector, being a nursing father to the Church. Or under God, a succession of monarchs in the British Isles upheld the establishment principle under Protestantism, e.g., King James I was a nursing father to the Church. We cannot doubt, that before the rise of the secular state in late 18th century America or 19th century in the British Isles and British Empire, the fact that the Christian State was so strongly established, with the Anglican Church as the established *Church of England* (England & Wales), and the established *Church of Ireland*, and the Presbyterian Church the established *Church of Scotland*, that

general, they have not historically supported the Establishment Principle. The Anglican newspaper, *English Churchman*, said in January 2008, that “the Southern Baptist Convention” is “the largest Protestant denomination in the USA,” and it has within it both a small, but growing number of “Calvinist” “pastors” (c. 10%), and a larger group of Arminians (“More Baptists Accepting Calvinism,” *English Churchman*, 18 & 25 Jan., 2008, p. 7). This is reflective of the Baptists’ Puritan origins, since during the Puritan movement of the 17th century the Baptists divided between an Arminian group (The General Baptists) and a Reformed group (The Particular Baptists). In the United States of America, among this large group of Baptists, one finds very little historic support for the Establishment Principle. Hence whereas in Commonwealth countries under the British Crown, such as Australia, New Zealand, or Canada, Christian symbols e.g., the Christian cross on top of the royal crown, is a widely used and common symbol for the Head of State; by contrast, one finds no specifically Christian imagery in the symbols of office for the President of the USA. And whereas under the *Act of Settlement* (1701) and *Act of Union* (1707) the UK throne can go to “such ...only ... as are Protestant members of the Church of England, and are married to none but Protestants” (Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 1:217); by contrast, the USA Constitution says, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ...” (Article 1, USA Bill of Rights).

e.g., the standing of the *Textus Receptus* was sure. In such a Christian State, the ungodly anti-supernaturalist musings of fools such as the neo-Alexandrians had no place. *Oh how greatly I admire the Biblical figures of the King's Counsellor, Holy Ezra (Ezra 7:14; 9 & 10), and the King's Governor, Holy Nehemiah (Neh. 5:14; 13)!*

2c) *The Secular State: Types 1 & 2.*

Following the era of the Protestant Christian State in which the church and state were one; a separation occurred between church and state. In the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State Era, which commenced at the time of the American Revolution in the late 18th century, and was then adopted with some modifications in 19th century Britain, and through the British Empire to countries like Australia, the Church was generally regarded as “an ally” of the State, particularly in the area of morals.

Unlike Type 1 Secularists in the United States of America, Type 1 Secularists in the United Kingdom and countries like Australia, were happy to retain some specifically “Christian” references and symbols in the Type 1 Secular State. Thus e.g., the secularists who wanted the removal from the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* of the Protestant Christian State Offices of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.), *The King's Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* (29 May), and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.); were nevertheless happy to retain *Accession Day* of a reigning Sovereign as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, even though under the secular state the monarch became largely titular or ceremonial in both church and state. By contrast, the USA Type 1 Secularists removed all such specifically Protestant Christian imagery from the office of President, though retained some references to “God.”

But notwithstanding this difference between the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State in countries like the UK and Australia, as opposed to the USA, the secular revolution that for Type 1 Secularist really impacted most on the Western world in terms of political philosophical influence, was undoubtedly that of the American Revolution. Hence Type 1 Secularists looked to the *Edmund Burke verses Thomas Paine* debate, and sided with Burke in being anti-French Revolution but pro the secular state that came out of the American Revolution. Had the secularists of the American Revolution gone straight to a post World War Two type of pro French Revolution “rights of man” Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) secularism, the people would have quickly cried out, “We want the King back! For George III with a Christian cross on his crown, and the Protestant 39 Articles in one hand, and the Saint James Bible in the other hand, was better than this! We want the King back!” And so the secularists first waited for over a hundred years in the case of the United Kingdom, or in the case of the United States of America, over 150 years, till after World War Two, when people were accustomed to celebrating and speaking favorably of the secular state. They waited till people had sidelined the so called “fanatics” who believed in a Protestant Christian State. They waited till anti-supernaturalists had side-line old earth creationists via the teaching of an anti-supernaturalist “science” with Darwinian macroevolution. They waited till people

were accustomed to speaking in heroic terms of a succession of secular state Presidents, or Prime Ministers, and other political figures. And then, in a carefully laid spring-loaded trap, with idolatry and blasphemy long established in the land under “religious liberty,” the denial of the Creator long established through Darwinism, and the repudiation of Biblical law through the precedent of some incest laws allowing e.g., marriage with a deceased brother’s wife; in the post World War Two era, the Devil behind the secularists sprang that spring-loaded trap, and implemented Type 2 secularism in which the remaining Christian morality would go, and Christians would be increasingly persecuted in e.g., colleges and universities, the media, and the work-place under “anti-discrimination” legislation “empowering” e.g., coloured aliens who are racial and cultural bastards to the land, sex role perverts, fornicators, adulterers, and sodomites.

The twofold irreducible elements of the Type 1 Secularist dismantling of the Protestant Christian State consisted firstly of the maintenance of religious liberty that allowed e.g., Deism, a vaguely defined Theism (e.g., Freemasonry), idolatry (e.g., Papists and Puseyites), witchcraft, etc. . This led to a dichotomy in which the first two of the Ten Commandments, and to some extent the Third and Fourth Commandments, were regarded as “Church matters,” but the remaining Decalogue morality was still broadly covered as “State matters.” The second plank which derived from this was the more general promotion of anti-supernaturalism. This generally led to the removal of that form of incest that Henry VIII broke with Rome over, namely, marriage with a deceased brother’s wife, although occasionally State 1 Secularists might retain this provision (as they did in the Australian State of Victoria before the *Barwick Act* of 1959, *infra*). Another clear manifestation of this anti-supernaturalism was the rejection of the Biblical Story of Sodom and Gomorrah, and with it the usage of Gen. 18 & 19 in conjunction with Lev. 20:13 to execute sodomites convicted at law of sodomy with man or beast, who instead came to be imprisoned. This anti-supernaturalism was also manifested in the so called “natural sciences,” in which the old earth creationists of the 19th century were moved out of the state colleges and universities, and anti-supernaturalist Darwinists put in, and allowed to define such “science” in specifically anti-supernaturalist terms.

On the one hand, the fact that the Type 1 Secular State was prepared to give a good deal to the Christians in terms of maintaining much Protestant morality in law and society, and via the immigration policy, maintain a white Christian population group that was mainly Protestant as the national race, acted to make many believe that the Type 1 Secular State was a desirable thing, or at least something that they could accommodate themselves to. But on the other hand, the fact that the most spiritually gifted who wanted a specifically Protestant Christian State were sidelined as “fanatics;” the fact that in the UK the Anglican Church was allowed to go to rack’n’ruin with Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals; the fact that the sciences were retarded by keeping out old earth creationists and putting in Darwinists, the fact that the more and more Darwinists denied the Creator (Rom. 1:20); more and more the land was filled with idolatry from, for instance, Papists and Puseyites (Rom. 1:1:21-23), meant that God in his holiness and righteous anger, was giving more and more people over to a homosexual orientation as a Divine Judgment on their denial of a Creator and idolatry (Rom. 1:24-26). And so the homosexual community grew more and more, and other wickedness and

vice started to ooze out. *Thus despite many of its “cleaner” appearances, the Type 1 Secular State very largely prepared the way for, and facilitated, the rise of the Type 2 Secular State.* Though it was largely unintentional on their part, the Type 1 Secular State fostered the creation of so much vice, that it became like a group of men sitting on a pressure-cooker lid getting burnt on their posteriors, finding it harder and harder “to keep the lid on,” which more and more came to feel like it “would blow sky high.”

I do not wish to enter recriminations. I myself was formerly deceived as to the true nature and desirability of the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State, so that both during and after my time at Sydney University in the 1980s and early 1990s, I used to argue for a return to the Christian morals of the Type 1 Secular State in opposition to the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State. I was regarded by the “human rights” and libertine secularists of the Type 2 Secular State at university as some kind of “arch-conservative,” even though, paradoxically, I now consider that in fact *I was too liberal*, being at the time deceived both with respect to theistic macroevolution (though not Darwinian macroevolution), and the failure to see the intrinsic dangers of the Type 1 secular state. I seek the forgiveness of God and man for my errors in supporting the Type 1 Secular State’s paradigm⁷⁷. *But we must move on. We must in a BACK TO THE FUTURE examination of religio-political ideology, come to realize the need for a specifically Protestant Christian State.*

We have all been deceived, we have all been tricked by the secularists, who have tried to box us in with their anti-supernaturalist and God hating philosophy, which act contrary to God’s holy ways and laws as set forth in the Bible. Our fight in this world is ultimately not with the masses of white Protestant Westerners, many of whom have in varying degrees been programmed and brainwashed to hate the His Divine Majesty’s white Christian royal guardians of society, and correspondingly they have been programmed to love the destroyers and crushers of white Protestant Christian society. By not putting themselves under God’s directive will as set forth in the Infallible Bible, they have in connection with their unbridled lusts been brainwashed and programmed against righteousness (although since this involves an element of their own lust, and since they are made in the image of God, they must in the next life justly bear God’s judgment for there negligence in such matters). Our fight in this world is ultimately with their programmers in the media, the colleges and universities, the judicature, and the legislatures, who through various means have programmed them to accept all kinds of unBiblical and ungodly values and attitudes, much to their spiritual and moral decay and hurt. Our fight in this world is ultimately not with the simple-minded programmed ones who have been moved away from Biblical authority, e.g., certain foolish persons who have opposed me because I am a white racist patriot or a patriarchal sexist; but rather, our fight in this world is really with their vile and evil programmers who in the words of Isaiah 5:20, “call evil good, and good evil,” and who in the words of Habakkuk 1:4 ensure that “the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth: for the wicked doth encompass the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth.” We see this in things

⁷⁷ *The American Journal of Jurisprudence*, Vol. 40 (1995), pp. 229-285 at pp. 235-263.

like, for example, cheap'n'easy divorce, the flood of pornography, or the abortion slaughter of unborn children.

Of course, as the Type 2 Secularists have learnt from experience, in which they constantly debase and drag standards down, *It's easier to roll a ball downhill, than to kick it uphill.* In this sense, I entirely disagree with the attitude of Lucifer and his devils, and instead take the view that we should use what powers of influence we have to ennoble and elevate people, putting the bit'n'bridle on them, teaching them the value of restraint. I think the proper response for those in such positions of power is one of *helping the humans, not hurting and hindering them.* I take the view of *noblesse oblige.*

In Psalm 2, in a post resurrection context and thus a Christian context, after in the words of Revelation 1:5 "Christ ... is ... the first begotten of the dead," after we read the words of Psalm 2:7 and Acts 13:33, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee;" and before the Second Advent of Psalm 2:9; between these two great events the Lord says in Psalm 2:10-12, "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Thus in a Christian context, after the resurrection of Christ, and before the Second Coming of Christ, the words of Psalm 2:10-12 teach that judges and lawmakers *should* uphold Biblical law. This is not the view of secularists, this is the view of those who uphold the Protestant Christian State! (Isa. 49:22,23)

Thus when I now look at the transition of the Protestant Christian State to the Type 1 secular state in the late 18th and 19th centuries, I see a transition from a "God first" focus to a "man first" focus, and thus a form of the Luciferian deception, "Ye shall be as gods" (Gen. 3:5). Thus issues connected with the first three commandments of the Holy Decalogue were either downplayed or sidelined altogether at the State level. For the Protestant Christian State, the issue of "God first" meant that idolatry and blasphemy were serious matters, and because, for example, the Roman Mass is described in the Final Rubric of The Communion Service of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer of 1662 as *idolatrous* in that the wafer is adored, and described in Article 31 of the Anglican 39 Articles as "blasphemous" because it denies the completed atonement of Christ on the cross, Roman Catholicism was not tolerated for its idolatry, blasphemy, and other matters. But with the secular state's emphasis on "man first," "religious liberty" meant that one asked instead if Papists were happy about having e.g., the Test Acts against them, and then these were repealed. This "man first" emphasis of Type 1 Secularism kept alive elements of the Ten Commandments which the Type 2 Secularism of the post World War Two period did not. Nevertheless, the Type 1 Secularism which did not care if a man worshiped one God, six gods, or no god, opened the land up to idolatry and other ungodliness; and the anti-supernaturalism injected into the so called "natural sciences" so greatly retarded a proper understanding of science, as to deny the Creator in Darwinism. Thus we now find that with immigration used to bring in coloureds and non-Protestants *en masse*, in the Type 2 Secular State, different groups that do not necessarily agree with each other, such as Papists, Mohammedans, Hindus, Buddhists, atheists, agnostics, coloured people, feminists, pornographers, homosexuals, abortionists, and others, all

unite to fight for the destruction of the fundamental elements of the white Protestant Christian society that they all hate so much. They are united in their opposition to goodness and godliness, just like in II Chronicles 20:22 the Ammonites, Moabites, and others, united in opposition so to oppose God's people in Judah.

The Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State Era commitment to broadly but not absolutely keep Christian morals, is seen in, e.g., Sir Garfield Barwick (1903-1997), who was a Commonwealth of Australia Attorney-General in the Menzies Government and then a Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia⁷⁸. Thus in referring to his work as Commonwealth Attorney-General on the *Matrimonial Causes Act* of 1959, he says in his autobiography, "the question for me was a secular one. In proposing legislation by Parliament, of necessity religious dogma could not dominate, though of course in making any political judgment the religious beliefs and sensibilities of the community had to be kept in mind." This was a community in which as Attorney-General Sir Garfield oversaw the continued administration of the *White Australia Policy*, which in general sought to keep Australia as white Caucasian, and in general a white race of what he called "Anglo-Celtic stock ... heritage" as an element "of national unity." Hence he says, "The Australian community's concept of marriage and its obligations were founded on adherence to monogamy, and designed, as the *Book of Common Prayer* so eloquently recites, for the mutual comfort of the pair and for the procreation and nurture of children⁷⁹."

In the front of a copy of this autobiography, *A Radical Tory*, Sir Garfield wrote to me, "To Gavin, I hope you'll find my book interesting particularly about matrimonial causes and racial matters. Garfield Barwick 27/11/95." Like myself, Sir Garfield was a racist who believed in various racial traits, and who wisely and rightly maintained the desirability of a white racial and cultural "Anglo-Celtic stock" based Australia nationalism as part of its "national unity"⁸⁰ (cf. The Table of Nations in Gen. 10). This included an English linguistic cultural element since he considered such racial "national unity" needed the "great unifying force of a common language," and there was thus a "risk to national unity" in "a babel of language in the public streets" (cf. The Tower of Babel in Gen. 11); and hence he said, "I doubt the wisdom of accepting migrants who cannot already speak English"⁸¹. He further believed that Christian morals were beneficial to society both in term of social cohesion (a Lord Devlin type view) and their intrinsic moral value (a Fitzjames Stephen type utilitarian view). This is seen in some of the following selected excerpts from two recorded interviews I had with him in 1991.

⁷⁸ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, "Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries*," section "(B) Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic;" subsection "(2) Some lives hurt by Angus's heresies: Four case studies," at "Case Study 1: Sir Garfield Barwick."

⁷⁹ Sir Garfield Barwick, *A Radical Tory*, *op. cit.*, pp. 120,300.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, e.g., pp. vii & viii ("forefathers"), 7,82,11,171,174,181,300.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

But before considering those excerpts the reader should be first made aware of some references in them to Lionel Murphy (d. 1986). Murphy was a Type 2 secularist who as Commonwealth Attorney-General (1972-1975)⁸² e.g., repealed the Type 1 secularist Sir Garfield Barwick's *Matrimonial Causes Act* of 1959 (also known as "The Barwick Act," *infra*), which had cause based divorce for such matrimonial offences as e.g., adultery (see active adultery, Exod. 20:14; Matt. 19:9; "Thou shalt not commit adultery," Matt. 19:18), desertion (see passive adultery with a denial of conjugal rights, Judg. 19:2; Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:5,15), cruelty (see cruelty causing / inducing passive adultery, Mal. 2:14-16; Matt. 5:32; 19:9), heterosexual or homosexual sodomy, or bestial sodomy; and Murphy also repealed other Type 1 secular legislation which used a natural law basis to correlate with the values of traditional Protestant Christian morality. E.g., under Murphy came an anti-racist Racial Discrimination Act (contrary to e.g., Gen. 9 & 10)⁸³, removal of censorship of immoral materials (contrary to e.g., the Ten Commandments of Exod. 20)⁸⁴, abolition of the death penalty (contrary to e.g., Gen. 9:6; Rev. 13:10)⁸⁵, and the establishment of the "Australian Law Reform Commission" under the inaugural Chairman of Michael Kirby – a homosexual who is thus not a fit and proper person for any such role (e.g., I Tim. 1:8-11)⁸⁶.

⁸² Murphy was also Minister for Customs and Excise (1972-1975).

⁸³ *Racial Discrimination Act*, 1975 (Cth).

⁸⁴ In 1973 Murphy announced that there would be no further prosecutions for importing obscene and indecent publications under the Commonwealth *Customs and Excise Act*, section 4A. This meant that there was effectively a removal of the Federal control of pornography entering Australia. (Sullivan, B.A., *The politics of sex: prostitution and pornography in Australia since 1945*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1997, p. 138. Copy at: <http://books.google.com.au/books?id=1Q3k-Q7BuH0C&pg=PA138&lpg=PA138&dq=lionel+murphy+pornography&source=bl&ots=w4hhnc0S3C&sig=MOQ3Mz2mxRP0H-PixovJ0Dt8U5I&hl=en#v=onepage&q=lionel%20murphy%20pornography&f=false>).

⁸⁵ The *Death Penalty Abolition Act*, 1973 (Cth) abolished the death penalty for all Federal Offences.

⁸⁶ See "Lionel Murphy," *Wikipedia* (Oct. 2011) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lionel_Murphy). "Michael Kirby and Homosexual Rights" *Salt Shakers*: "Helping Christians make a difference," refers to Kirby's "homosexuality" with his "long-term partner (from 1969) Johan van Vloten," which it says Kirby referred to in e.g., *Who's Who* (1999 edition). It further says, "Michael Kirby has spoken out against Christians who oppose the promotion of homosexuality on the basis that the Bible says it is sin As a practicing homosexual, he has made a number of speeches promoting the homosexual cause" (<http://saltshakers.org.au/issues/homosexuality/207-michael-kirby-and-homosexual-rights>). E.g., in 2007 Kirby attacked the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, Peter Jensen, because anti-sodomite values were being "reinforced ... to this day by religious

Murphy became a High Court Judge (1975-1986). Murphy was thus like Sir Garfield in being first a Commonwealth Attorney-General (1958-1964)⁸⁷ and then a High Court judge (1964-1981) - although unlike Sir Garfield he never became a Chief Justice of the High Court, and indeed, Sir Garfield is Australia's longest serving Chief Justice (1964-1981). This shows the contrast between Murphy who was a Type 2 secularist introducing anti-racist legislation, or libertine or "at pleasure" divorce laws in the *Family Law Act* (1975); and a State 1 secularist in Sir Garfield maintaining racist *White Australia Policy* legislation in harmony with Gen. 10, or using Christian values in his caused based divorce code of 1959. In our discussion, the reader should be aware that Sir Garfield and I are at times alluding to, or making reference to, comments by Australian historian Manning Clark at the time of the death of Lionel Murphy. Manning Clark described Murphy as a man who sought "passionately" to remove "the morality of Judaeo-Christianity I see ... Murphy as a man who in that context strove to end the domination by God over human beings, ... by a parent over a child, or by a man over a woman, or by a husband over a wife." Clark also recognized that the ideological differences continued to exist, further saying, "The only thing we can say with certainty ... is that judgment on him [Murphy] will depend on who wins in the future, not who wins now. History is written by the winners⁸⁸."

I also testify that when Lionel Murphy died of cancer in 1986, I was strongly impressed in my mind that this was a Divine Judgment by Almighty God on an evil man. King Solomon says, "Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish: why shouldest thou die before thy time?" (Eccl. 7:17). Moreover, the fifth commandment, "Honour thy father and mother" contains a "promise" to "live long" (Eph. 6:2), and a corresponding warning of early death for those who disregard it. Its orbit includes racial fathers (see racial "families" in Gen. 12:3, rendered in Acts 3:25 by Greek *patria* / "kindreds," referring to racial families from a common patriarch, e.g., the great white patriarch Japheth)⁸⁹. Murphy's anti-racism which opposed white race based nationalism (with an English linguistic culture) did not honour his racial father, Japheth, who is the racial father of Australia as rightly recognized by the earlier *White Australia Policy*. As I

instruction" from Archbishop Jensen; in "Michael Kirby (judge)," *Wikipedia* (Oct. 2011) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Kirby_\(judge\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Kirby_(judge))). In 2008 the Anglican Rector of St. Stephen's Bellevue Hill, the Rev. Mr. Richard Lane, publicly urged High Court Judge Michael Kirby "to cast yourselves on the mercy of Jesus," "admit your sin, confess your wrongdoing and turn in humble repentance to the Lord Jesus." Kirby then lodged an unsuccessful complaint against the Rector to Archbishop Peter Jensen of Sydney ("Admit your sins to the Lord, priest tells ... judge," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 April 2008).

⁸⁷ Sir Garfield was also Minister for External Affairs (1961-1964).

⁸⁸ Cited by: Santamaria, B.A., "Lionel Murphy: a personal viewpoint," *The Weekend Australian* (newspaper), November 1-2, 1986, p. 23.

⁸⁹ See Appendix 5: "Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb. 2012)."

pondered these and other matters of law and society, I also came to be deeply impressed that Marriage Law such as Matrimonial Causes Law should, and historically had been, made with some reference to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. When after these things I discussed race, marriage, and Murphy with Sir Garfield in the following interviews, I realized that God had been preparing my mind for these important interviews, with Sir Garfield saying the very types of things that I had been thinking for some time. I was thus confirmed in my mind that God had been leading me to undertake and record these important interviews with Sir Garfield Barwick.

These recordings were on a cassette tape, and Sir Garfield, whose eyesight was very poor, would sometimes look down and make sure the recorder was switched off before he made certain comments to me. While his unrecorded remarks were in the same area as his recorded remarks, *infra*, they were put in stronger language or greater detail e.g., only in such unrecorded discussions did we talk about the Biblical story of Babel in Genesis 11, or in such unrecorded discussions he would speak in much stronger condemnatory tones of Lionel Murphy's values and their connected changes to law and society. While I am not prepared to reveal the greater content of these comments since he only wanted his recorded comments to be part of the interview, the reader will find the basic substance of them in a combination of the recorded interviews, *infra*, and his autobiography, *supra*.

To give the reader an example of this, in Interview 1, the cassette tape was switch off, and Sir Garfield made some unrecorded comments about his citation from the Old Testament Book of Hosea in the House of Representatives (the lower House of the Federal Parliament in Canberra,) when he introduced the *Barwick Act*. The cassette player was switched back on (with the specific quotation located by myself), and in its recorded interview form this was:

SIR GB

I forgot, very few of the men in the House [of Representatives] would know their Bibles well enough to remember Hosea. The other thing I overlooked also was the high percentage of Roman Catholics in there would not know Hosea because in the Douay he is Osea, or something, but I said that a few of us were Saints, like Hosea.

GBM

Yes, I have the quote here: "Few indeed have the Saintliness of Hosea who forgave and embraced again his unfaithful wife."

SIR GB

Yes, that is right.

Let us now consider some further excerpts from two 1991 interviews I had with Sir Garfield.

SIR GB ... I had been brought up in a Wesleyan household - at least my mother was a Wesleyan and I had been sent to Sunday School and I became quite a good student of the Bible, and on top of that in my university days I was secretary of the Christian Student Movement I became more skeptical of things on the theological side, though always tremendously wedded to the social values and standards of the Christian ideology and I maintain those now. ...

GBM You mentioned a comparison with the *Family Law Act*, Sir. Would you say you have a situation where traditional Christian values are rejected in a piece of legislation? I mean, by the sound of it you would not have been prepared to introduce something like the *Family Law Act*?

SIR GB No.

GBM Would that be at all related to religious 'Judaeo-Christian' objection to the Act or would your rejection of the *Family Law Act* be disassociated from any 'Judaeo-Christian' rejection of the Act?

SIR GB I don't think, being brought up the way I was and lived the way I have lived, that I could ever exclude from my mind, Christian values, moral values, family values

... I think the *Family Law Act* is very wrong in many respects, including its exclusion of the conduct of the parties

GBM So you would not be prepared to introduce a piece of legislation that was, say, contrary to the Ten Commandments, that would allow the removal of the adultery ground, or whatever?

SIR GB No, I wouldn't

... *The Family Law Act* - you know Manning Clark, when Murphy died, he praised Murphy for having destroyed the 'Judaeo-Christian' morality, and said that Murphy set out to do that. ...

... Murphy was a libertarian⁹⁰. ... On this [*Family Law*] Act, I do not think I would have been as hard on him as Manning Clark was. I think his Act does effectively undermine Christian morality, but I do not think I would have said, myself, that Murphy set out to do it so expressly. It was part of his libertarianism, and it would not have worried him that he was doing it. Whether he had a grand plan, I do not know and I would have given him the benefit of the

⁹⁰ "Libertarian" was used by Sir Garfield for a "libertine," defined in the Oxford Dictionary as: "Free-thinker on religion; licentious (man); free thinking, antinomian; chartered libertine, person allowed to do as he pleases (Shak. *Hen. V*, I. i. 48)."

doubt. Manning Clark didn't. ...

GBM Sir, how do you see that libertarianism, as you call the thinking type, the Murphy type libertarianism, - and we will then call the 'Judaeo-Christian' type 'the conservative liberal' - how do you see that sort of conflict in terms of manifesting itself in the Parliament, in legislation? For instance when you were the Attorney-General in the Liberal Party in 1959 and 1960 [it] wasn't of that libertarian type. Whereas it subsequently became so ... I mean at a Parliamentary level they don't talk about 'the restoration of Judaeo-Christian morality,' or anything like that. Is there some sort of conflict in the Liberal Party about this or how does that work, those sort of different viewpoints, ideologies? There seems to be libertarians in the Liberal Party.

SIR GB Oh, there are. Yes, there are. The Liberal Party, since Menzies departure, has not had a philosophy. Howard was bringing a little bit of it back into the Party⁹¹ ... but there are others that are simply power brokers and are just anxious to persuade the Electorate to send them back irrespective. The Liberal Party has no real disprin, either. It is liable to pick up along the way, people who have not much philosophy at all. That is a weakness at the present time, in this country

... it does not only just exist among the religious. It is remarkable how

⁹¹ John Howard (b. 1939), was Leader of the Opposition from 1985 to 1989. Three years before this interview Howard had stated antipathy to multiculturalism in 1988. In a radio interview he had said that for "social cohesion" he thought the rate of coloured Asian migration should be "slowed down a little." Hence Sir Garfield considered "Howard was bringing a little bit of" "philosophy" "back into the Party." But after Sir Garfield made these comments in 1991, in order to curry further favour with Type 2 secularists in the Liberal Party who were unhappy with even this "little bit of" "philosophy," in 1993 Howard more fully embraced the Type 2 secularists' wicked and evil desire to destroy white Christian Australia and so reneged on his earlier comments about curbing coloured immigration in comments he made in 1995 and 2002. Thus when Howard again became Leader of the Opposition in 1995, and then Prime Minister from 1996 to 2007, he failed to deliver on "bringing" back even this "little bit of" "philosophy" which was more in the Type 1 secularist's direction. (Van Onselen, P. & Errington, W., *John Winston Howard: The Biography*, Melbourne University Press, Victoria, Australia, p. 157; Paul Kelly's "The Common Man as Prime Minister," *The Australian* {newspaper}, 19 May 1999 & *The End of Certainty*, Allen & Unwin, pp. 427-8; Ward, I., "Australian Political Chronicle: January –June 1995," *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 41 {3}; Megalogenis, G., "Asian influence spices up contest," *The Australian* {newspaper}, 27 Feb. 2007; referred to in "John Howard," *Wikipedia*, Oct. 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Howard#cite_note-38).

pervasive the Christian morality really is ...⁹².

Sir Garfield was a religious skeptic⁹³; and a number of other Type 1 (Christian morals) secularists have held these same type of beliefs e.g., Fitzjames Stephen was an agnostic. This relates to the fact that Type 1 secularists believe in religious liberty, and consider Protestant Christian values should generally be retained for reasons of natural law or reason. However, some of the former Type 1 secularists did have religious belief

⁹² Interview No. 1 with Sir Garfield Barwick (SIR GB) and Gavin Basil McGrath (GBM), Tuesday 12 February 1991, at Sydney. (Hereafter referred to as Interview No. 1).

⁹³ When dealing with the unsaved, a good way of seeing if any spiritual interest has been aroused in them by the Spirit of God, is to touch on the issue of the need for the remission of sins (Matt. 9:2; Acts 2:38). In a letter to Sir Garfield on Tues. 22nd of Oct., 1996, I said to him, "The philosopher said, 'Evil triumphs when good men stand back,' and it seems to me a great pity that good men such as yourself and Sir Robert Menzies no longer have the influence they once did in The Liberal Party. Of course, while you and I are in general agreement on the desirability of a nexus between Christian morality and the law, you would not agree with me on my spiritual-religious belief, since I see an underpinning spiritual battle behind the whole thing, with God desiring that the people learn basic Decalogue morality and ideas such as restraint, offering 'the forgiveness of sins' (*Nicene & Apostles' Creeds*) to those who with faith in Christ repent; and the Devil seeking to lead people into sin. Nevertheless, we are both agreed on the benefit to society of e.g., family values, and the destructive impact of libertinism, which is increasingly masked in political discourse behind the name of so called 'rights' for which there are no corresponding 'duties'." But this foray into the area of "'the forgiveness of sins' (*Nicene & Apostles' Creeds*)" proved futile, since Sir Garfield, who was always extremely polite and courteous in his demeanor with me, continued to maintain his religious skepticism to the very end. The last time I saw him, just before his death (d. 1997), *he was the same as always*, in both his religious skepticism and support for Christian morality in law and society. On that occasion, which was at his retirement home rather than in his Office (which is where the two 1991 interviews occurred), with a his nurse / cook / cleaner (I forget what she was,) hovering around us in the background, we discussed the 1977 USA Supreme Court case of *Coker verses Georgia* which stopped the usage of the death penalty in cases of miscegenationist rape. We agreed the case was wrongly decided, and that the US Supreme Court had no business in overruling such a statute. In Sir Garfield's case, he disliked using the death penalty for any rape case, but considered that a Supreme Court had no business making law by overruling such statues; whereas in my case I support the death penalty in rape or sexual assault cases involving such elements as incestuous rape, pack rape with cruel violence, rape with unusually cruel violence (e.g., accompanied with facial lacerations with a knife permanently ruining the woman's looks), miscegenationist rape, sodomite sexual assault (heterosexual or homosexual), or sexual assault of a pre-pubescent child. Thus unlike the judges in *Coker v. Georgia*, I support the execution of e.g., miscegenationist rapists (Gen. 34).

as Deists, vaguely defined Theists, and *sometimes* as Christians. This is seen in Sir Garfield's comments on Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies (Prime Minister: 1939-1941 & 1949-1966), Australia's longest serving Prime Minister, and in whose government Sir Garfield served as Attorney-General. He said of Sir Robert:

... he was a very strong Presbyterian and a very strong believer in marriage and its maintenance, and for him - as he told me once - "all divorce was dirty." He didn't like it at all⁹⁴.

But for such Type 1 secularists, the value of such traditional Protestant Christian morality (e.g., Sir James Fitzjames Stephen & Lord Patrick Devlin), meant that persons without religious belief in society, or Jews, should be socially and legally bound by it as part of the wider Christian fabric of society. This is seen in the following comments:

GBM So, you see Christian morality being adopted by people who don't actually have a spiritual belief?

SIR GB That is right, even among those who don't even know about it, because it is part of the actual fabric of the society. ... I suppose in one sense it is one of the miracles of life, I think, that it has persisted and been so pervasive over such a large area.

GBM And you see that reflected in support by the larger group then, supporting things like the *Barwick Act* ... ?

SIR GB Yes. ...⁹⁵.

On the one hand, in the *Barwick Act* Sir Garfield followed the secularists who from the mid to late 19th century on no longer upheld law as related to Divine acts, as seen in their rejection of Parker's Table of incest (connected with the issue of Henry VIII's brake with Rome, Lev. 20:21), and so he agreed with the type of revised Table of Consanguinity & Affinity put out by the Church of England in 1946, and the Anglican Church of Australia in 1981. But on the other hand, he believed in generally upholding Christian morals in law and society, and in this context told me that he was a friend of Lord Devlin, and had some familiarity with Devlin's *Enforcement of Morals* (1965)⁹⁶. It is also seen in the following dialogue we had in 1991 about the "*Book of Common Prayer*," and how Sir Garfield used it to form his view of marriage when he put together

⁹⁴ Interview No. 2 with Sir Garfield Barwick (SIR GB) and Gavin Basil McGrath (GBM), Tues. 26 Feb. 1991, at Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

⁹⁵ Interview No. 1.

⁹⁶ On 19 March 1991 Sir Garfield wrote to me saying, "I was friendly with Mr. Justice Devlin (Pat) Devlin's *Enforcement of Morals* was included in my general reading"

the *Matrimonial Causes Act*, No. 104, of 1959-1975 (Commonwealth of Australia) i.e., the *Barwick Act*.

SIR GB Now, Cranmer's marriage service is marvelous because it expresses so clearly the purpose of marriage. If you take the words - they are beautifully written. Cranmer's *Book of Common Prayer* - is a beautiful bit of English and you there see the obligations of the parents, and the need to comfort one another, and the need to raise children, and the need to nurture children. So I had that in my mind, of course, and if you call that an ideology, I would accept that.

GBM So for the *consortium vitae*, you used the *Book of Common Prayer*, the service for the "Solemnization of Marriage" or "Matrimony"?

SIR GB Yes. The non-conformists use it too. It is a common form. They are very nice words, so, in my concept of marriage - of course I did the *Marriage Act* as well subsequently, the *Matrimonial Causes Act* would indeed be influenced by that⁹⁷.

By contrast, in the Type 2 ("human rights" & libertinism) Secular State Era, the Church is generally regarded as an enemy of the State in the area of morals, or at least, religious conservatives who believe in traditional Biblical morality are so regarded. The Type 2 Secular State Era more generally commenced in the UK and USA at the end of World War Two; but in Australia figures such as Sir Robert Menzies and Sir Garfield Barwick sought to retain the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State, so that together with the *White Australia Policy* and section 127 of the Australian Constitution which ensured Aborigines were not citizens of Australia, (although they were citizens of the State or Territory they were in,) it survived about a further 15 to 20 years, and remained into the mid 1960s till the departure of Sir Robert Menzies as Prime Minister in 1966. Thereafter, both major political parties in Australia moved to bring in the bad and sad Type 2 Secular State. E.g., the *Family Law Act* of 1975 (Commonwealth of Australia) introduced "no fault" or at pleasure divorce in strident opposition to Biblical Christian morals (e.g., Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:15), and the race based nationalism of the *White Australia Policy* and requirement that Aborigines be not citizens of Australia (under the former section 127 of the Australian Constitution) were tragically removed, contrary to Genesis 10.

During the Type 1 Secular State, the remembrance of the monarch on *Accession Day* and associate Christian imagery, though of a largely titular or ceremonial monarch, was thus regarded as an aid from the church as an "ally." Thus e.g., in Australia the monarch was styled "Defender of the Faith" until the Whitlam regime (1972-1975), and so styled on Australian coins till the mid 1960s. But under the Type 2 Secular State there have been various moves to try and remove such linkage. To the question, What value has the monarch as "Defender of the Faith" under the Type 2 Secular State which is

⁹⁷ Interview No. 1.

as unBiblical, ungodly, and vile as it can be?; there are two broad answers. Firstly, it still acts to represent a standard calling men to reclaim that which has been lost to the ungodly secularists. Secondly, it still acts as an important counter-balance in the battle of images or symbols with the Pope of Rome. That is because, like the monarch, the Pope is both a temporal and spiritual power; but he claims a “universal” spiritual jurisdiction. However the fact that the monarch, Elizabeth II, has vast temporal holdings in countries such as the UK, Australia (the world’s second largest country geographically if one includes the Australian Antarctic Territory), and Canada (the world’s third largest country geographically if one includes the Australian Antarctic Territory as part of Australia), together with a spiritual jurisdiction in the *Church of England* that entitles her to be called, “Defender of the Faith,” and “Supreme Governor of the Church of England,” thus acts as a counter-balance to Papal claims of a “universal” spiritual jurisdiction. For these purposes, it does not matter that the Crown is as titular in the area of the Church as in the area of the State. It only matters that because the Crown is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* that NOBODY ELSE IS, and THUS THE POPE IS NOT.

The Establishment Principle’s legacy into the era of the secular state, includes e.g., public petition of Almighty God (through common grace, as opposed to special grace,) for his blessing and protection e.g., “God save the Queen.” But we Christians may also pray through special grace, with respect to the soul of the monarch, “God save the Queen.” Lacking the benefit of the Christian State, in general, the people no longer know how to think properly, dress properly, speak properly, enjoy life properly, marry properly, or live properly. They have been greatly damaged by their own lusts, and have not had the benefit of Christian governors and magistrates to help point them in the right direction. I am fed up with the fact that the only people with enough spiritual and intellectual knowledge to help these now deep-seated problems are targeted as “racist bigots,” “religious bigots,” “sexist bigots” etc. . For as so used by these “human rights” God-haters and Decalogue-breakers, the phrase “bigot” belongs in the realm of propaganda since such godly Christians are not in any true sense of the word, “bigots,” although it must be admitted that the word “bigot” might be fairly applied to those who, most especially in the post World War II era, have promoted suchlike. For such persons lack the capacity to be governors, and so when looking at the wise laws that once existed, they simply pool their ignorance, and not understanding them, then set about to repeal them; in the process, going so far as to “pat themselves on the back” for being “such intelligent persons.”

Since 607 A.D. the office of Antichrist was formed with the Roman Papacy⁹⁸, when the emperor in Constantinople, Phocas, declared the Bishop of Rome to be “universal bishop.” He is called, “son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3), since like Judas Iscariot (John 17:12), he is beyond redemption. The Papal claim to be “vicar of Christ”

⁹⁸ See Homily 5, Book 1; Homily 10, Book 1; Homily 16, Book 2; Homily 21, Book 2, Article 35, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*; Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 25:6; my sermon, “Exposition of I & II Thessalonians 2/3: Roman Catholic Pope is Antichrist” (<http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible>); and my book, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006 & 2010) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

with “universal” jurisdiction usurps the place of the Holy Ghost, and is an unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:31,32). It means that as a vice-God, “he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4). Thus irrespective of how any Pope attains the position, from 607, the Devil has access to, and complete control of him.

Indeed, while the Devil generally leaves devil-possession of persons to lesser devils, since 607, the Devil himself, has personally possessed every Pope, moving in a metamorphosis from one Pope to the next (II Thess. 2:9; Rev. 12:3; 13:1,2; 16:13; 18:2). Thus in addressing a Pope, one can, like Isaiah addressing “the king of Babylon” (Isa. 14:4,12-15), or Ezekiel addressing “the king of Tyrus” (Ezek. 28:12-17), look the Pope in the eye, and directly address Lucifer himself. The good Christian reader should be cautioned that this is an exceedingly hazardous and dangerous manoeuvre, and one should not do so unless very clearly called, and very clearly impressed by God to do so, for some very specific reason. The likelihood of such a call by God, is, in my opinion, so low, that if the roof of a room represents a 100% certainty, and the wall various gradients down to the floor, the probability that God will call one to do this, is so low, that it is “under the carpet.” Good Christian reader, if you should ever have to address the Pope, *do so with the greatest caution and prayer*. REMEMBER, in so speaking to Satan himself, one must ensure one maintains a respectful tone and disposition (Jude 9), bringing no “railing accusation” (Jude 9), nor being a “reviler” (I Cor. 6:10). One should remember, that the Devil is His Majesty, “the prince of this world” (John 12:31), and “the god of this world” (II Cor. 4:4). Afford him proper respect, but give him *no sympathy for what he has done, and is doing*.

Now e.g., the Devil is “a murderer” (John 8:44), and so e.g., he greatly promotes abortion upon demand. Yet if, by God’s common grace, a person turns from such wickedness, this same Devil is there in the Pope he devil-possesses, to say, “Welcome home. You know, I have always opposed abortion, and made many strong statements against it. This good work you are now doing against abortion is most pleasing to God. *Indeed, it is now earning you merit with God for the purposes of heaven.*” Thus the Devil then tries to hog-tie the person, and bind him over for the pits of hell. For if any man dare to come into God’s presence, and claim anything but the righteousness of Christ alone, or dare to claim God is somehow in his debt, or dare to claim any kind of joint sin-bearing, whereby any other than Christ bears all our sins, God’s holy wrath doth consume him. The Devil knows this, and so he tries to bind people with various heresies that mean they do not trust solely in Christ for their redemption (Gal. 1:6-8; 2:16; 3:11-13; 4:4-6; 5:19-21). He is a past-master of deception.

And so it was, that when the Antichrist himself, in relatively recent years visited the United States of America in April 2008, he stood before that abominable body called the “United Nations” (UN) at New York, and said these words, “... The promotion of ‘human rights’ remains the most effective strategy for eliminating inequalities between countries and social groups” The UN Assembly then arose, and greatly applauded the old Antichrist. “All the world ... worshipped” “Satan,” “which gave power unto the” Pope (Rev. 12:9; 13:3,4).

When the Pope came to America in April 2008, the President of the United States of America, George Bush (President 2001-2009), went to personally meet him at the airport, an honour he has never extended to any other visiting world leader. Thus arrived “the great whore” of Rome, “with whom the kings of the earth have committed” spiritual “fornication” (Rev. 17:1,2). A journalist from the Eternal World Television Network, Raymond Arroyo, spoke to President Bush. President Bush first referred to Pope Benedict XVI (Pope from 2005) as the “Holy Father.” This common Papal title is a great “blasphemy” (Rev. 13:1) against God the Father, whose proper title this is (John 17:11). Arroyo asked Bush, “When you look into Benedict XVI’s eyes what do you see?” To this, Bush replied, “God.” In an article reporting this, the *English Churchman* newspaper also shows a picture of the Pope standing with his arms outstretched on a balcony, and Bush standing behind, applauding the Pope⁹⁹.

President Bush said he saw “God” in the eyes of Pope Benedict XVI. Scripture says that as a vice-God or vice-Christ, the Pope “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4). This same Pope authorized on 5 December 2007, for a special plenary indulgence to be issued for those Papists who visit Lourdes in 2008 up until 8 December 2008. This was to celebrate the 150th anniversary of certain Marian “visions” connected with the shrine in 1858. The Papists claim Mary is “co-redeemer” with Christ, and “co-mediator” with Christ. Such Papal indulgences are said to give remission for time in purgatory. They remind us of the claims of Tetzl in Luther’s time, “As soon as the coin in the coffer rings; the soul from purgatory springs!”¹⁰⁰

What saith the Word of God? “There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. 2:5). And, in the “gospel” of “grace” (Gal. 1:6,7), “The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11) for “Christ hath redeemed us” (Gal. 3:13). As “when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law” (Gal. 4:4,5). Thus Martin Luther was surely right to say in his celebrated *95 Theses*; nailed to the chapel door of Wittenberg Castle in 1517, “The Pope has no power to remit guilt” (Thesis 6); “Those who assert that a soul straightway flies out (of purgatory) as a coin tinkles in the collection-box, are preaching an invention of man” (Thesis 27); “Those who think themselves sure of salvation through their letters of pardon will be damned for ever along with their teachers” (Thesis 32); “Every Christian who is truly contrite has plenary remission both of penance and of guilt as his due, even without a letter of pardon” (Thesis 36); “Christians are to be taught that to give to the poor or to lend to the needy is a better work than the purchase of pardons” (Thesis 43); “Confidence in salvation

⁹⁹ “Bush says he sees God in eyes of Pope,” *English Churchman*, 25 April & 2 May, 2008, p. 2 (Zenit.Org).

¹⁰⁰ “Indulgences are boosting Lourdes,” *British Church Newspaper*, 18 Jan 2008; & “Lourdes saves purgatory: Pope,” *Australian Presbyterian*, Feb. 2008; both in *Faith & Freedom*, No. 510, March 2008, pp. 2 & 7.

through letters of indulgence is vain; and that ... even if the Pope himself should pledge his soul as a guarantee” (Thesis 52); “Papal pardons cannot take away the least of venial sins, as regards guilt” (Thesis 76); “The treasures of indulgences are nets, with which they ... fish for the riches of men” (Thesis 66); and “The true measure of the Church is the sacrosanct Gospel of the glory and grace of God” (Thesis 62)¹⁰¹.

The Pope seeks both spiritual and temporal power, either direct temporal power as seen in the Papal states he lost between 1860 and 1870 (holding them since 756 A.D.), or through other political influence. And yet, good Christian reader, it is also true that the Pope’s “deadly wound was healed” (Rev. 13:3) from the loss of the Papal states between 1860 and 1870 with the creation of the Vatican City State from the Lateran Pacts in 1929. I have thrice visited Rome, and there inspected both Phocas’s Column erected to the emperor’s honour in the Roman Forum; and also a Popish memorial of the events of 1929 in the Lateran Pact Room of the museum annexed to the Basilica of St. John Lateran, which is one of three extra-territorial holdings of the Vatican City State in the larger City of Rome.

And so, when we behold the applause given to the Roman Pope by e.g., these deluded persons in the UN Assembly meeting at New York, USA, or by USA President Bush, *supra*, we are reminded of the words of Holy Scripture, “and all the world wondered after the beast ..., saying Who is like unto the” Pope? “Who is able to make war with him?” (Rev. 13:3,4).

The UN Assembly may like to arise in 2008, and applaud the Antichrist. But we ought to remember that the events of the Barletta martyrs in 1866 are also a type of what will happen to good Christian people just before Christ’s return. The Papacy will again acquire enormous influence, and then “the mark ... of the beast” (Rev. 13:17) will be given to those who do not “worship the image of the beast” (Rev. 13:15)¹⁰². Those who applaud the Pope today, would do well to remember that the only reason why he does not now generally kill Protestants as he did during the 1260 day-years (607-1866), is that he is restrained by God in accordance with Biblical prophecy. (I say “generally,” for we still find certain isolated incidents such as e.g., the killing by Papists of an Evangelical Anglican Minister, the President of the Protestant Truth Society, John Kensit, on English soil in 1902; or the Protestants killed by Irish Roman Catholic terrorists in the Omagh Bombing, Northern Ireland, UK, 1998.) They would do well to remember that this same Bible forewarns us that this period will finally go, and the Church of Rome will again set about to more generally kill the Protestants.

¹⁰¹ Bettenson’s *Church Documents*, pp. 185-191.

¹⁰² See the Appendix of my work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004). It is available on the internet under “Gavin McGrath Books” via yahoo or google, or by directly entering (without a search engine) <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Under Protestant Christianity, the Establishment Principle with what in broad terms, was a Biblically sound and protected form of Protestant Christianity in both Anglicanism (England, Wales, & Ireland) and Presbyterianism (Scotland), was historically a great protection mechanism in the British Isles against Popery and its dangerous inroads. Even now after the horrors of the disestablishment of the *Church of Ireland* (1871) and the *Church of England* in Wales (1920), and with the *Church of England* in a largely apostate condition, the Establishment Principle still helps protect the UK and British Commonwealth countries under the monarch, from some forms of Popery. For instance, the Act of Settlement (1701) prohibits a monarch marrying a Papist, or being a Papist.

When in recent times, some Papists in the UK parliament sought to repeal this wise law in 2008, even the generally ungodly “Justice” Secretary, Jack Straw, replied, “Because of the position Her Majesty occupies as head of the Anglican Church, it is rather more complicated than may be anticipated¹⁰³.” Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second is not, as Straw unqualifiedly said, “head of the Anglican Church,” although it is true that Henry VIII was styled as “Supreme Head” in England and Ireland “as far as the law of Christ allows.” But recognizing that Christ is the head of the universal or catholic church (Col. 1:18; 2:19; Eph. 5:23), this was better styled as “Supreme Governor of the Church of England” (and “Supreme Governor of the Church of Ireland”) from Elizabethan times. Thus Elizabeth II is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith*¹⁰⁴. Nevertheless, the basic point that Straw makes is significant. Since a British monarch is Supreme Governor of the established *Church of England*, it follows that the monarch must be an Anglican Protestant, and not a Papist or anything else such as Eastern Orthodox, infidel, or heathen. Thus this is a great protection device.

And here I note that these same Papists do not so argue for Protestants to become monarchs in Popish lands. They do not, e.g., claim that the Roman Papacy itself should be open to Protestants, an admittedly absurd idea. But it is also absurd to suggest that the Supreme Governor of the Church of England should marry, or be, a Papist! Why do these same Papists not spend their time “demanding” that “the Roman Catholic canon law affecting the Vatican City State of Rome be changed, so that the Pope of Rome may marry a Protestant, or for that matter, marry even a Papist woman!”

I note that these same church-state separationist secularists have introduced the most repressive and discriminatory laws against Christians found in the Western world

¹⁰³ *English Churchman*, 11 & 16 April, 2008, p. 5. (The Popish politician was Jim Devine, a Scottish Labour Party MP.)

¹⁰⁴ “Defender of the Faith” was a title originally conferred on Henry VIII by Pope Leo X in 1521, before he broke with Rome in 1534 and started the formal process of the Anglican Reformation in England and Ireland. In its present form, the title was annexed to the Crown by Act of Parliament in 1543; is further found in the 1571 Ratification of the 39 Articles by Queen Elizabeth I; and applied to King James I in the 1611 Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version.

since our liberation at the time of the Protestant Christian Reformation in the 16th century. Acting like seditious fifth columnists from the late 18th and 19th centuries on, but so acting in an accelerated and more comprehensive form in the post World War II era, they have e.g., used the immigration policy to disinherit white Caucasians of their lands which are now filled with racial aliens. Under anti-discrimination laws, especially although not exclusively in government positions, godly Christians are victimized and e.g., dismissed for “inefficiency.” More generally they are kept out of influential positions in the media, universities, and legislatures (or occasionally where they cannot be stopped, strongly marginalized). They are marginalized in media images, and given negative connotations. Their views are either greatly distorted, or not covered at all.

On the one hand, God’s power and goodness sometimes overrules in certain situations, and we can be thankful to God for the extent that his goodness and grace kept a lot of Christian morality in place for the first one to one and a half centuries of “the secular state.” We can also be thankful to God that even in this wicked post World War Two secular state, we still generally have freedom of public worship and access to the Bible; and that a number of the blessings of God’s common grace, racial blessings of Japhethites, and blessings of special grace, are still to be found in evidence. E.g., murder (other than abortion and in some jurisdictions, euthanasia,) is still generally regarded as wrong, as is theft, rape, assault, and some forms of incest. God’s gracious blessings are also apparent in e.g., electricity, roads, medicines, accessible and affordable education, public libraries, cars, trees, blue skies, and a host of other good things that come from God’s great bounty of love and generosity. I do not wish to deny these good things that come from God even in this wicked secular state that we find ourselves in.

But on the other hand, I think the secular state is a great misery, and a great pain for the righteous to live in. It is a society which frequently rewards the evil and persecutes the just. I do not support it. My contentment at knowing that these people will be greatly punished in the pits of hell is some consolation now, and no doubt will be of consolation to me throughout the eternal ages, when His Divine Majesty most justly decrees of them, “their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched” (Mark 9:44,46,48). How blessed are the words of Holy Scripture, Thus “saith the Lord. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh” (Isa. 66:23,24).

What of those who seek e.g., the Disestablishment of the Church of England so the Sovereign is no longer Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith? I think these anti-Christian pesky Jews should be told to, “Go and harass the Israeli Knesset about the fact that they always elect a Jew to be the President of Israel, never a Christian.” I think these anti-Protestant pestering Papists should be told to, “Go and harass the Pope about the fact that he can’t marry a Protestant women or any woman, and the fact that he has to be a Roman Catholic.” I think Jews, Papists, church-state separationist secularists, and anyone else who wants to undo or tamper with such Protestant Christian Establishment Principle should be told in no uncertain terms to,

“PING OFF!!! And leave the Supreme Governor of the Church of England alone!!”

The reality, of course, is that the British Crown as a clearly identifiable Protestant figure is an important international impressionistic counter-weight who counter-balances the Romish impression generated by the Pope as a so called “Christian leader.” This impressionism helps even our Protestant brethren in republics such as the United States of America. This international impressionism is part of the reason why so many Papists in British Commonwealth lands are republicans, and are trying to get Commonwealth countries to sever their ties with the Crown and become republics like southern Ireland. They want the international status of the Roman Pope and Roman Catholicism to be increased, at the expense of the white British Crown and Protestantism. To these Popish republicans my response is clear. “God save the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England!*” “God save the *Defender of the Faith!*” “God save the *Queen!!!*”

But when the Established Churches of England and Ireland (Anglican), and also Scotland (Presbyterian), were functioning properly, this also helped to create a broad Christian culture where other Protestants groups just *took for granted* the fact that the Bible would be the guide in a whole range of matters such as immigration and emigration with respect to ethnicity and religion, or family values with respect to divorce, or the restraint of pornography, or Sunday trading laws, or freedoms to proclaim the Christian gospel, etc. . *Somebody’s values must prevail and it is clear that if it is not the Christian values of Protestants, then it is somebody else who will ultimately be hostile to God’s holy saints.* Now whether a revitalisation of the Christian church establishment principle under the true Protestant faith will, or will not occur in my lifetime, I do not know. *On present indicators, such a possibility may be reasonably doubted.* Perhaps the matters will be left for Christ to deal with at his Second Advent (Dan. 2:43,44)?

But either way, whether or not under the establishment principle we again have Christian magistrates, who among other things, ethnically cleanse our Western lands, so that they be culturally white, pure, and Christian, either way, I say, good Christian reader, I take some comfort in the grammatical similarity of the Latin and the Greek. Their similarities (see Matt. 17:15) and diversities (see Matt. 17:3), remind me of the once racially pure Japhetic mind made by God for his Aryan people descended from the great white progenitor, Japheth, when after the great flood of Noah, he created and separated the racial families into nations, giving to each of them their own tongue (Gen. 10:2-5).

And either way, long live the honourable memory of two of my greatest Biblical heroes, Ezra and Nehemiah! *Oh how greatly I admire the Biblical figures of the King’s Counsellor, Holy Ezra, and the King’s Governor, Holy Nehemiah!*

The Protestant Christian State as it existed in the British Isles before the sad and bad rise of the 19th secular state, recognized supernatural acts of God, such as the amazing way God protected the lives of Londoners in the 1666 Great Fire of London, while simultaneously judging London for its sin by this fire. It thus showed the judgement (fire) and mercy (protection of human life) of God, bearing in mind also that Matt. 24:7,8 teaches that up till the end of the world, all wars, “famines, and pestilences,

and earthquakes” are either directed by God or permitted by God, to remind and warn people of the Final Day of Judgement that will occur at Christ’s Second Advent.

The Great Fire of London in 1666 is an important historical event, although I shall not now discuss it in the greater detail I could. Suffice to here not that the first church service with regard to it was declared by King Charles II as 10 October 1666, which was an official day of fasting to remember the Great Fire of London which started on 2 September 1666 in Pudding Lane. Thereafter, an annual service was held at St. Paul’s Cathedral every 2 September (until its abolition in 1859).

I have seen Wren’s *The Monument* near London Bridge, remembering the 1666 Great Fire of London, on numerous occasions during my five trips to London between 2001 and 2009. There are various Latin inscriptions dating from its construction in 1671 to 1677. On the wall facing Pudding Lane, London, EC3, the words, “But Popish frenzy which wrought such horrors is not yet quenched,” were added in 1681. However, these words were chiseled out in 1830, so that a large chiseled recess exists in the stone, where once they were. This vandalism against the Protestant Christian heritage of England, was perpetrated by the ever increasing thuggish arm of the early 19th century secular state.

The first type of the secular state dates mainly from the 19th century (or in the USA from the late 18th century). It was anti-French Revolution (anti-Thomas Paine), but pro-American Revolution (pro-Edmund Burke). It was generally characterized by a belief in freedom of religious belief, but not freedom from Christian morals. But the Type 1 Secular State was also attended with an anti-supernaturalist belief of Deists, vaguely defined Theists, Universalists (e.g., sometimes in Freemasonry), agnostics, and atheists, that saw the removal of laws relating to Divine acts.

Thus under the Type 1 Secular State, Christian morals or history related to celebrated miracles or exhibitions of supernatural power, were denied. E.g., the type of incest that Henry VIII had broken with Rome for, was increasingly tolerated; even though God had unleashed his power and exercised his reserve rights (not always so exercised), so as to ensure the union was “childless” (Lev. 20:21), both by the death of most of the children of Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII in infancy, and then the early death of the lone survivor, Mary I, known as “Bloody Mary,” in adulthood. Or the idea of executing sodomites (Lev. 20:13,14,15) on the basis of the Biblical Story of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19), was also removed from the legal system. Or the Offices of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (C. of E. & C. of I., 5 Nov., God’s supernatural protection of Protestantism against Popery in 1605 and 1688), *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* and *The King’s Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* (C. of E. & C. of I., 30 Jan & 29 May, God’s supernatural protection of the monarchy with the Restoration of the legally Protestant Crown after the Puritan republican revolutionaries of the 1640s and 1650s), *Irish Massacre Day* (C. of I., 23 Oct., God’s supernatural protection of Protestantism against a Papist massacre designed to destroy it), or the annual service in St. Paul’s Cathedral for *Great Fire of London Day* (C. of E., 2 Sept., God’s supernatural protection of the London population as 3/5ths of the city burnt, and God’s judgement on sin), all went from the

Church of England and / or Church of Ireland.

So too, this anti-supernaturalism in the first type of the secular state, meant that creationism was denied, as in the universities and colleges old earth creationists like William Buckland, Pye Smith, and Adam Sedgwick came to be replaced by anti-supernaturalist Darwinian macroevolutionists. Thus there was a denial of Divine creation, with the rise of Darwinian macroevolution and connected anti-supernaturalist thinking in “science falsely so called” (I Tim. 6:20).

Likewise, the idea of a supernaturally preserved *Textus Receptus* or Received Text was also denied, as in the Colleges and places of “learning” the neo-Alexandrian texts were greatly promoted, and the Authorized (King James) Version increasingly attacked. This era also saw the more general rise of religious liberals who denied the supernatural element in Scripture, together with the more general rise of anti-supernaturalist thinking, e.g., the age old sin of atheism (Pss. 14:1; 53:1).

In the place of miracles and the supernatural, the first type of the secular state claimed various “rationalistic” arguments rather than Biblical arguments, which nevertheless generally paralleled the Christian morals of Biblical Protestantism. These included Blackstonian natural law (Sir William Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 1765-9); Fitzjames Stephen’s utilitarianism (Sir James Fitzjames Stephen’s *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, 1873 & 1874), as opposed to Mill’s rival form of libertine utilitarianism; or social cohesion in a historically white Christian society (Lord Patrick Devlin’s *Enforcement of Morals*, 1965). In such instances, the secular politicians might say to their electors, “we will uphold Christian morals;” but in their discourses in the legislature or in the judgment of judges they appointed, a non-Biblical reason was given for such morals (although Blackstonian natural law still recognized Nature’s God; and Devlin’s type of thinking was still prepared to use the word, “Christian” or “Divine Law” for it).

Then, having disconnected people from leaders who believed in a Christian State, and type-cast them in unfavourable terms, putting in their place a long line of politicians and judges who believed in “the secular state,” and who lulled them into a false sense of security as to its benevolence; the scene and trap was now set for the second type of the secular state. This second type saw the strip down and rip down of Christian morals from the legal system in the post World War Two era. In its place was a combination of libertinism (Mill’s type of utilitarianism) and French Revolution derived type “rights of man.” This would lead to the persecution of Christians, most especially in the work place, not in theory on the basis of their religious belief, but on the basis of their moral beliefs connected with their religious belief. It would deny white Protestants so much as segregated areas where they could be free from coloureds, heathens, pornography, immodestly dressed women, wicked and obnoxious adverts, and other deeply offensive matters.

It started with the pulverisation of the Divine Law definition of race based nationalism (Gen. 10 & 11) via racial desegregation; and associated attacks on the

protection of a traditional family in which the base unit of a society was a man and woman of the same race and religion. I.e., while marriage satisfies certain personal needs and wants of the participants, it also does so in the context of them using it to protect the base unit of society, found in their race and religion. The attack on a white Protestant base unit to Western societies such as the UK and USA, was sometimes combined with the more generally mischievous rock'n'roll music and its ungodly culture. In early rock'n'roll concerts, having first whipped up the young, impressionable, and naïve, into sensual lusts, partly by taking their focus away from God, partly by getting their bodies to pulsate to a "black beat," and partly by wicked images and lyrics, a number of concert goers then jumped segregation lines at rock'n'roll concerts in the USA, and also sometimes engaged in miscegenation.

But this desegregation was also largely brought about by immigration of non-white and non-Protestant peoples into Western lands. It continued with all kinds of moral looseness and laxity, promoted in the "entertainment" industry, places of "learning," and legislatures. It saw sex role perversion (feminism), pornography, mass murder in abortion, and images of anything silly, stupid, or frivolous promoted; so that men were taught to minimize the impact their Protestant Christian religion might have on society, and might not think on more important matters connected with God and the Bible. Once again, it sought to disconnect the people from their intellectual, moral, and spiritual God ordained and natural leaders, type-casting them with such crowd-control negatively loaded words as "racist," "sexist," etc., and portraying on the media absurd and ridiculous figures who were said to "represent these extremist views."

The people's only hope was the grace of God through the message of the Bible. For God has designed man in such a way, that he can only achieve his true intellectual and other potentials if he is subject to God's Infallible Book. But they had cut their anchor ropes to the Bible, and were adrift on the high seas of doubt, Devilishness, and ultimate destruction and despair. There are three broad levels of intellectual perception. Firstly, those who by the grace of God may perceive e.g., racial traits such as Caucasian creative genius in much higher intensity among the white Aryan peoples (although still only in a very small percentage of this population group), or a much lower intensity of this among some Mongoloid races e.g., gunpowder, silk, china (porcelain), and tea. So too, the recognition that Caucasian creative genius was halted and southern Europe's technological advance retarded as a consequence of miscegenation with non-Aryan peoples with the eventual collapse of the old Roman Empire.

A second level of perception are those who can understand such things if it is explained to them. E.g., they could understand if one pointed to Genesis 9 & 10 and said something like, "The racial and cultural definition of a nation is God's mechanism for, among other things, inhibiting a one-world government. It is no comment on the value of this or that individual of this or that race since (although the Christian State historically regarded allowing a small number of segregated Jews as "a special case" and I would agree with this,) if the UK or Australia was "cleansed" of "all" racial and religious "strangers" (Neh. 13:30), irrespective of how many generations their line had been in these countries, this would remove some generally good persons and retain some

generally bad persons. But it is God's way and that is the salient point (Gen. 10 & 11; Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13; Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:23). The failure of Christians to stand up on this issue from the mid to late 1940s on, in defence of a white Caucasian English speaking Protestant Christian nation, has resulted in a situation where the only people with the intellectual, spiritual, and moral strength to govern a nation with Christian morals have been largely side-lined and locked out of various key positions in e.g., the media, universities, and government."

A third level of perception involves those who cannot comprehend such things. One could say to them something like:

The human (primary) divides into five secondary races: 1) Caucasoids, 2) Negroids (from Cush, Gen. 10:7; *Head Hair*: woolly & black; slight facial & body hair; broad noses; strong prognathism; brown eyes, black skin; on average lower IQs); 3) Mongoloids (*Head Hair*: black & straight; *Prognathism*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: brown; some higher IQs, but much lower creative genius than Caucasians, they can e.g., take out degree positions in universities & associated professions, but then "foul up" the system because they are "bad drivers" who cannot develop it the way Caucasians can). The Chinese at the commencement point of the Great Silk Route, are referred to in Rev. 18:11,12 as the "silk" "merchants."

4) Australoids (typed by the Australian Aborigines) (from Elam, Gen. 10:22; 5 tertiary races subdivide into two branches, Dravidic Australoids & Negritic Australoids. 4)i) The Dravidic Australoids are typed by the Dravidians who being at the commencement point of the cinnamon trade route, are referred to in Rev. 18:11,13 as the "cinnamon" "merchants." The Dravidic Australoids subdivide into three tertiary races. 4)i)a) Dravidians of India and Sri Lanka (*Head Hair*: wavy to woolly & black; *Male facial & body hair*: moderate to medium; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown; *Stature*: medium). Miscegenation with Aryans in and around the north of India created an ethnic geographical barrier between the Elamite Australoids around southern Mesopotamia and the Dravidian Australoids in the south of India, and produced an Aryan speaking Dravidian-Caucasian (Australoid-Caucasoid) admixed population in the region of and around north India. 4)i)b) Dark Vedda of Farther India into the East Indies (interior Ceylon / Sri Lanka, Nicobar Islands, some of the Moi of Indo-China, Senoi or Sukai of Malay Peninsula, Toala of Celebes). (*Head Hair*: wavy & black; *Male facial & body hair*: moderate; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: medium *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: brown; *Stature*: short. *Other features*: brows knit, eyes deep-set, large mouth, jaws peaked, male facial hair medium, they possibly have some Mongoloid admixture.) 4)i)c) Australian Aborigines. (*Head Hair*: wavy & black; *Male facial & body hair*: moderate to abundant; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: strong; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown to black; *Stature*: medium. *Other features*: Large toothed, long-legged, heavy eyebrow ridges.) Aborigines generally have better vision than other races, and an excellent visual recognition

of, and memory for, shapes. These racial traits mean they make excellent trackers, and historically they have been profitably used for such purposes by the Police. Unique Adamite qualities include possession of a soul with an associated spiritual dimension (Gen. 2:7), the making of stone structures (Gen. 8:20), cultivation of land, domestication of animals (Gen. 4:2,3), and the making of musical instruments (Gen. 4:21). The failure of any people to recognize the monotheistic God of creation is inexcusable (Rom. 1:19,20), and Christian missionaries found these half-naked savages in animistic heathenism. In small isolated areas Aborigines built permanent stone walls in water-ways as fish traps, planted and cultivated edible yams, semi-domesticated dogs, and played the didgeridoo; but the greater part of them were nomadic hunter-gatherers. The Aborigines show up in the fossil record as a robust skeletal group and came to Australia c. 28,000-23,000 B.C. . They should not be confused with the soulless non-human gracile skeletal group of satyr beasts found in Australia from c. 38,000 B.C., which did not interbreed with the Aborigines, but were a distinctive group that were gradually eliminated before going extinct thousands of years B.C.

4)ii) The Negritic Australoids (typed by the Negrito) subdivide into two tertiary races. Genetic research has proven them to be Australoid and not Negroid, e.g., their Australoid blood group is unknown among Negroids; a fact that reminds us that while God “made” “all nations” “of” / from “one blood,” they are no longer of “one blood” as they then spread out to various “bounds of habitation” (Acts 17:26; cf. Deut. 32:8). Nevertheless, the phenotypic similarities of the Negritic Australoids to Negroids is quite astounding. “Negrito” is Spanish for “little Negro” and the Negritoes were first called “Negrito” by Spaniards who thought the Negritoes of the Philippines must have been “little Negro” survivors from a shipwrecked slave-trade ship. But since “Negro” or “Negrito” (like Negroid) comes from the Spanish or Portuguese word, *negro* meaning “black,” the term “Negrito” can still be used for the Australoid *Negrito* as opposed to the African Negroid *Negrillo*. 4)ii)a) *Negrito* of South-East Asia and Oceania (*Head Hair*: black, woolly, and fuzzy; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Head size*: broad; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: black; *Stature*: very short). 4)ii)b) *Melanesians* of Oceania e.g. Papua New Guinea. “Papua” is a Malay word meaning “frizzled” with reference to the Papuans hair, and “New Guinea” was named after Guinea in Negroid Africa. (*Head Hair*: called “the fuzzy-wuzzy angels” by World War Two white Australian soldiers whom they assisted as carriers because of the properties of their black, woolly, and fuzzy or frizzy hair which is very similar to, though not identical with, Negroid hair; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown, although in parts of Papua New Guinea some have black skin; *Stature*: medium).

5) The Capoid secondary race (named after the *Cape* of Good Hope in South Africa). This is the numerically smallest and in accomplishments the least

impressive of the five secondary races of man. (*Head Hair*: tight, woolly, & black; *Male facial & body hair*: slight; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Prognathism*: slight; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: yellowish-brown; *Stature*: very short. *Other features*: Flat face, prominent forehead, wrinkles, thin lips, and slanty eye.) The Capoid secondary race subdivides into Hottentots and Kalahari Bushmen. The Hottentots have longer and narrower heads than the Kalahari Bushman; and many Hottentot adult males lack armpit or pubic hair. The female Kalahari Bushmen often show large fat deposits in the buttocks (steatopygia), and a high placement of nipples on both sexes.

Secondary races thus further subdivide into tertiary race e.g., the Caucasoid secondary race has two tertiary races, Caucasians and Mediterraneans. Caucasians / Japhethites, Gen. 10:2-5. *Head Hair*: wavy and of various colours: orange or red, black, brown, blonde; *Facial & body hair*: abundant male facial and body hair; *Head size*: variable; *Nose*: narrow; *Prognathism* or jaw protrusion: slight; *Eyes*: variable, usually blue, green, or brown; *Skin*: white; *Stature*: variable. They are racially blessed (Gen. 9:27) and have an unmatched high intensity of creative genius, so where non-admixed over long periods of time they create ever more technologically advanced and innovative societies; though without the benefits of Bible believing Protestantism, like others, they go badly awry.

Ethnic racial divisions occur within e.g., Caucasians by cultural identifiers such as language. Race was not made at Babel (Gen. 11). Following an anthropologically universal and world-wide flood in a geographically local west Asian world (cf. e.g., Gen. 41:56; Luke 2:1) probably c. 35,000 B.C.; race based nations were made through Noah's three sons in Gen. 10. They long predate Babel (3rd millennia B.C.). The "earth" of Gen. 11 is evidently a regional or local world since it was all "of one speech" (Gen. 11:1) long after the racial and linguistic cultural divisions of man (Gen. 10:5,20,31,32). It tells of the lesser origins of an amalgamated society with a common tongue (Sumerian), which then subdivided into some Mid. Eastern groups, notably the Hebrews and Babylonians.

But those of the third or lowest level of perception, being programmed with anti-racist values, and / or Darwinian values through which they try to pre-date Australian Aborigines to the gracile skeletal non-human group, would reply something like, "Those kind of statements make me go crazy." Or "I just wantta' laugh at those kind of claims. The person making them must have 'gone bananas'." All such persons really know is that either living in a society that has e.g., race based white Caucasian nationalism, patriarchal structures, and Christian morals; or they are living in a society like the Type 2 Secular State one. To such persons these things are like ball-bearings from a broken ball-bearing wheel strewn over the floor with no inter-connection whatsoever.

Yet beyond these three levels of perception is also the issue of moral strength. Those at the first and second levels of perception, *supra*, might be in a society such as this contemporary one where they are programmed to be e.g., anti-white racists; and if so,

in the case of level 2 perception persons, being morally weak persons, they may well engage in a wilful shutting of their eyes; or in the case of level 1 perception persons, simply choose to be derelict in their duty to God and man, for an easier life. That is because *it is not enough to know what is right, additionally, at a moral level, one must, by the grace of God, choose to do what is right*; and of course, this may bring many bad consequences in a society such as the contemporary Western World where that which is morally right is frequently “politically incorrect,” and so one then runs up against “the programmed puppets” who think of themselves as “very intelligent” and those like myself as something else. E.g., if I had wanted to, either in my university days or now, it would have been a relatively easy intellectual exercise to pretend the values of the Type 2 Secular State “were correct,” and e.g., play the “stupid fools” in the universities for “suckers” by producing post-graduate work in further “justification” of anti-racist or anti-sexist rubbish, and have made a good academic career for myself. Only a very small number of people such as myself would be capable of doing that with absolute consummate skill, since such a person would need to clearly understand that it was all political propaganda and “a lot of rubbish” of simply *telling those far gone in wickedness and lust what they wanted to hear, and doing so in a way that made them feel they were “expanding their horizons even further with these brilliant insights” etc.* . This is exactly the type of thing Lucifer likes to do (Gen. 3:5; Matt. 4:5,6). While I treat the Devil with proper respect as “the god of this world” (II Cor. 4:4), so that I “durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but” say, “The Lord rebuke thee” (Jude 9), I do, of course, entirely repudiate this type of Luciferian thing. Lucifer has made his choice and I have made mine; so too, some at a level 1 intellectual perception may make their choice in the opposition direction to mine in order to reap financial benefits, political power, social status, or other worldly benefits. In the end, we all make choices (Joshua 24:15); and I have walked in my integrity (Prov. 10:7).

So how can a society be possibly governed with people in all these three levels of perception? God has made a way, AND IT IS THE ONLY WAY. It involves people at all three levels living in submission to God’s directive will as set forth in the Bible, and over time allowing God to guide and mould their lives. IT IS THE ONLY WAY TO GET THE SHOW ON THE ROAD. And thus I return to the basic problem, to wit, *the people’s only hope is the grace of God through the message of the Bible. For God has designed man in such a way, that he can only achieve his true intellectual and other potentials if he is subject to God’s Infallible Book. But generally, though not in all instances, the people have cut their anchor ropes to the Bible, and are adrift on the high seas of doubt, Devilishness, and ultimate destruction and despair. They cannot discern the wood from the trees!*

Thus in the post World War Era, much filthiness and vileness has now burst out, in the Big Beat Popular music (i.e., rock’n’roll, pop, metal or heavy metal, R & B, Rap or Hip Hop, and Punk, and their associated so called, “rock idols” and other Big Beat Popular music “idols”); as well as TV, movies, dress standards, and general attitudes.

Now “if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted?” (Matt. 5:13). Let us e.g., consider in a little more detail, the issue of Big Beat Popular music as one of

the outgrowths of the secular state¹⁰⁵.

The American Revolutionaries who started the modern idea of the secular state, sought to cut the anchor ropes between the Bible and the State, replacing e.g., a *Christian Head of State* who as King was *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, with a *secular Head of State* who as President was of any religion or no religion. Under their “Bill of Rights” (1791), subject to Article 1, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion ...” (Article 1). Since this republic had fused together as one of its elements the Cromwellian idea that Divine Law injunctions against “seditious” (Gal. 5:20,21) can be set aside by ‘higher law natural law’ concerns of “tyranny,” this “Bill of Right” also gave “the right of the people to keep and bear arms” as something that “shall not be infringed” (Article 2). I.e., the belief that sedition is justifiable against so called “tyranny,” and the concomitant view that “the people” therefore should have a “right” “to” “bear arms,” i.e., so that they can rise up in revolution if their government becomes “tyrannical,” was constitutionally enshrined in the USA.

And so for many of them it was a case of them saying something like, “I used to believe in Christianity. I used to believe in the Trinity. But I don’t know, ever since I was part of the revolution, something happened to me. There’s a kind of black cloud that surrounds my head when I think about God now. And even though I can still believe in Nature’s God in some kind of broad way; I just can’t believe in the Christian God anymore. It’s strange, but there’s a kind of black wall that now comes between my mind and the Christian God of the Bible. I don’t care if people do believe in the Christian God, but personally, ever since I got involved in the revolution, I just can’t believe in that anymore.” Romans 13:2 says, they did “receive to themselves damnation.”

More generally, the USA model put in the place of the *Biblical authority* of the Protestant’s *Christian State*, a secular state emphasis on so called “freedom” or “liberty,” and the wreck of humanity found in e.g., the pornography, sex role perversion (feminism), fornication, adultery, homosexuality, abortion, and debased media and “entertainment” industries of the USA now tragically “exported” from the USA around the world, tells its own shockingly horrible story about such “liberty.” E.g., even though as at 2012 it is now 25 years out of date, it is still useful to look at Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987), to understand where Big Beat Popular Music is coming from. (WARNING: Larson’s works must be used with caution¹⁰⁶.) American rock’n’roll (including British and other rock “idols” they help to promote), has produced rock “idols” with such names as, “Beastie Boys,” “Billy Idol,” “Black Sabbath” (referring to the witch’s sabbath), “Iron Maiden” (a device used by Papists to kill “heretics” under the Spanish Inquisition), “Judas Priest,” “Motley Crue,” or a group of women called “the Cycle Sluts.” Their songs have had such titles such as, “Let’s get physical,” “One Night

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Textual Commentaries Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 19:29c.

¹⁰⁶ See my comments on Bob Larson at “Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth,” subsection “c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA,” *supra*.

Love Affair,” “Only the good die young” (a song promoting fornication), “Magic Carpet Ride” (they’ve certainly been “taken for a ride” by the Devil!), or “My Sweet Lord” (said about the pagan Hindu god, Krishna, and invoking this heathen deity, or rather the devils behind it, to “Keep me free from birth” i.e., the heathen Hindu idea of reincarnation)¹⁰⁷.

We cannot doubt the dangers posed by rock’n’roll music to the spiritual and moral fibre of a man and a society, since this music is calculated to beat up the flesh, and thus induce “fleshly lusts, which war against the soul” (I Peter 2:11). Like Elvis Presley¹⁰⁸, *The Beatles* are historically important to the popular rock’n’roll culture. *We do not need to “keep up” with all the new rock’n’roll “idols” (Col. 3:5) that come’n’go like flies, in order to know that it is wrong. The big picture is that this music is something people “feel” or “pulsate to,” rather than listen to like classical music, and so it is “a brain deadening” music genre used to beat up “fleshly lusts” (I Peter 2:11); and then to this are added lyrics and images that move people away from a Biblical God focus and towards various “worldly lusts” (Titus 2:12)¹⁰⁹. This type of sentiment is well captured in the popular terminology of “sex, drugs, and rock’n’roll,” together with the popular parlance of calling rock’n’roll singers, “idols.”*

Though I have not ridden a motor-cycle for more than a quarter of a century, back in the late 1970s I rode my green Honda CB 200 motor cycle, with what was then its legal, but what would now be its illegal crash-bars or roll-bars (fitted in January 1977), into the city to hear some addresses in the Central Business District of Sydney held by Bob Larson from the USA. One was at Scott’s Presbyterian Church and another at a Hall. In the Hall, Larson also sang some songs he wrote. I remember talking to one of Larson’s team while they were still setting up, and he said to me that Bob Larson was then working on “a new book” which this American member of Larson’s team regarded as better because it would have more up to date details on more recent rock’n’roll idols. But if we understand the overview I have given, *supra*, it follows that *we do not need to “keep up” with the many new rock’n’roll “idols” that usually go just as quickly as they came (though some of them persist longer).*

¹⁰⁷ Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1897) (ISBN 0-8423-2859-9), *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 15, 32, 36, 45, 46, 142, 146, 158, 159, 162.

¹⁰⁸ Known as, “the king of rock’n’roll,” he was also called, “Elvis the Pelvis” to focus on his gyrating pelvis, at which point his guitar was used as a phallic symbol to try and focus people’s attention more on sexual lust. Addicted to various drugs, including the illegal drug of heroin, he understandably died prematurely. See Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock, infra*, p. 176; & Bob Jones III’s, *Idols, Rock Music, and Elvis Presley*, (cassette recording 771003), Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, USA.

¹⁰⁹ Hence it does not matter that e.g., the following books on this topic are now about 15 to 40 years old. See also Garlock, F., *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast* (1971), *op. cit.*; Peck, R., *Rock* (1985), *op. cit.*; Ankerberg, J. & Weldon, J., *The Facts on Rock Music*, Harvest, Oregon, USA, 1992; Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock* (1987), *op. cit.* .

The numbers of such rock “idols” comes and goes with such speed, that one year’s “idols” are replaced the next year with new “idols,” so that e.g., “the Cycle Sluts” as it were, “rode off years ago;” although some rock “idols” have “stuck around like flies over a bad smell” for a longer duration. Thus a main source for my information in this section on Big Beat Popular Music is Larson’s *Book of Rock*, which being written in 1987, would now be regarded by some as “about a quarter of a century out of date.” *But as already explained, it does not matter that e.g., Larson’s Book of Rock was published 25 years ago in 1987, since though prima facie now “a quarter of a century out of date,”* (and even more so as more years pass by,) it still makes the point about *the type of thing* one finds in rock’n’roll music, and *some* of these “idols” retain a longer duration of interest. Nevertheless, the interested reader who wants some more recent examples may find them at the constantly updated “Music” section of *Focus on the Family’s* “Plugged in Online” (<http://www.pluggedin.com> WARNING: This website embraces the ecumenical compromise with e.g., Roman Catholics, and must be viewed with caution).

Rock music at its later derivatives and connected forms, i.e., rock’n’roll, pop, metal or heavy metal, R & B, Rap or Hip Hop, and Punk, focuses on *the beat of the music*¹¹⁰ i.e., first and foremost people *feel the beat* and so are whipped up into fleshy “worldly lusts” (Titus 2:12) by it. Thus “fornication,” “lasciviousness,” “drunkenness, revellings, and such like” (Gal. 5:19,20) are easily connected with it, and the rock’n’roll lyrics and images tend to promote this by e.g., an over-focus on, and thus an idolatrous focus (Col. 3:5), on sex. Sometimes, although by no means always, the lyrics and images further seek to excite some form of illegal drug abuse (e.g., “Puff the magic dragon,” or the terminology of, *sex, drugs, and rock’n’roll*), or in some, though once again by no means all instances, specifically heathen religious imagery (e.g., the group “KISS” = “Knights In Satan’s Service”)¹¹¹. Those who enjoy listening to this rock’n’roll music, like those who perform it, are debased and depraved. It is also notable that they call their rock’n’roll singers, “idols,” an admission by them of just how much they focus on them, a fact also seen in the fact that they become so warped and twisted, that they “just have to listen” to this horrible music “to relax,” whether in their cars, in shops, or in their homes. Such persons are very sin sick indeed.

One of their “idols” of yesteryear, Marilyn Munroe, sang before she committed suicide, “Freedom’s just another word, for nothing left to lose.” Many Christians in secular states such as e.g., the UK, USA, or Australia, have been sold the swindle in favour of the “freedom” of “the secular state.” Thus on the one hand, they are not happy about e.g., the abortion slaughter or “entertainment” industry of e.g., Hollywood’s sick films and rock’n’roll music. But on the other hand, they still think as “wrong” those, who like myself, like Luther, like Calvin, *et al*, advocate the Christian State. They need to reconnect with *the true Christian history of e.g., the UK or America*, for instance the American Christian State of the pre-1776 American Revolution era. They need to *walk*

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57, 263-5; Peck, R., *Rock, Making Musical Choices*, Bob Jones University Press, South Carolina, 1985, pp. 35-6.

humbly with their God, and seeking forgiveness from him for the horrible rebellion of 1776, turn in repentance to recreate a Protestant Christian State in the USA.

In terms of so called, *Realpolitik*, it would be easier to return Western lands back to a Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State than a Protestant Christian State, although on present trends, even a move back to a Type 1 Secular State would be exceedingly difficult. But in terms of *what is really needed*, I think our goal must be the Protestant Christian State. Let us seek our God, the source of true “wisdom” (Jas 1:5), praying to “Our Father” in the words of the *Lord’s Prayer*, “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:9,10).

Rather than having a “secular state” claiming that “intelligent” people are anti-supernaturalists, and so e.g., claiming “man evolved” via Darwinian macroevolution, or (even though Erasmus knew about Codex Vaticanus in the 16th century,) claiming the neo-Alexandrian texts which were largely rediscovered in the 19th century “are the best;” we should in e.g., the UK, USA, Australia, and elsewhere, by the grace of God, have a Christian state, in which people are more rightly taught, that “intelligent” people realize the utter stupidity and folly of Darwinian macroevolution, which is clearly ruled out by the law of genetics, and “the best text” is the Divinely preserved neo-Byzantine Received Text of the NT and neo-Masoretic Received Text of the OT. I pray God for the return of the Christian State, such as we had in the better days of the e.g., Established *Church of England* (Anglican) and Established *Church of Scotland* (Puritan)¹¹². I pray God to

¹¹² In federations, it would be possible to have an Anglican-Puritan divide up of states may be possible, if so, the Puritan States would probably be Presbyterian since other Puritans generally do not support the Establishment Principle; and if a state has a large Lutheran population (I do not say a majority population, n.b., the historically Established C. of I.), that church might also be established; in all instances, with Dissenter toleration to other religiously conservative Protestants. Looking at the failures of e.g., the English Puritans’ republic, relative to the successes of e.g., the Established C. of E., I would make the following observations. A Christian State is not a utopia, since a perfect state requires perfect people; and we will only get this in heaven; but I maintain we are better off returning to it, “warts and all.” Reformed doctrine recognizes that, at least usually, the masses are unwashed. Let the Established Church rigorously pursue Protestant doctrinal standards among its clergy and those in teaching positions e.g., the historic application of the 39 Articles to clergy and Oxbridge teachers, and allow no such absurd interpretations as brought to them by Wesley or the Puseyites. But providing members of the congregation are not voicing doubt about such broad doctrine as the Apostles’ & Nicene Creeds or Lord’s Prayer, or attacking the 39 Articles by e.g., some publications, nor living in clear immorality as found most specially in the precepts of the Decalogue, then one should be more tolerant to them. Many are not elect vessels and believe what they do from common grace, not special grace. (The wheat and the tares, Matt. 13:24-40. This the English Puritan republicans never grasped. N.b., authorities must carefully monitor such points as: entry of Ministerial candidates, and teachers in their theological training colleges, lest the “tares” percolate up through the system, a problem which “overnight” crippled the C. of E. from the 19th century, once under the

replace the secular state with the Christian State¹¹³. “Be wise now therefore, O ye kings:

secular state, due care and consideration was no longer given to such matters.) So too, wider societal outbreaks of immorality and vice may occur, such as happened in parts of the 18th century in the Christian State of England. The masses are generally unwashed. But if in the Christian State the Bible’s values are upheld, and the government assists the godly in teaching them, then by God’s common grace, moral reformation and belief in God is possible *within certain bounds* by common grace (Rom. 1 & 2). Nevertheless, this more general type of societal moral reformation may still leave attitudes to e.g., drunkenness and prostitution among large numbers of them, which are repugnant to the saved man. While offences such as “drunk and disorderly” should exist, and prostitutes kept in a segregated area and groups of them collected *en masse* by the Police say once a week to pay a fine, which in effect is something like a tax, but which still stigmatizes prostitution; and while clergyman should still preach against these evils; the reality is that the law must to some extent allow, while not condoning, such horrible vices. This type of thing the English Puritan republicans never grasped. Religious holy days such as Christmas, Easter, and Papists’ Conspiracy Day, can be celebratory days of deeper religious significance for the saved; and have more of a carnival flavour to the unsaved. But they remain useful and valuable tools. This the English Puritan republicans never grasped (although the Established C. of S. ran a better church than the English Puritan republicans without such days, the English character could never accept such views).

¹¹³ Though I prefer the specific Establishment of a Protestant Church as the State Church, from which Protestant dissenter toleration is allowed, in theory, *prima facie* one might have a Protestant Christian State without such an Established Church. I.e., simply establish the State as a Christian State by enshrining in its Constitution e.g., the *Apostles’* and *Nicene Creeds*, and *Reformation Motto*, requiring Government Office bearers to read and swear allegiance on the Bible to these doctrinal standards together with some statement such as e.g., “by saying, ‘I believe’ ‘in’ ‘Jesus Christ’ in the *Apostles’* and *Nicene Creeds*, I do thereby also uphold the Reformation teaching of justification by faith, as historically taught in Protestant Christianity and found in the threefold *Reformation Motto: sola gratia* or grace alone, *sola fide* or faith alone, *sola Scriptura* or Scripture alone, as sometimes further expanded out to its fivefold form which further specifies *solo Christo* or Christ alone and *Soli Deo Gloria* or Glory to God Alone.” Prayer to God alone could be enshrined through e.g., reference to *the Lord’s Prayer*, statements that Christ is our only mediator and correspondingly repudiating invocation of saints, and some other prayers offered to God the Father *through Jesus Christ our Lord*. A basic moral code would also need to be constitutionally enshrined, that e.g., upheld *The Ten Commandments* as understood through reference to the NT (e.g., the 4th commandment now refers to Sunday sacredness, and the 7th commandment now prohibits polygamy). And e.g., the Ten Commandments *might* be heraldically included as part of a legal crest. It would also be necessary to provide some form of ecclesiastical courts to e.g., prevent religiously liberal or supercilious interpretations of the *Apostles’ Creed* and *Nicene Creed*, and ensure that a religiously conservative Protestant interpretation was placed on them, that allowed broad religiously conservative Protestantism. Such an ecclesiastical court would also have to ensure broad Protestant values e.g., one would not want Puritan views of the second or fourth commandments

be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him” (Ps. 2:12).

resulting in the smashing of Anglican Church stained-glass windows or crosses on the claim they “violated the second commandment,” or Puritan views of “sabbath-breaking” with respect to the fourth commandment being legally imposed. Traditional Protestant diversity would also have to be allowed on the meaning of “he descended into hell” in the *Apostles’ Creed*, and “baptism” in the *Nicene Creed* would need to be interpreted to mean the “one baptism” (Eph. 4:5) of spiritual regeneration (Matt. 3:11; Titus 3:5) common to all born again Christians (John 3:5). It would also be necessary to ensure that extremist Puritan groups did not use the opportunity to e.g., try and impose the death penalty too widely (on a Rushdoony type model), or impose their alcohol prohibitionist views. And while any such Christian State should be firmly creationist in rejecting biological macroevolution, in, for instance, State Colleges and Universities, it would also be important to safe-guard old earth creationism against the extremist Puritan-types seeking to impose their teachings of a young earth; for their frightfully bigoted notions of a 6,000-10,000 year old earth and global flood, are every bit as unscientific as the frightfully bigoted macroevolutionist views of Darwinists, and like them, have the effect of excluding the more intellectually gifted and spiritually mature from their midst. But bearing in mind the distinction between heresy and error, in which *a heresy consists in holding a false opinion that is repugnant to some point of doctrine essential to the Christian faith* e.g., a denial of man’s common descent from Adam, or a Pelagian type denial of man’s fall from original righteousness and conditional bodily immortality into both sin and death as a consequence of Adam’s fall; as opposed to an error, e.g., thinking the earth is 6,000-10,000 year old, I also think some accommodation has to be made among creationists to different models, in a way that allows diversity of opinion, and recognizes that such diversity of views have continued from ancient times both in the Christian Church and also among Jews. I think one should also enshrine as public holidays such Christian holy days as Christmas and Easter, together with one or more specifically Protestant holy day e.g., Reformation Day (31 Oct., Eve of All Saints’ Day), or if it was a largely British Protestant derived society under the Crown, *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.). But given that masses in the population are unwashed, churches like the Anglican, Presbyterian, and Lutheran Churches, would also have to seek to run in the type of way they historically did as established national churches, with the “wheat and tares” mentioned in the previous footnote. But without, e.g., the Anglican Church established, and a legislature seeking to keep it Low Church Evangelical Anglican, I fear the danger of it becoming corrupt, with the “tares” getting through to choke of the “wheat,” would be exceedingly great, and this would then be counter-productive to the Protestant State’s interests. Thus I think a Protestant Christian State really needs an Established Church, in which “iron sharpeneth iron” (Prov. 27:17), as under God, those in church and state act to help keep each other on a religiously conservative Biblical Protestant pathway.

3) *Red and Black Letter Days.*

The basic Anglican Calendar I endorse is that of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*¹¹⁴. The 1978 *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB) says on its title page that it is intended “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662.” There are only a very small number of parts of the AAPB I find of any value, which could be reduced in size to a small number of pages that could be added (or glued) into the front or back of the BCP. Thus I do not consider there was any fundamental need for a new prayer book, simply a need to add a small number of pages (perhaps just after The Calendar and before “Tables and Rules,” in the 1662 BCP.) E.g., adding in a small number of black letter days, *infra*; and stating a small number of established conventions acceptable to Low Church Evangelical Anglicans that have grown up in the usage of the prayer book, e.g., before the Prayer for the Church Militant at The Communion Service, the Minister may bid special prayer and thanksgivings; or the congregation may join in saying the Sanctus (“Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory; Glory be to the, O Lord most High. Amen.”); or at Mattins (Matins) and Evensong there may be special prayer or thanksgiving before the Prayer of Saint Chrysostom. I would also support An Alternative Table of Lessons, but ONLY as *alternative* readings for Matins or Evensong on those passages presently given from the Apocrypha. I also support the established tradition, which could be stated in a rubric, that when the Minister taking the service of Morning or Evening Prayer is not a priest, (i.e., a layman or deacon,) instead of pronouncing the Absolution, he prays the Collect for Trinity Sunday 21¹¹⁵. Thus I maintain that the basic 1662 BCP should be retained and used in a traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican form. This thus includes the continued usage of its Calendar which seeks to be uncluttered with an excessive number of days.

Therefore, while I do not agree with most of the changes in the alternative 1978 Calendar of *An Australian Prayer Book*, there are e.g., *a small number of added black letter days* I agree with. Since like the rest of the AAPB, the 1978 Australia Calendar is “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662,” this means that all, or any of its Calendar days, not also found on the 1662 BCP Calendar, are purely optional and may be dismissed in favour of the BCP Calendar. Certainly, there are only a small number of added black letter days from the optional 1978 Calendar that I endorse, and which I integrate in with the 1662 BCP Calendar. E.g., transferring Benedict from 21 March to 11 July and making 21 March Thomas Cranmer’s Day; following its removal in 1859, reviving King Charles I’s Day on 30 Jan.; or adding in, e.g., Richard Johnson and the First Christian Service in Australia in 1788 on 3 Feb.; or Gregory of Nazianzus on 9

¹¹⁴ With regard to Anglican hagiology, see “Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth,” subsection, “a) The danger of ‘ecumenical’ tolerance to Roman Catholics,” *supra*.

¹¹⁵ Now so done in AAPB, pp. 20-21. The BCP Collect for Trinity 21 is, “Grant, we beseech thee, merciful Lord, to thy faithful people pardon and peace; that they may be cleansed from all their sins, and serve thee with a quiet mind; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

May; or Columba of Iona on 9 June; or Basil the Great on 14 June¹¹⁶; or the Reformers and Martyrs of the English Reformation, 1555 on 16 Oct. (the date of Ridley and Latimer's martyrdoms at Oxford); or Henry Martyn (1781-1812) of the *Great Protestant Missionary Movement* on 19 Oct., who was a missionary and Bible translator in India and Persia (AAPB, pp. 298-304).

Last year in 2011, *Accession Day* fell on a Sunday. Thus Sunday 6 February 2011 was both the *Fifth Sunday after Epiphany* which is a red-letter day, and *Accession Day* which is a red-letter day with its own Office. On that Sunday I attended a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* service at St. Philip's Church Hill, inner City of Sydney (near the Harbor Bridge), which in harmony with the local tradition of that particular Anglican Church which transfers remembrance of *Richard Johnson's Day* (3 Feb.) to the Sunday *before* or *after* 3 February, when 3 February is not a Sunday, (since 1978 this has been a black letter in Australia,) transferred this black letter day *forward*, to the Sunday *after* Thursday 3 Feb. 2011, which was Sunday 6 Feb. 2011, and gives it the status of a red-letter day since the Church contains the *Richard Johnson Chapel*. By contrast, the previous year, I attended a special 3 p.m. 1662 prayer book Evensong Service at St. Philip's which transferred remembrance of *Richard Johnson's Day* (3 Feb.) *back* to the Sunday *before* Wed. 3 Feb. 2010, which was Sunday 31 Jan. 2010. (St. Philip's has at most only one such 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Evensong service per annum; and in the morning of 31 Jan. 2010, I had attended what is one of only four 1662 prayer book services per annum at St. Matthew's Windsor.)

It is unusual to have on the same day of Sunday 6 Feb. 2011 the convergence of three red-letter days. Firstly, what is a black letter day on the Australian Anglican Calendar (since 1978) of 3 Feb. remembering the *First Christian Service in Australia, conducted by Richard Johnson, Sydney 1788*, transferred to this nearby Sunday, which at St. Philip's (though not generally elsewhere), is given the status of a red-letter day in connection with this Church's *Richard Johnson Chapel* and the fact that it is the custodian of Richard Johnson memorabilia such as Johnson's King James Bible and Book of Common Prayer. Secondly, a red letter day of *Fifth Sunday after Epiphany*, and thirdly, a red-letter day with its own Office, *Accession Day*. This triple convergence of three notable Calendar days acts to raise the issue of the difference in these type of days, all of which the New Testament gives Christians a liberty to keep, or not to keep (Rom. 14:5,6); although basic Sunday sacredness is obligatory (Exod. 20:8-11; John 20:1,19,26;

¹¹⁶ The *Church of England's* 1980 *Alternative Service Book* (ASB) "for use ... in conjunction with The Book of Common Prayer," has 14 June, "Fathers of the Eastern Church," "Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea, Teacher of the Faith, [d.] 379," i.e., with no specific reference to Gregory Nazianzus, though he would be covered under the general reference to "Fathers of the Eastern Church;" but the ASB's 2000 replacement of *Common Worship* (CW), in which "*The Book of Common Prayer* remains the permanently authorized provision for public worship," has 2 January as "Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus, Bishops, Teachers of the Faith, [d.] 379 and [d.] 389 [respectively]."

Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10).

The basic Anglican Calendar I endorse is that of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. In the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, the highest liturgical honour that the Anglican Church can bestow on a day is a red-letter day with its own Office, the next is a red-letter day, and thereafter are black letter days. On the 1662 Calendar, black letter days do not have any special religious observance in the *Church of England*; and in the absence of any Collects or Office, nothing of detail is specifically said about them. I.e., what one thinks of them, is largely left to private judgment. Nevertheless, their inclusion on the 1662 calendar indicates that they are figures of historical significance to the *Church of England*, who in some way, however limited, set a good example. But some of them may be elevated to a higher status by a local tradition, e.g., St. George's Day on 23 April is celebrated throughout England as the national Saint of England.

In the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, there is a tradition that a Bishop will be consecrated on a red-letter day. Thus, for example, Sir Marcus Loane (1911-2009), was consecrated on *St. Matthias' Day* (24 Feb.) 1958 as a bishop, later becoming Archbishop of Sydney (1966-1982; Primate of Australia, 1978-1982). Or when I attend one of the four to six annual Evensong Services from the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* at St. Swithun's Pymble in Sydney, on a number of occasions I have seen there two retired Diocese of Sydney Bishops, Bishop Donald Cameron, who was consecrated in St. Andrew's Cathedral on *St. John Baptist's Day* (24 June) 1975; and Bishop Donald Robinson, who was consecrated on the *Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul's Day* (25 Jan.) 1973, later becoming Archbishop of Sydney (1982-1993) (although Bishop Robinson has more commonly been absent in more recent times due to age and infirmity). And at St. Philip's Church Hill in York Street where I attend various services from the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, I come across another retired Diocese of Sydney Bishop, Ray Smith, who since 2004 assists part-time at St. Philip's on matters connected with the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and historical matters connected with the parish, and who was consecrated on *All Saints Day* (1 Nov.) 1993. In a discussion with Bishop Smith at St. Philip's on *Quinquagesima Sunday* (6 March), 2011, he advised me that in the *Diocese of Sydney* the prerogative for selecting the red-letter day upon which a new Bishop will consecrated rests with the Archbishop of Sydney, who advises the new future Bishop of this i.e., a new future *Diocese of Sydney* auxiliary Bishop apparently does not have any input (or at least any necessary input¹¹⁷), into selecting the red-letter day upon which he is to be consecrated¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁷ Of course, there may be some variation on this issue depending on the discretion of this or that Archbishop of Sydney,

¹¹⁸ In the Sundays after Epiphany, and preceding Lent, there are three Sundays known as "Septuagesima," "Sexagesima," and "Quinquagesima." These refer to the period of ten days during which they fall, and hence in the longer Latin titles they are derived from *Septuagesima* is abbreviated from, "Dominica in Septuagesima" meaning "Sunday in the seventieth," that is, the set of 10 days between 70 and 61 days before Easter, being 63 days before Easter Sunday; *Sexagesima* is abbreviated from, "Dominica in Sexagesima," meaning "Sunday in the sixtieth," that is, the set of 10 days between 60

Other than *All Saints' Day* which is a general catch-all, red-letter days (with Collects & Readings) in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* are focused on NT figures or events. Red-letter days with their own Office have historically been limited to Protestant figures only. Thus before 1859, the *Church of England* had four such days issued by Royal Warrant of a reigning monarch, *Papists' Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day* (5 Nov.) which remains in the public celebration in England of Bonfire Day; *King Charles the Martyrs' Day* (30 Jan.) and *The King's Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* (29 May), a memory of which has now been revived in the black letter day of *King Charles I's Day* in Canada (1962), Australia (1978), and England (1980 – where it is an optional red-letter day), since the primary focus of *King Charles I's Day* are the events of

and 51 days before Easter, being 56 days before Easter Sunday; and *Quinquagesima* is abbreviated from, “Dominica in Quinquagesima” meaning “Sunday in the fiftieth,” that is, the set of 10 days between 50 and 41 days before Easter, being 49 days before Easter Sunday. And so these three Sundays, “Septuagesima,” “Sexagesima,” and “Quinquagesima,” begin the liturgical cycle that passes through Lent and culminates with Easter. The period of Lent is the forty days of fasting or abstinence from Ash Wednesday to Easter Even (the Saturday Before Easter Sunday) inclusive, but excludes all the Sundays in this period because Sunday is ALWAYS a Feast day and NEVER a Fast Day. The period of Lent recalls the example of Christ’s “forty days” of fasting, and hence the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Communion reading for the Gospel on *The First Sunday in Lent* is Matthew 4:1-11, recording that Christ “fasted forty days and forty nights,” and so it looks to four lots of ten days as the model for Lent. It is the model of these forty decimal days of four lots of ten days, that gives the propriety to the usage of decimal days in the reckoning of *Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima*, and *Quinquagesima*, all of which are preparatory to this season of Lent. Hence one goes over four Sundays from the set of ten days from 70 days (*Septuagesima*), to the set of ten days from 60 days (*Sexagesima*), to the set of 10 days from 50 days (*Quinquagesima*), to Lent which is four lots of 10 days of fasting or abstinence or 40 days; i.e., from 70 decimal days, to 60 decimal days, to 50 decimal days, to 40 decimal days. A complicating factor is that red-letter days falling in Lent are also feast days not fast days. This results in the question of what to do when this happens with Annunciation Day (25 March) or St. Mark’s Day (25 April), or the black letter day of St. George’s Day (23 April) where by local tradition such as in England it is more generally kept with celebrations, or the black letter day of St. Patrick’s Day (17 March) (which though absent from the 1662 Calendar has been added as an option in e.g., Australia, 1978, or England, 1980,) where by local tradition such as in parts of Sydney Australia or Ireland it is more generally kept with celebrations? Some choose to keep suchlike as feast days like the Sundays in Lent, others may, for instance, transfer them e.g., one might transfer Annunciation to a nearby Sunday which is already a feast day. The AAPB rubric (which like parts or all of its alternative Calendar is optional since it is “For use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662”), says, “When the Annunciation (March 25) or feast of Saint Mark (April 25) fall between the Sunday next before Easter and the Sunday after Easter, the observance may lapse or be kept on the second Tuesday after Easter” (AAPB, p. 304).

30 Jan. 1649, and the secondary focus of this day are the events of the royal oak, interregnum, and Restoration. Another such day on the *Church of Ireland Calendar*, *Irish Massacre Day*, remembering the massacring of Protestants by Papists in 1641, was a red-letter day in Ireland from 1663 to 1859, and inside these dates, had its own Office in the 1666 Irish prayer book from 1666-1800.

Accession Day was the only other red-letter day with its own Office, which existing both before and after 1859, is now the only such surviving day on the 1662 BCP Calendar which receives the Anglican Church's highest liturgical honour. Its inclusion thus bespeaks the Protestantism of the Crown, as Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and Defender of the Faith. It reminds us of the legally Protestant throne, and the standards of the 39 Articles. As this Volume of the Textual Commentaries is Dedicated on the 60th anniversary of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II's Accession, 6 Feb. 2012, let us remember to thank God for this legally safeguarded Protestantism of the Crown.

4) *The 350th anniversary of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (1662-2012).*

- a) *St. Paul's College Sydney University Symposium;*
- b) *Other matters.*

4a) *St. Paul's College Sydney University Symposium.*

Following the Restoration in 1660, demand for Cranmer's prayer book of 1559 & 1604 was so great that it went through five editions in one year. It was e.g., used in a service before the House of Lords on 10 May 1660. But in October 1660, King Charles II issued a declaration promising the conference that met in April 1661 at the Savoy Palace in London¹¹⁹, known as the *Savoy Conference*, in order to consider draft proposals to what became the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. It consisted of twelve Anglican Bishops e.g., John Cosin of Durham (1594-1672), and John Pearson of Chester (1612-1686) known for his work on the Apostles' Creed in Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed*; and twelve Puritan Ministers e.g., Richard Baxter of Kidderminster (1615-1691)¹²⁰.

¹¹⁹ Though it is common to refer to this meeting as being at the Savoy Palace, the old Palace was actually destroyed in the 14th century, and the Savoy Hospital built in its place in the 16th century. Though this closed in the 18th century and its old buildings generally demolished in the 19th century, the Savoy Chapel from the time of the *Savoy Conference* remains off The Strand in London. Given that shortly before this time, the Congregationalists had issued their 1658 *Savoy Declaration* here under the Puritan republic (a revision of the Presbyterian Westminster Confession), and Cromwell favoured Congregationalism, the symbolism of Royalist Anglicans here in 1661 deciding to revive Cranmer's 1559 & 1604 prayer book in a revised form is clearly very pregnant.

¹²⁰ See e.g., "Savoy Conference," *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Multimedia Edition, CD, International Version 1999, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1994-1999); & Percy Dearmer d. 1936) "Everyman's History of the Prayer Book," (A.R. Mowbray, London, 1912), chapter 10, "The Savoy Conference" (Dearmer's useful work must be used with

Among other changes, the Puritans wanted the removal of versicles and responses, and removal of the congregational reading or singing of the psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, saying “the people’s part in public prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto, and to declare their consent in the close, by saying, ‘Amen’.” This Puritan demand would e.g., be the death-knell to the Litany, which would have become simply what they called, “one solemn prayer.” The Puritans also wanted the Minister to have discretion to “omit part” of the prayer book service and replace it with his own extempore prayer. While this was not granted, as discussed at the Christopher Haigh Lecture, *infra*, after 1662 in practice some Dioceses allowed extempore prayer inside the liturgy (as is now commonly done) and some did not.

The Puritans also wanted the ornaments rubric omitted even though they did not properly understand what it meant. The Puritans objected to the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling at Communion as “fountains of evil.” They wanted wearing a woman’s wedding ring optional (and in this sense prefigured similar desires in certain feminist ideology which opposes women wearing a wedding ring, since they do not care if a man looks upon a women with interest, only to later learn she is already married), and the removal of Godparents at baptism. They wanted “nothing in the Liturgy which may seem to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast;” and further wanted “the religious observance of saints’ days ... and the vigils thereof ... to be omitted.” They objected to the terms, “Sunday,” “priest,” and “curate.”

The Puritans further wanted the Minister to face the people at all times during the service, rather than the Anglican practice of e.g., “the priest standing at the north side of the Table” at Communion, facing the table as he there reads from the prayer book, “Ye that do truly and earnestly repent” etc., and after the Confession, “Then shall the priest ... stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce the absolution” (1662 BCP). They thus opposed the rubric of the 1662 BCP which at Communion says, “the priest, standing before the Table” i.e., at the north end facing the table, is to “say the prayer of consecration” so that his actions are “before the people” (1662 BCP). Notably, the Papists also opposed this rubric, in their instance because they wanted the Romish priest to stand in the middle of an “altar” with his back to the people so his actions would not be “before the people,” and he would then elevate the consecrated Communion bread so that the people would idolatrously adore it. Hence this Anglican practice of standing at the north end of the Table was disliked by Papists and Puritan alike, though for different reasons. I.e., the Papists disliked it because it was a *Protestant* teaching not to elevate the bread and have the people idolatrously adore it; whereas the Puritans disliked it because it was an *Anglican* tradition that the Minister did not always face the people.

caution as he was a socialist and a vaguely defined broad-churchman) (http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/everyman_history/Chapt10.htm). For greater detail Dearmer recommends e.g., Edward Cardwell’s *A History of Conferences & other proceedings connected with the revision of the Book of Common Prayer from ... 1558 to ... 1690* (3rd edition, Oxford University Press, UK, 1849).

In substance the basic reply of the Anglican Bishops to these type of Puritan objections is the classical Anglican view found in Article 34 of the Anglican 39 Articles, that the church has found such practices to be useful and good, and that “nothing be ordained against God’s Word” in them.

However, some Puritans desires were met. Notably, that the Epistle, Gospel, and other readings in the liturgy be from the King James Bible of 1611. This is found in the words of The Preface, that “such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy; ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation,” and this made the King James Version the Authorized Version.

The *Savoy Conference* decided that those who had not been ordained by a bishop during the Interregnum years would need to be before exercising an ordained Ministry in an Anglican Church (Article 36, Anglican 39 Articles). It further decided to revive with some revisions, Cranmer’s prayer book of 1559, which in its 1559 & 1604 form had been made “illegal” under the Puritan republic from 1645. Thus in the same way that Cranmer’s 1552 prayer book had been revised and revived in 1559 as a symbol of Protestantism after it was taken away by Papists under Bloody Mary; so too Cranmer’s prayer would now be revised and revived in 1662 as a symbol of Anglican Protestantism after it had been taken away by Puritans during the Interregnum. Thereafter, most of the Puritans chose to have a separate and distinctive identity to that of The Established *Church of England*.

An 1844 printing of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* that I have seen in the British Library¹²¹, contains a title page that reads at the top, “THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER as Revised and Settled at the Savoy Conference Anno 1662. 14 Charles II. Reprinted from the Sealed Book in the Tower of London.” The *Savoy Conference* was held from 15 April to 24 July 1661. On 9 July 1661 the House of Commons passed the Bill of Uniformity. On 20 Dec. 1661 Cranmer’s 1552, 1559, & 1604 *Book of Common Prayer* as revised was adopted by both houses of the *Church of England’s* Convocations of Canterbury and York. On 25 Feb. 1662 the *Book of Common Prayer* was annexed to the Bill of Uniformity. On 9 April 1662 the Bill of Uniformity passed the House of Lords. On 19 May 1662, the Bill received Royal Assent from King Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), and thus became the 1662 Act of Uniformity for the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662.

Given that the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* came into existence in both 1661 and 1662, the celebration of the 350th anniversary of this prayer book to some extent covers both the years 2011 and 2012. The Anglican Church’s liturgical years starts with *The First Sunday in Advent* which in 2011 fell on Sunday 27 November. On the following Wed. 30 Nov. 2011, in what was the liturgical year of 2011-2012, St. Paul’s

¹²¹ Printed by William Pickering, London, UK. (On my USB stick photocopy, the shelf mark as written on the page opposite the title page, has been crossed out and changed a number of times, but the last shelf mark is stamped RAR 264.83.)

College Sydney University held a *Symposium on the 350th anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer*.

I had a triple interest in this Symposium since I support the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*; I am an old Pauline¹²²; and I am a graduate of Moore Theological College¹²³, and Moore College supplied both a prayer book exhibition from its Library, and also one of the two lecturers I listened to. I enrolled for the Symposium and selected to attend two Lectures, the first in the morning (9.30-10.30 am) followed by Morning Tea (10.30-11.00 am); and the second in the evening (8.00-9.00 pm). The interested reader will find some relevant photos of this event at my Textual Commentaries webpage (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

Before attending the first lecture, I purchased a book on sale at the Symposium entitled, *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present and Future, A 350th Anniversary Celebration* (2011)¹²⁴. This contains a series of articles by different writers on the BCP and its cover jacket has a red circle with yellow writing stating “350th Anniversary Celebration”. The material in these is of a variable standard and not always accurate¹²⁵.

¹²² Most of my time at Sydney University I was a day student. However, I was a boarder in residence at St. Paul’s College in 1987 and 1988. It is an Anglican male residential college of Sydney University. Unlike the normal pronunciation of “Pauline” (e.g., the Pauline Epistles), in which the letter “i” is pronounced “ee” as in “seen,” the letter “i” in “old Pauline” is pronounced “i” like the letter “i” in “sign.”

¹²³ I have a Diploma of Biblical Studies from Moore College (1995). It is an Evangelical Anglican College of the Diocese of Sydney, and geographically next door to St. Paul’s College.

¹²⁴ Daily P. (Editor), *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present and Future, A 350th Anniversary Celebration*, Continuum, London, UK, 2011.

¹²⁵ E.g., one writer tells how “As a child” he “attended a ... church camp which had evangelistic tent meetings I was invited ... to turn away from sin and give my life to God, which I joyfully confess I did – several times I remember ... my cabin counsellor put his hand on my shoulder and suggested that I should return to my seat as I had ‘already done that.’ ... Yet stubbornly I pressed forward, because the words of the call were still true. I was a sinner and I wanted to repent and know forgiveness” He then claims that there is a “need for on-going conversion and repentance” (*Ibid.*, pp. 159-160). Alas, this writer has not realized after some decades that what his cabin counsellor had told him is correct (although possibly the cabin counsellor did not explain the matter to him properly). There is a difference between conversion and the convert’s ongoing need to confess his sins. We do not, as the Papists claim, fall in and out of salvation which is why a last confession is so important to Romanists i.e., *justification by confession*; for Christ is “is able ... to save ... to the uttermost” “them” “that come unto God by him” (Heb. 7:25). But though he has “purged our sins” (Heb. 1:3), due to our sinful natures (Ps. 51:5; Jer. 17:9; Rom. 5:12; 7:7-25) there are ongoing actual sins (II Chron. 6:36), and so an ongoing need to “confess our sins” and ask forgiveness through

Notably the cover jacket also says the book has a “Foreword by HRH the Prince of Wales”. In this Foreword, the heir apparent to the throne, His Royal Highness, Prince Charles, says: “As Patron of the Prayer Book Society, I am delighted to introduce this anthology, which has been timed to coincide with the forthcoming 350th Anniversary of the 1662 edition of The Book of Common Prayer. The Prayer Book ... remains in use in many churches across the land and has, for hundreds of years, not only enriched our liturgical life, but has also provided a sense of permanence and continuity in an ever-changing landscape Thomas Cranmer’s words were, quite deliberately, like those of Shakespeare, ‘not of an age but for all time.’ ... Words and phrases from the liturgy have become part of the heritage of the English language” The Prince’s good humour is apparent in his words, “And yet, over recent years, we have witnessed a concerted effort to devalue the currency of these resonant words. But who was it who decided that for people who aren’t very good at reading, the best things to read are those written by people who aren’t very good at writing? Poetry is surely for everybody But banality is for nobody. It might be accessible for all, but so is a desert.” But the Prince then hits a more sombre note when he says, “It is hard to escape the suspicion that so many changes have been made to the cadence of the language used just to lower the tone” “Perhaps it is worth recalling what George Orwell pointed out in ‘1984,’ ‘that the best way of getting rid of history and thought is to get rid [of] the language of history and ideas’.” The Prince then ends by saying that the “language and theology of the Book of Common Prayer ... will be of abiding interest,” and it “has become such a blessing to the faithful of The Church of England and other Anglican churches over so many years.” *We thank God for this endorsement of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer by Prince Charles!*

The *Symposium on the 350th anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer* Morning Lecture I attended at St. Paul’s College was by Christopher Haigh. In England, Haigh taught at Manchester University and then for 30 years at Oxford University, before retiring in 2009, after he had been head of the Oxford History Faculty for five years. His works include *English Reformations: Religion, Politics & Society under the Tudors* (1993), and as at 2012 he is presently writing a volume for the *Oxford History of the*

our “Advocate” “Jesus Christ the righteous” (I John 1:9-2:2). *But this is NOT CONVERSION!* Hence when Martin Luther realized that he would not be kept out of heaven because he had forgotten to confess a sin, or committed a sin before he had time to confess it before his death (cf. Ps. 19:12), he recognized a pivotal element of justification by faith. Luther spent long hours in a confessional trying to recall all his sins until he realized salvation is a GIFT (Rom. 5:15-17; Eph. 2:8,9). But by talking about a “need for on-going conversion and repentance,” this writer is seeking to re-introduce the bondage of *justification by confession* i.e., if a believer has any unconfessed sin he is no longer justified / converted / saved. The Biblical Protestant teaching is that by faith one receives an *imputed* righteousness and a *judicial justification* (Rom. 4:1-8), so that Christ’s obedience, not ours, is the basis for our salvation (Rom. 5:6; II Cor. 5:21).

Christian Church series on 17th century English religion.

Christopher Haigh's lecture was entitled, "Introducing the Prayer Book in 1552 and 1662." With regard to the 1552 prayer book, he said that following the introduction of Cranmer's 1549 prayer book, there was consternation "by Protestants" that this was not Protestant enough. He also made reference to the "more Protestant" theology of Cranmer's 1552 prayer book as seen in the "rubric" prohibiting "adoration" (also found with some modification in the 1662 prayer book). He also referred to how after it was removed under the Roman Catholic Mary I (Regnal Years: 1553-1558), the basic 1552 prayer book was reintroduced under the "Protestant Elizabeth I" (Regnal Years: 1558-1603) as the 1559 prayer book.

With regard to the 1662 prayer book, Haigh said that after the Puritans introduced the Directory of Public Worship in 1645 (which purportedly made the prayer book "illegal," though the King never gave his Royal Assent to any such Bill,) this was disregarded in many congregations which continued to use the prayer book. He also said that some Puritans disregarded the Directory of Public Worship because they wanted something "freer." The work of Jeremy Taylor in seeking to keep alive Anglican concepts of liturgy during the Interregnum was also referred to¹²⁶.

Haigh referred to how after the Restoration in 1660, many parishes immediately dropped the Puritan's Directory of Public Worship, and went back to the 1559 prayer book. E.g., Christ College, Oxford University, printed a Latin form of the 1559 prayer book for its own usage. There was a "great debate" between Anglicans and Puritans on whether or not to have the liturgy, with over 40 books published in "a big controversy." He said that those opposed to the prayer book claimed e.g., that it was "idolatrous," to which the Anglicans replied that such "notorious incendiaries" incited the civil wars of the 1640s and 1650s. He said both sides sometimes used the same argument, but with a different slant. For instance, the Puritans said that the liturgy did not exist till the fourth century A.D., being introduced to stop Pelagians and Arians, and therefore it should be dropped; whereas the Anglicans said the liturgy was introduced in the fourth century because it was found to serve a desirable purpose, and for similar reasons it should now be retained (i.e., in the form of Cranmer's prayer book). E.g., the Lord Bishop of Exeter, Bishop John Gauden (1605-1662), said he wanted the liturgy to restrain "the vanity and exuberance" of certain clergymen from doing silly things, and to uphold the Reformed religion against "Romish superstitions" and other "fanatics," saying that without the prayer book the Reformed religion could not be established in England.

Haigh said there were three broad groups, a Puritan Congregationalist group which wanted no liturgy; a group called "Presbyterian" but not the same as the Westminster Confession Presbyterians, who wanted a "flexible liturgy" that could be used or not used in various ways; and an Anglican group which wanted Cranmer's prayer book. The old Anglican-Puritan division emerged between what was to be done about

¹²⁶ After the Restoration in 1660, Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667) was made Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore in the *Church of Ireland*.

things left indifferent in the Word i.e., with regard to worship forms, Anglicans said that the church could settle the matter¹²⁷, whereas the Puritans said the church should not settle the matter¹²⁸.

Reference was made to how the Puritan group objected to e.g., the term “priest” for an ordained Minister; and objected to having “Godparents” at baptism. They objected to using versicles and responses on the basis that they considered that it was “an interruption to the Minister’s preaching” to have congregational participation with versicles and responses. They were also unhappy that the 1662 prayer book was to have readings from the Apocrypha as the 1559 prayer book did not. (And on this issue I agree with them and the 1559 prayer book. At the very least, I think that wherever there is an Apocrypha reading, there should be an alternative reading from the canon of Scripture, a practice now accepted.) The Puritan’s objections to Coverdale’s 1540 Psalter being retained in the prayer book of 1662 was overruled; but the Puritan’s desire to have the readings in the liturgy from the King James Version of 1611 was adopted.

Haigh said there was a debate on “comprehensions” in the Church of England i.e., allowing both Anglican and Puritan Services inside the Established Church, or “toleration” i.e., tolerating Puritan Churches as a separate entity outside the Established Anglican Church. Though in 1660 Charles II had argued for both, *the times they were a’ changing*. The Anglican Bishops “controlled” the *Savoy Conference* of 1661, and rejected Puritans objections to e.g., the surplice and sign of the cross and baptism. While Bishop John Cosin (1594-1672) desired the reintroduction of Cranmer’s 1549 prayer book, this was a minority view and the more general desire was for a return to the 1559 prayer book i.e., for Cranmer’s 1552 prayer book as revised in 1559, to be again revised, and this is what was done with the 1662 prayer book. With the coming of the Act of Uniformity in 1662, the requirement that clergymen be ordained by a bishop if they had not already been so, and the requirement to repudiate *The Solemn League & Covenant*, among the Puritans, some “936 clergy” refused.

At the end of this lecture there was a time for *Questions & Answers*. I asked Christopher Haigh firstly, “how rigidly” the 1662 prayer book was “enforced,” and by way of a specific example, I asked if the biddings at Communion before the prayer for the Church Militant, which have come to be quite commonly used in BCP services, would be allowed; and secondly, how this was enforced? In reply, Christopher Haigh said the Bishop of a Diocese set the tone for enforcement rigidity. Thus he said the Bishop of Ely disallowed any extempore prayers or biddings; but by contrast, the Bishops of Exeter and Norwich were more free and did allow e.g., such biddings, and also the injection of some extempore prayer both before and after the Sermon. He further said

¹²⁷ Cf. “nothing be ordained against God’s Word” in Article 37 of the Anglican *39 Articles*.

¹²⁸ Cf. the so called Regulatory Principle, “God ... may not be worshipped ... any way not prescribed in ... Scripture,” Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 21:1; & the unclear qualification of *Westminster Confession* 1:6

that while enforcement was ultimately by “the courts,” enforcement procedures often involved questioning church wardens about whether or not a minister, “Is following the book?” i.e., the BCP; but he said that there was some uncertainty as to the accuracy of their testimony in some instances, and some suspicion that at least in some instances where they answered “No,” it was for personal reasons of local politics against the Minister.

At the Morning Tea following Christopher Haigh’s Lecture, I inspected a Display Cabinet set up in the Common Room of St. Paul’s College, Sydney University, by the Library of Moore College. Items of interest included: an original print of Cranmer’s 1549 prayer book; an original print of Cranmer’s 1552 prayer book; and an original 1662 print of Cranmer’s prayer book as revised to become the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. On top of the Display Cabinet there was also a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* which was part of a limited 400 copy special edition that was issued for the coronation of King Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901-1910).

The second lecture I attended at the *Symposium on the 350th anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer* at St. Paul’s College was an Evening Lecture by Michael Jensen. He is a Lecturer at Moore Theological College and the son of the Diocese of Sydney’s Archbishop Peter Jensen. His lecture was entitled, “‘Humble and Hearty Thanks’: Some Reflections on the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Lost Art of Thanksgiving.”

The rubric of the 1662 BCP says this is “A General Thanksgiving” which may “be used before the two final prayers of the Litany, or of the Morning and Evening Prayer.” The rubric says of the words in italics in square brackets, “This is to be said when any that have been prayed for desire to return praise.”

Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we thine unworthy servants do give thee most humble and hearty thanks for all thy goodness and loving-kindness to us and to all men; [*particularly to those who desire now to offer up their praises and thanksgivings for thy late mercies vouchsafed unto them.*] We bless thee for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all for thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory. And we beseech thee, give us that due sense of all thy mercies, that our hearts may be unfeignedly thankful, and that we shew forth thy praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives; by giving up ourselves to thy service, and by walking before thee in holiness and righteousness all our days; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end. *Amen.*

In his reflections on this prayer, Michael Jensen said that a disposition of gratitude and thanksgiving was a desirable thing, and brings health to Christians. He said Jesus Christ is our supreme example of a life of true gratitude and he empowers Christians to do likewise. He said that the words, “Almighty God” refer to God’s sovereignty, and that this element was lacking in various new liturgies. He linked the words, “Almighty

God, Father of all mercies” to the fact that by common grace God’s “mercies” benefit “all men,” which is also manifested in “creation;” though special grace is seen in “the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ.” He defined “the means of grace” by which God may elicit faith as both “the Word and sacraments.”

He further said that the *Book of Common Prayer* recognizes that it is God who fashions a thankful heart in man. He said this is seen in the versicles and responses:

Minister: “O Lord, open thou our lips.”
Answer: “And our mouth shall shew forth thy praise”
 (Morning & Evening Prayer, cf. Ps. 51:15).

He said it is also seen in the people’s responses after each precept of the Decalogue (Exod. 20:1-17) which is read by the Minister, “Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law” (The Communion Service, cf. Matt. 15:22; 20:30; Joshua 24:23; I Kgs 8:57,58; Ps. 119:36).

4b) *Other matters.*

In e.g., John 20:1,19, “the first of the week (*sabbaton*)” is a contextual double entendre also meaning “the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*).” Thus Sunday became a weekly Sabbath by virtue of Christ’s resurrection. Article 10 of the Apostles’ Creed says, “I believe in ...the holy catholic church; the communion of saints.” This here provides us with a contrast between the “catholic” or universal church which incorporates all believers, and which is “in one communion and fellowship” with God (Collect, *All Saints’ Day*, 1662 BCP; see I John 1:3); and the local church where one has “the communion of saints” i.e., the fellowship of believers (I John 1:7). I understand “the communion of saints” to mean “the fellowship of believers” in a local church context, nothing more, and nothing less. It is thus a commitment to the teaching of such Scriptures as Heb. 10:25, “not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together.” Thus this relates to the recognition that one element of the fourth commandment “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy,” that continues to bind us Gentile Christians with regard to Sunday sacredness (e.g., John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7), is the fact that the weekly “Sabbath is “an holy convocation” (Lev. 23:3), i.e., a day for “assembling of ourselves together” (Heb. 10:25), in which we offer public “worship” to “God” (I Cor. 14:25) “upon the first day of week” (I Cor. 16:2), since in addition to being a day of rest (Exod. 20:8-11), the “sabbath” is properly a day when we “worship” “the Lord” (Isa. 66:23).

Of course, we may offer such public worship on other days (Rom. 14:5,6), but Sunday is the chief of such days for us Gentile Christians. (Though Col. 2:16 allows a liberty for Jewish Christians to keep the Jewish Sabbath and other days of the Jewish liturgical year if they so wish, e.g., Acts 16:13-15; Gentile Christians are forbidden to so keep the Jewish sabbath “days” or Jewish liturgical year in Gal. 4:10,11. Of course, Jewish Christians may also choose to keep Sunday rather than Saturday; and seemingly this was the NT times practice at Corinth which had both Jewish and Gentile Christians

in it, I Cor. 12:13; 16:2.)

Article 34 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, “It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at times they have been divers[e], and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, time, and men’s manner’s , so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word ...” (emphasis mine). Thus while Anglicanism allows as valid different forms of worship e.g., the more Puritan forms found in Calvin’s Geneva, nevertheless, on the basis that it *has been found to be useful and good* and is not “against God’s Word” (Article. 34, 39 Articles), Cranmer’s prayer book of 1552 has come to characterize historic forms of Anglican Protestant worship. This remains so through the small number of revisions of it in the 1559 Elizabethan prayer book, the 1559 and 1604 Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book, and now the 1662 Caroline prayer book, all of which are essentially Cranmer’s prayer book of 1552.

This Anglican view that “nothing be ordained against God’s Word” (Article. 34, 39 Articles) is different to the Puritan view sometimes called, “The Regulatory Principle.” As found in the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 21:1 this says, “God ... may not be worshipped ... any way not prescribed in the holy Scripture” (emphasis mine). However, Westminster Confession 1:6 makes an unclear qualification to that, saying “... there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, Which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word”

The tolerance of Article 34 of the Anglican 39 Articles means that Anglicans are not opposed to Presbyterian forms of worship for Presbyterians, but simply choose different ones for themselves. Thus Cranmer’s prayer book as now found in its 1662 form is not something I would seek to impose on unwilling Puritans, even though I personally support it as an example of something that is *useful and good* and not “against God’s Word” (Article 34, 39 Articles).

Romans 14:5-8 refers to certain feast and fast days, and a Christian’s liberty to keep these or not. In addition to certain fast days or days of abstinence, the 1662 Anglican Calendar consists of three types of days on its Calendar that remembers the good examples or ensamples of figures from church history, in harmony with such Scriptures as I Thessalonians 1:7, which in referring to those in the universal sainthood of all believers at Thessalonica says, “ye were ensamples to all that believe;” or II Peter 5:1,3 which says of church “elders,” that they should be examples or “ensamples to the flock;” or in I Timothy 4:12 St. Paul says to St. Timothy, “be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, faith, in purity.”

Thus as more fully explained in the next section, “5) Accession Day Principles,” *infra*, the Anglican Calendar of 1662 unites such Scriptures as those upholding various saints as examples or ensamples, with the liberty to keep or not keep holy days in Romans 14. By tradition “the four beasts” of Rev. 4:7 are used to symbolize the four Gospels; and by a later tradition these symbols may also be used to manifest certain parts of the *Nicene Creed*. Though different traditions match different “beasts” to different

Gospels, in the Western Church tradition of St. Jerome¹²⁹, St. Gregory the Great¹³⁰, and e.g., the Book of Armagh¹³¹ or the Lindisfarne Gospels, St. Matthew's Gospel is symbolized by the "face" of "a man," and the *Nicene Creed* says, "Jesus Christ ... was made man" (Rev. 4:7; cf. Ezek. 1:10; Matt. 1 & 17:2); St. Mark's Gospel by the "lion" (Rev. 4:7; cf. Gen. 49:9,10; Mark 1:3; Heb. 7:14), and the *Nicene Creed* says, "Jesus Christ ... rose again" (cf. Ezek. 1:10; Mark 16; & Rev. 5:5); St. Luke's Gospel is symbolized by the "calf" (or ox) (Rev. 4:7), and the *Nicene Creed* says, "Jesus Christ ... suffered and was buried" (cf. calf: Lev. 9:2,3,8-11; 22:28; or ox: Lev. 17:3-5; Ezek. 1:10; Luke 1:5,8; 15:23,27,30; 22:19,20,42-44,63-65; 23); and St. John's Gospel is symbolized by the "eagle" (Rev. 4:7; cf. John 1:1; 3:13), and the *Nicene Creed* says, "Jesus Christ ... ascended into heaven" (cf. John 20:17; "flying eagle" in Rev. 4:7).

The strength of this tradition in Western Church art may in the first instance be reflective of the fact that two of the Western Church's four doctors, Jerome and Gregory, took this view, even though others, including one of the four doctors, Austin, took a different view¹³². In the second instance, it probably owes something to the fact that these four depictions look to verses at the start of each of the Gospels, and this is a helpful way to remember them (Matt. 1:1; Mark 1:3; Luke 1:5; John 1:1, *infra*). And in the third instance, it probably reflects the historic importance of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and in this context, the connected appropriateness of using St. Jerome's matching of these symbols to the four Gospels. St. Jerome and St. Gregory match these "four beasts" or "four living creatures" to the Gospel writers *on the basis of how their respective Gospel starts* i.e., St. Matthew starts with the Son of God being made a man in Matt. 1, and hence the appropriateness of the "face" of "a man." Or St. Mark starts his gospel *like a roaring lion* (cf. e.g., the "roaring" of "a lion" in Isa. 5:29,30), with his record of "The voice of" St. John Baptist "crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (Mark 1:3) i.e., St. Mark's Gospel "roars like a lion" in its presentation of Christ at its start (and in this context of citation of a Messianic

¹²⁹ Schaff, P., & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, 1892, Reprint: Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1979, Vol. 6, St. Jerome: Letters & Select Works, p. 495 (Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew*).

¹³⁰ Oden, T.C. (Editor), *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, Old Testament, Vol. 13, Ezekiel & Daniel, Inter Varsity Press, Illinois, USA, 2008, p. 5 (Jerome's *Homily on Mark*, 75; & Gregory's *Homilies on Ezekiel*, 1:4:1).

¹³¹ See Gwynn's *Book of Armagh* (1913), pp. 64,102,132,175.

¹³² Austin matched the lion to Matthew, the face of a man to Mark, the calf to Luke, and the eagle to John. And other ancient writers took yet other views again e.g., Schaff says Irenaeus matched the lion to John, the calf to Luke, the face of a man to Matthew, and the eagle to Luke. Schaff, P. (Editor), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, 1887, Reprint: Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1974, Vol. 6, St. Augustine: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels, pp. 80-1 (Austin's *Harmony of the Gospels* 1:6:9).

prophecy from Isa. 40:3, I think it also significant that “our Lord sprang out of Juda,” Heb. 7:14, and as one from the “lion’s whelp” of “Judah,” he holds “the sceptre” that “shall not depart from Judah,” Gen. 49:9,10). Or St. Luke starts with the priestly work of Zacharias (Luke 1:5), and Christ’s sacrificial work is thus symbolized by the “calf” (cf. Lev. 9:2,3,8-11; or “ox,” cf. Lev. 17:3-5). Or St. John’s Gospel starts with reference to the Deity of Christ (John 1) as an eagle soaring in the heavens.

The optional later addition to this earlier tradition of some of the theological truths emphasized in the *Nicene Creed*¹³³, is straightforward for St. Matthew (*Nicene Creed*: “Jesus Christ ... was made man”), and St. Luke (*Nicene Creed*: “Jesus Christ ... for us men and for our salvation ... was crucified He suffered and was buried”). It is a natural enough outgrowth from the Gospel for St. Mark, which must first be developed with regard to the resurrection of “the Lion of the tribe of Juda” who “hath prevailed” (Rev. 5:5; *Nicene Creed*: “Jesus Christ ... rose again”). And likewise, it is a natural enough further development for the Gospel St. John, in which Christ said *with regard to those standing around him at the time*, “no man” *then and there present with him* “hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven,” thus referring also to his incarnation (John 1), from which we are also reminded of his final ascension (John 20:17, *Nicene Creed*: “Jesus Christ ... ascended into heaven”).

Certainly I am not suggesting that this type of matching of “the four beasts” to the four Gospels in Western art, nor the additional later tradition of further matching this to some of the truths emphasized in the *Nicene Creed*, is present in the original passages of Ezekiel 1:10 or Rev. 4:7. Rather, I think that in looking for appropriate religious symbols for the four gospels, it is simply that this Biblical imagery of “the four beasts” or “four living creatures” presents itself as providing some useful images whose artistic categories of thought can be profitably tailored and adapted to Christian symbols for the four Gospels. Thus while I do not suggest that this is the plenary meaning of the depictions of these four angels, I nevertheless consider it is an appropriate usage of these Biblical images in matching them to parts of the four Gospels in a way that is not “against God’s Word” (Article 37, Anglican 39 Articles), both for the purposes of religious art, and the teaching of other Biblical truths. While this fact means that one can make, and indeed other Christian writers have made, different matches of these “four beasts” to the four gospels, and there are those who would so prefer one of these other matches¹³⁴; my own view is that I think the historic strength in the Western Church of using the “face” of “a man” for St. Matthew’s Gospel, the “lion” for St. Mark’s Gospel,

¹³³ Cf. Broderick, R.C., *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, Simon & Schuster, New York, USA, 1957, pp. 150 & 151 (The Evangelists).

¹³⁴ Barclay prefers Austin’s matches, although he says e.g., Athanasius matched the face of a man to Matthew, the calf to Mark, the lion to Luke, and the eagle to John. Barclay, W., *The Daily Study Bible*, Revised Edition, *The Revelation of John*, Volume 1 on Chapters 1-5, The Saint Andrew Press, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1976, reprint 1987, pp. 160-1.

the “calf” for St. Luke’s Gospel, and the “eagle” for St. John’s Gospel should be allowed to stand.

Philip Schaff notes that Jerome’s view “differs from that of Augustin” (Austin / Augustine), but says, “the prevalent application is that of Jerome,” and notes it is so also in the history of the Western Church as it is the view “accepted in mediaeval art¹³⁵.” It is an artistic tradition with the support of two of the Western Church’s four church doctors, namely, St. Jerome and St. Gregory; it links with a literary tradition in the Gospels since these four depictions look to verses at the start of each of the Gospels (Matt. 1:1; Mark 1:3; Luke 1:5; John 1:1, *supra*); and since this was the view of Jerome, it is also harmonious with the historic importance of St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate in Western Christendom. On the one hand, I consider that for such religious symbols to operate effectively and without confusion, one tradition must be selected and generally used, and hence I consider the attempts of those who would now seek to change the traditional Gospel images of Jerome’s and Gregory’s application of the four beasts to others are unwise, and the source of unnecessary confusions. But on the other hand, this is not an issue of theological orthodoxy, and there are others who disagree with my assessment.

Given that this is the final of the four commentaries on the Holy Gospel of St. Matthew, I also think it appropriate to make some reference to St. Matthew’s Day. In the Book of Common Prayer, the annual anniversary of St. Matthew’s Day on 21 September is a red letter day. The 1662 BCP Communion Lessons from the AV for St. Matthew’s Day are II Cor. 4:1-6 and Matt. 9:9-13. The Collect is, “O Almighty God, who by thy blessed Son didst call Matthew from the receipt of custom to be an Apostle and Evangelist: grant us grace to forsake all covetous desires and inordinate love of riches, and to follow the same thy Son Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. *Amen.*” This Collect is manifested in a stained-glass window at St. Matthew’s Windsor, that the reader can see on my website, which together with this Gospel reading includes the words of Matt. 9:9, “Follow me.”

Hence I have included on my website some photos of *St. Matthew’s Fair*. Having a church fete or fair is a very Anglican tradition, which provides a bit of annual “public relations” for the church. Although such church fetes or fairs are now sadly on the decline in the city regions of the Diocese of Sydney, Windsor is still semi-urban and semi-rural, and this church fair has survived. *St. Matthew’s Fair* is an annual church fair held at St. Matthew’s Windsor in western Sydney, by general tradition in September which is the same month as St. Matthew’s Day. A tarred road divides the large church grounds of St. Matthew’s, and on the same side of the road as the Rectory is the Church Hall and it is in these grounds that the Fair is held, set up under marquees, stalls, and gazebos. There were stalls selling such things as books, toweling, aprons, cakes, and jams; as well as a blow up castle for kids to jump around in¹³⁶.

¹³⁵ Schaff, P. (Editor), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, 1887, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 80 (Schaff’s commentary on Austin’s *Harmony of the Gospels* 1:6:9).

¹³⁶ See photos on my textual commentaries website at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Cranmer's prayer book of 1552 was taken away by Papists from 1553 to 1558 and restored in 1559 as a symbol of Protestantism; and taken away by Puritans from 1645 to 1660 and restored as a symbol of Anglican Protestantism in 1662. Understood as a symbol of Protestantism, there has been an internal fifth column systematic attack on the 1662 BCP in historically modern times, as part of the attack on the Protestantism of Anglicanism.

Because of its origins in 1552, some of the Bible verses in the 1662 prayer book are from Henry VIII's Great Bible of 1539 which was edited by Coverdale, and had a Preface by Cranmer (& hence it is also known as "Cranmer's Bible"). Others are Cranmer's translation. E.g., the "comfortable words" said at The Communion Service are Cranmer's translation, and I have heard them in recent times at 1662 BCP services at St. Matthew's Windsor and St. Philip's York Street. These are: Matt. 11:28, "Come unto me all that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you" (using the AV's "are" before "heavy laden," to modify Cranmer's 1549 & 1552 prayer books' "be heavy laden," this reading owes something to both Cranmer & the KJV); John 3:16, "So God loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" I Tim. 1:15, "This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Christ Jesus came unto the world to save sinners;" and *one perfectly preserved from Cranmer's translation in the later King James Version* from I John 2:1, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins."

However, some were updated to the AV in the 1662 prayer book, for instance, most of the Bible quotes at the start of Morning Prayer (Mattins / Matins) and Evening Prayer (Evensong) are from the AV. Thus I have heard a number of such AV quotes at the start of the Evensong Service at, for instance, St. Swithun's Pymble (in Sydney), where it is generally held four times a year on a Sunday. E.g., at the Evensong I attended there on Sunday 6 Nov. 2011, I heard quoted at this section, first Matt. 3:2, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and then Ps. 51:17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise;" i.e., these readings at the beginning of Evensong (sung Evening Prayer) were read from the Authorized Version of 1611, not the Great Bible of 1539.

But more than this, the Preface of the 1662 prayer book says that "such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy ..., are now ordered to be read according to the last translation." This made the King James Version of 1611 "the Authorized Version." Hence we read on the title page of King James Version, "Appointed to be read in Churches." E.g., at what is now the one and only annual 1662 BCP Evensong Sunday Service (held at 3 p.m.) at St. Philip's York Street, (although even this was not held in 2011¹³⁷), on Sunday 31 Jan. 2010 (transferring remembrance of

¹³⁷ In 2011, remembrance of Richard Johnson was instead transferred to the BCP morning Communion Service. Since the 2000s St. Philip's only has a minority of services from the BCP, and it has lost its former commitment to the AV.

Richard Johnson on 3 Feb. back to the previous Sunday and deeming it a red-letter day as this Church contains the *Richard Johnson Chapel* and is the custodian of Richard Johnson memorabilia), the two Lessons that were both read from the Authorized Version were Gen. 48:1-22 (first lesson) and Matt. 19:3-27 (second lesson)¹³⁸. Or when I have lived in London and attended *Church of England (Continuing)* services at St. Mary's Reading or St. John's South Wimbledon, all services are from the 1662 BCP, and this church requires that only the AV be used in readings and sermons. Thus the 350th anniversary celebration of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, is also a celebration of 350th anniversary of the King James Version as the Authorized Version.

As previously discussed at "The 400th Anniversary of the King James Version (1611-2011) comes and goes," *supra*, as part of the 400th Anniversary celebrations of the Authorized Version, in 2011 Cambridge University Press issued a 1611-2011 "Transetto Edition," and The Trinitarian Bible Society a 1611-2011 Commemorative Edition. I attended a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Service at St. Matthew's Windsor in western Sydney on what in local tradition there is called, "Reformation Sunday" (transferring remembrance of the Eve of All Saints' Day in memory of Luther's 95 Theses in 1517 back to the previous Sunday if the Eve of All Saints' Day is not a Sunday,) Sunday 30 October, 2011. On the following Saturday, 5 Nov. 2011, I again visited St. Matthew's. A photograph of myself was taken holding these two 1611-2011 anniversary editions, in which I am standing in front of a display case at St. Matthew's which contains an 1821 print of a King James Bible sent out by King George IV (Regnal Years: 1760-1820) to St. Matthew's which was used as the pulpit Bible till 1936. The appropriateness of the time of this photo is that Saturday 5 November, 2011, was *Papists' Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day*. This remembers God's deliverance of the Protestant King James and Parliament from the Popish treachery of Guy Fawkes and others to blow them up with gunpowder in 1605, the very year after King James decided in the 1604 Hampton Court Palace Conference to translate the King James Bible, and God's protection of him in 1605 meant the King James Version was then completed and published in 1611.

5) *Accession Day Principles*

The *Accession Day* of a monarch is the day that a given monarch accedes to the throne, which is thus also the day of the death or abdication of the former monarch.

¹³⁸ 3 Feb. remembering the First Christian Service in Australia conducted by Richard Johnson in Sydney is a black letter on the 1978 Australia Calendar, which is "for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662," so that all, or any of its Calendar days, not also found on the 1662 BCP Calendar are purely optional and may be dismissed in favour of the BCP Calendar. Thus some do not remember 3 Feb. as a black letter day (although this is one of a small number of added black letter days from the optional 1978 Calendar that I endorse). But where it is additionally elevated to a red-letter day, such as by local tradition it is at St. Philip's, this means no specific Collect or readings are provided. Hence these two Lessons were selected because they are the two Lessons provided in the 1662 Calendar for Morning Prayer on 3 Feb., and were the ones used by Richard Johnson in the First Christian Service in Australia on 3 Feb., 1788.

Hence different monarchs generally have different Accession Days, although occasionally they might coincide, for instance, the Accession Day of Richard III (Regnal Years: 1483-1485) was 26 June, which is the same as the Accession Day of William IV (Regnal Years: 1839-1837). So too, the Accession Day of James II (Regnal Years 1685-1688) was 6 February, which is the same as the Accession Day of Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952).

Between 1662 and 1859 when the Anglican Church had the four offices of 30 Jan., 29 May, and 5 Nov., together with Accession Day, and the Anglican *Church of Ireland* additionally had 23 October, there was always a possibility that a Sovereign's accession day might fall on the same day as one of these other Offices. But in fact, this only happened once, since Charles II's Accession Day was 30 January, but since he was remembered as the secondary focus in the Office of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* on 30 January, and had his own more specific memory in the Office of *The King's Restoration Day* on 29 May, there was no need to have a specific Office of Accession Day. But sometimes the two were close together. Thus the Office of *Accession Day* for George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820) was on 25 October, which was just two days after *Irish Massacre Day* on the *Church of Ireland's* Calendar for 23 October, remembering the martyrdom of Protestants by Papists in 1641. *Irish Massacre Day* was a red-letter day from 1663-1665 and 1801-1859, and had its own prayer book Office from 1666-1800. Thus from 1761 to 1800 these two Offices were close together for Irish Anglicans. Furthermore, George IV (Regnal Years 1820-1830) had an *Accession Day* Office for 29 January, which was just one day before the Office for *King Charles the Martyr's Day* on 30 January.

The *Accession Service* remains in usage to this day, and may be used on more than just Accession Day itself. The opening rubric of this Office says, "For use in all Churches and Chapels ... upon the Anniversary of the day of the Accession of the Reigning Sovereign, or upon such other day as shall be appointed by Authority" (emphasis mine). E.g., on my fifth trip to London from September 2008 to March 2009, though Accession Day fell on Friday 6 February, 2009, I recall on a Sunday in February 2009, hearing some prayers used from this Office by the Minister, the Reverend Mr. Peter Ratcliffe, at St. John's *Church of England (Continuing)*, South Wimbledon, in London. Thus this is an example of such transference from 6 February to another day, in this instance, a nearby Sunday. Mr. Ratcliffe advises me that he continues to use "the Accession service prayers" at St. John's¹³⁹.

The 1662 BCP Service at St. Matthew's Windsor I attended on Sunday 29 Jan. 2012, included prayers by the Minister, the Rev. Mr. Aleks Pinter, for the Queen's Diamond Jubilee anniversary. This included thanks to God for the Queen upholding Christianity, and asking God that those who succeed her would also uphold Christianity. She is Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and so he also prayed for the Church of England to depart from its liberalism and return to God's Word; and God was asked to help those Evangelical Churches in the UK seeking to be faithful to him.

¹³⁹ Reply email to myself from Peter Ratcliffe, 2 July 2011.

The 1662 BCP Service at St. Philip's York Street, inner city of Sydney, I attended on Sunday 5 Feb. 2012, included a Collect from the *Accession Service* which may be used "upon such other day as shall be appointed." The parish bulletin for the "8.30 AM" "1662 Book of Common Prayer" Service had printed at p. 3, "**THE COLLECTS**". The first one was for "*Septuagesima*," and the second one was placed under the heading, "**Diamond Jubilee of the Queen (1952-2012)**" and read:

O LORD our God, who upholdest and governest all things by the word of thy power: receive our humble prayers for our Sovereign Lady ELIZABETH, *as on the 6th day of February*, set over us by thy grace and providence to be our Queen; and, together with her, bless, we beseech thee, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, and all the Royal family; that they, ever trusting in thy goodness, protected by thy power, and crowned with thy gracious and endless favour, may long continue before thee in peace and safety, joy and honour, and after death may obtain everlasting life and glory, by the merits and mediation of Christ Jesus our Saviour, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. **Amen.**"

These two Collects were both prayed by the Right Reverend Ray Smith (Senior Associate Minister at St. Philip's, and a retired Diocese of Sydney auxiliary Bishop).

Therefore, let us now consider some of the relevant thinking on remembering certain days on the Calendar in general, and the relationship of this to *Accession Day* in particular. The Bible teaches that there is a universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Rom. 1:7; 8:27; 12:13; 16:2,15; Philp. 1:1; 4:21). The Bible also isolates certain saints to hold them up before the body of believers as worthy examples (Rom. 1:8; Philp. 3:17; I Thess. 1:7; II Thess. 3:9; I Tim. 4:12; Heb. 11; I Peter 3:6; 5:3). E.g., St. James says, "Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience" (emphasis mine). Of course, all these examples of the saints point us ultimately to Christ, as St. Peter says, "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps" (I Peter 2:21, emphasis mine). Other than the weekly sabbath which is required of Christians (e.g., Exod. 20:8-11; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10), the Scriptures also give Christians a discretion to either keep or not keep holy days, religious feast days, or religious fast days (Rom. 14:5,6). This is also seen in the NT spirit of toleration urged between Jewish Christians having an option of keeping a Christ recognizing form of the Jewish liturgical year (e.g., Acts 16:13; 17:1,2; 20:6,16), or the Christian Sunday (as both groups did at Corinth, I Cor. 12:13; 14:16; 16:2), and Gentile Christians who were forbidden to keep the Jewish liturgical year (Gal. 4:10,11; I Cor. 16:1,2); where we read in Col. 2:16, "Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of an holyday."

Against the backdrop of such Biblical teaching, it has been the wisdom of the Anglican Church in her 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* to remember the example of certain saints on certain days; as well as looking to the contemporary *legally Protestant example* of a given Sovereign as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* on

Accession Day, although *Accession Day* also contains *additional elements unique to a Head of State* (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:7; I Peter 2:17). However, Article 34 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* also recognizes that other fellow Protestant Christians, such as Puritans, may choose to not keep such days, and that this constitutes legitimate diversity among the body of believers in the wider catholic or universal church.

The Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, upholding the Protestant teaching of the universal sainthood of all believers, bestows her first degree of honour on all faithful departed. E.g., in the prayer “for the whole state of Christ’s Church militant here in earth,” at The Communion Service, we find the words, “O Lord, ... we ... bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to give us grace so as to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.” A second degree of honour are memorials or plaques e.g., to faithful departed saints placed in a church, or a Christian grave which may be dug in a churchyard to remember suchlike. This is very limited to a local church.

The Anglican Church then bestows her third degree of honour on many saints in churches that bear their name, and who left behind an example in some way worthy of emulation, but whose special memory is thus local, and whose names were not placed on the Calendar of the 1662 prayer book. E.g., St. Christopher’s *Church of England* Pott Shrigley, in Cheshire, England, or St. Christopher’s *Church of Ireland*, Belfast, Northern Ireland. But historically there are not many Anglican Churches dedicated in memory of Christopher, a third century Christian martyr, and his memory has not been regarded by Anglicans as sufficiently significant to put him on the Calendar. Thus if one wanted to put a special focus on his example, and remember him in a given year, one would do so by referring to him on All Saints’ Day (1 Nov.), which is a general catch-all red-letter day. Or in the Evangelical Anglican *Diocese of Sydney*, there is St. Basil’s Church, Artarmon, which is named after St. Basil the Great (d. 379), and when the foundation stone of this church was laid in 1912 by the Archbishop of Sydney (John Wright), St. Basil was not on the Calendar, although he is referred to in the Homilies of Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*. (Basil was later given a black letter day on 14 June on the alternative 1978 Calendar of *An Australian Prayer Book*, whose title page says it is “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662.” This is one of only a small number of black letter day additions that I would agree with to the 1662 Calendar.) Or St. John’s Parramatta, which is a Pro-Cathedral for the Bishop of Parramatta (an auxiliary bishop appointed by the Archbishop of Sydney,) was named in memory of the early New South Wales Governor, John Hunter (d. 1821), a Presbyterian.

The Anglican Church bestows her fourth degree of honour on certain saints by placing their names on the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar as black letter days. These persons have no religious service or memory required on their day, since for those so given black letter days, their inclusion on the calendar indicates that they are figures of historical significance to the *Church of England*, who in some way, however limited, set a good example. In the absence of any collects or office, nothing of detail is specifically said about them; and so what one thinks of those on the Calendar with black letter days is largely left to private judgement.

Then in her 1662 prayer book, the Anglican Church places her fifth degree of honour on certain saints worthy of emulation with a red-letter day; and also red-letter days on matters connected with the liturgical year's three focal points of Christmas (with Advent and Epiphany), Good Friday and Easter Day (with Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Lent, Easter, with following Sundays after Easter, Ascension Day, & Whitsunday also known as Pentecost), and Trinity Sunday (with following Sundays after Trinity). These days have their own Collects and Lessons (Bible readings) for Matins (Mattins), Evensong, and Holy Communion, provided in the BCP.

In the Sundays after Epiphany, and preceding Lent, there are three Sundays known as "Septuagesima," "Sexagesima," and "Quinquagesima." These refer to the period of ten days during which they fall, and hence in the longer Latin titles they are derived from *Septuagesima* is abbreviated from, "Dominica in Septuagesima" meaning "Sunday in the seventieth," that is, the set of 10 days between 70 and 61 days before Easter, being 63 days before Easter Sunday; *Sexagesima* is abbreviated from, "Dominica in Sexagesima," meaning "Sunday in the sixtieth," that is, the set of 10 days between 60 and 51 days before Easter, being 56 days before Easter Sunday; and *Quinquagesima* is abbreviated from, "Dominica in Quinquagesima" meaning "Sunday in the fiftieth," that is, the set of 10 days between 50 and 41 days before Easter, being 49 days before Easter Sunday. And so these three Sundays, "Septuagesima," "Sexagesima," and "Quinquagesima," begin the liturgical cycle that passes through Lent and culminates with Easter. The period of Lent is the forty days of fasting or abstinence from Ash Wednesday to Easter Even (the Saturday Before Easter Sunday) inclusive, but excludes all the Sundays in this period because Sunday is ALWAYS a Feast day and NEVER a Fast Day. The period of Lent recalls the example of Christ's "forty days" of fasting, and hence the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Communion reading for the Gospel on *The First Sunday in Lent* is Matthew 4:1-11, recording that Christ "fasted forty days and forty nights," and so it looks to four lots of ten days as the model for Lent. It is the model of these forty decimal days of four lots of ten days, that gives the propriety to the usage of decimal days in the reckoning of *Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima*, and *Quinquagesima*, all of which are preparatory to this season of Lent. Hence one goes over four Sundays from the set of ten days from 70 days (*Septuagesima*), to the set of ten days from 60 days (*Sexagesima*), to the set of 10 days from 50 days (*Quinquagesima*), to Lent which is four lots of 10 days of fasting or abstinence or 40 days; i.e., from 70 decimal days, to 60 decimal days, to 50 decimal days, to 40 decimal days.

A complicating factor is that red-letter days falling in Lent are also feast days not fast days. This results in the question of what to do when this happens with e.g., Annunciation Day (25 March) or St. Mark's Day (25 April), or the black letter day of St. George's Day (23 April) where by local tradition such as in England it is more generally kept with celebrations remembering St. George as the national saint of England (or in a local church outside of England known as "St. George's" which is dedicated to God in special memory for the life and example of George), or the black letter day of St. Patrick's Day (17 March) (which though absent from the 1662 Calendar has been added as an option in e.g., Australia, 1978, or England, 1980,) where by local tradition such as

in parts of Sydney Australia or Ireland it is more generally kept with celebrations? E.g., for 2013 the red-letter day of St. Matthias's Day (24 Feb.) falls after the start of Lent (Wed. 13 Feb. 2013); as does the black-letter day of St. David's Day (Fri. 1 March 2013) and by local tradition in Wales it is more generally kept with celebrations remembering St. David as the national saint of Wales (or it may be remembered by local tradition in a local church outside of Wales known as "St. David's" which is dedicated to God in special memory for the life and example of David). Some choose to keep suchlike as feast days like the Sundays in Lent; others may let them lapse; and others may, for instance, transfer them e.g., one might transfer Annunciation to a nearby Sunday which is already a feast day. The rubric of *An Australian Prayer Book* of 1978 (AAPB), which like parts or all of its alternative Calendar is optional since it is "For use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662," says, "When the Annunciation (March 25) or feast of Saint Mark (April 25) fall between the Sunday next before Easter and the Sunday after Easter, the observance may lapse or be kept on the second Tuesday after Easter" i.e., after Lent in Easter Week (AAPB, p. 304).

These red-letter days which receive the fifth degree of honour, have their own Collects and Lessons (Bible readings) for Matins (Mattins), Evensong, and Holy Communion, provided in the BCP. The term, "red-letter day," comes from the tradition, found in *some* printings of the BCP, (and also the AAPB,) of printing the names of such days on the Calendar in red ink. Even though many other editions of the BCP (such as my working copy which is a 2008 printing of a 2004 Cambridge University Press edition,) uses just black ink at "THE CALENDAR with the table of lessons," and makes this distinction by putting red-letter days in black ink with italics, e.g., "*All Saints' Day*" (1 Nov. a red-letter day) as opposed to "Agnes," a "Virgin and Martyr" (21 Jan., a black letter day), nevertheless, in the Anglican tradition known to me one still uses the terminology of "red-letter days" and "black-letter days."

Subject to a small number of exceptions and qualifications, the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 reserves such red-letter days for events or figures from the New Testament. The first Protestant qualification is that in the *Church of Ireland*, from 1663-1665 and 1801-1859, and bearing in mind that the *Church of Ireland* as part of the *United Church of England and Ireland* used the 1662 prayer book between 1801 and 1859, there was a red-letter day type status attached to *Irish Massacre Day* on 23 October, which required that on this day a Church Service be held remembering the massacre of Protestants in Ireland by Papists in 1641. Thus *Irish Massacre Day* was a Protestant exception to red-letter days being from the NT from 1663-1665 and 1801-1859 (although from 1666-1800 it received the seventh degree of honour, *infra*). A second Protestant qualification is that since the massacre of Protestants by Papists in Paris, France, in 1572, the red-letter St. Bartholomew's Day on 24 August *may* carry a specifically Protestant connotation through reference to the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in e.g., the sermon. An important exception to red-letter days is All Saints' Day (1 Nov.) which may be used to remember a saint or saints from any age; and in this connection, a third Protestant qualification is that by tradition the Eve of All Saints' Day is used to remember Luther and the Reformation. (And in more recent times, this memory may be transferred to the nearby Sunday when it does not fall on a Sunday.) Thus All Saints'

Day is a general catch-all for those with no specific red-letter day memory on the Calendar. And so local church tradition may vary a good deal as to who is remembered on All Saints' Day, and indeed, even in the same church, those selected for special memory on All Saints' Day may vary a good deal from year to year.

Another exception and qualification to this relates to the name of an Anglican Church or its Chapel(s). (By extension this may also apply, though does not necessarily so apply, to the memory of a national saint. E.g., St. George's Day in England.) The rubric of *An Australian Prayer Book* (1978) says, "The anniversary of a church's dedication and the observance appropriate to the name of the church may be observed as red-letter days; such observance may be kept on the next available Sunday" (AAPB, p. 304). But this merely states what was an established practice with the *Book of Common Prayer*, although transferring days to the Sunday before or after if they are on a weekday is a newer idea which has been accepted as *one possible option* due to the exigencies of modern society in which many people have insuperable difficulties in getting to church on a weekday. E.g., while the *Church of Ireland* historically remembered the national saint of Ireland, St. Patrick (d. 461), in a number of ways, e.g., in their Cathedral Churches named "St. Patrick," for good contextual cause, they did not have St. Patrick's Day (17 March) on their Calendar till the twentieth century¹⁴⁰. But though St. Patrick is on neither the Calendar of the 1662 Anglican prayer book which was used in Ireland from 1801 to 1871, nor the *Church of Ireland's* 1666 prayer book used till 1800; we know of the local celebration of St. Patrick's Day in, for instance, St. Patrick's *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Dublin in 1756¹⁴¹.

¹⁴⁰ While I support St. Patrick's Day as one of the small number of black letter days (17 March) on the alternative 1978 Calendar "for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662," it should also be clearly understood that my support for having Patrick on the Calendar is *provisional*, for precisely the same reasons that it was historically not on the Irish Calendar, for instance, abuse of the day by Roman Catholics to harm Protestants and / or damage Protestant Churches. The Romanists of Ireland also used St. Patrick's Day as part of an anti-Crown sentiment, and it was not till after the partition of Ireland into Northern Ireland and southern Ireland in 1922, that the *Church of Ireland* considered they could safely place the day on their Calendar from 1926. But if such violence towards Protestants and / or their Churches, should again come to be connected with St. Patrick's Day in the north and / or the south of Ireland, or opposition to the Crown in the north, then my *provisional* support for having this day on the Calendar would be withdrawn. However, even if this were to occur, (and I hope so sad an event will not be deemed necessary,) like the historic *Church of Ireland*, I would still recognize St. Patrick as the motif saint of Ireland, and support this in such manifestations as e.g., the St. Patrick's Cross (a red shaped "X," found e.g., on the Union Jack in the top left corner of the Australian Flag).

¹⁴¹ William Henry, *Love of our Country: A sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Dublin, March 17th, 1756* (Dublin, Ireland, 1756); cited in Barnard, C.I., "The Uses of 23 October 1641 & Irish Protestant Celebrations," *The English Historical Review*, 1991, (Oxford University Press,) pp. 889-920, at p. 919.

So too, on the BCP Calendar, Swithun (d. 862), a former Bishop of Winchester, has a black letter day on 15 July. But on Sunday 17 July 2011, I attended a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Service at St. Swithun's Pymble in Sydney, which had transferred remembrance of Swithun to that Sunday (Trinity Sunday 4) and deemed St. Swithun's Day as red-letter day. Likewise, 3 February is the black letter day of the "First Christian service in Australia, conducted by Richard Johnson, Sydney, 1788," and this is one of only a small number of black letter days on the alternative 1978 Australian Calendar "for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662," that I support *as additions to, not as a replacement of, the 1662 Calendar*. But Richard Johnson (d. 1827) is remembered at St. Philip's York Street in the inner City of Sydney in that Church's *Richard Johnson Chapel*, and St. Philip's is also custodian of certain Richard Johnson memorabilia; and thus I have attended a number of 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Services at St. Philip's where Richard Johnson's Day is transferred to either the Sunday before or after 3 February, and this memory of Richard Johnson is by local tradition elevated to the status of a red-letter day.

A further special sixth degree of honour is given to the red-letter days of Christmas, Easter, Ascension Day, Whit-Sunday, and Trinity Sunday, all of which have Proper Prefaces at *The Communion Service*. And in this connection, *Christmas Day* (with Advent and Epiphany), *Good Friday* and *Easter Day* (with Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Lent, Easter, with following Sundays after Easter, Ascension Day, & Whitsunday also known at Pentecost), and *Trinity Sunday* (with following Sundays after Trinity), form three focal points for the liturgical year.

And a special seventh degree of honour, may be placed on certain red-letter days by giving them an Office or Service. This the very highest degree of honour that she can bestow, the Anglican Church declares in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (and also the Church of Ireland's 1666-1800 prayer book,) she only gives to *Protestant* figures from the time of the Reformation onwards, for it is Protestant Christianity that is true Christianity. From 1662 to 1859 such honour was bestowed on King James I and King William III in the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*; upon King Charles I in the Office of *King Charles Martyr's Day*¹⁴²; upon King Charles II with regard to his preservation during the interregnum and Restoration in 1660 in the Office of *Restoration of the Royal Family* on Royal Oak Day. And in the case of the *Church of Ireland*, in addition to these three Offices, there was from 1666 to 1800 also the fifth Office of *Irish Massacre Day* remembering the events of Papists massacring Protestants in Ireland in 1641 (although

¹⁴² *King Charles I's Day* shows an unusual movement through these varying degrees of honour, being at the seventh degree of honour in the 1662 prayer book till 1859; then at the third degree of honour with *King Charles the Martyr's Churches*; then being raised to the fourth degree of honour with a black letter day in Canada (1962), Australia (1978), and England (1980); and being potentially raised to the fifth degree of honour in England where since 1980 it is also an optional red-letter day. He has also sometimes received a second degree of local church honour e.g., a 1649-1899 250th anniversary bust of him at Carisbrooke Castle Chapel, Isle of Wight, England.

from 1663-1665 and 1801-1859 it received the fifth degree of honour, *supra*). But since 1859, the Anglican Church has only one such red-letter day with an Office, and that is the Office of *Accession Day* for a reigning Sovereign. We are thus reminded that it because of the importance of the symbol of the Protestantism of the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, that this red-letter day with its own Office, is to this day, found in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. It is the lone survivor of this, the Anglican Church's very highest liturgical honour, reserved exclusively for Protestants. This *Accession Service* is issued by Royal Warrant of each successive monarch¹⁴³.

Another point of continuation is found in the firing of canons. Before 1859 canons were fired throughout *Papists' Conspiracy Day* on 5 November. So too, salutes are still fired in the United Kingdom throughout *Accession Day* on 6 February. In the capital city of London, a Royal Salute is fired with guns by the King's Troop, by the Royal Horse Artillery at Hyde Park, and at London Tower by the Honourable Artillery Company. So too Royal Salutes are fired in London at Woolwich; more widely in England at Colchester, York, Plymouth, and Dover Castle; in Northern Ireland at Belfast; in Wales at Cardiff; and in Scotland at Stirling Castle and Edinburgh Castle¹⁴⁴. A number of these places are known to me, and for the interested reader, I include on my website photos of Dover Castle (taken on my Christmas-New Year UK mainland trip in 2001-2), and Stirling Castle (taken on my Oct. / Nov. UK mainland trip in 2008).

On the principles of hagiology evident in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 any red-letter days with Offices are limited to those from Protestant history. Since 1859 this has been limited to *Accession Day*¹⁴⁵. This acts to uphold the legally Protestant throne, and thus celebrates Protestantism. Therefore, *Accession Day* is not a saint's day for the general life of a reigning monarch, but rather is focused on the big

¹⁴³ My matrilineal grandmother, Alma Davis (1890-1986), was a young girl when Queen Victoria died in 1901. But via this Anglican grandmother and my Anglican mother (b. 1924), I have been the recipient of some prayer books dating from the time of Victoria to the present monarch of Elizabeth II. For a discussion of some relevant *Accession Service* Royal Warrants in ten *Books of Common Prayer* dating from the time of Victoria through to the present time, see Appendix 5: "Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb. 2012)."

¹⁴⁴ "Accession Day," *Wikipedia* (Oct. 2011) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Accession_Day).

¹⁴⁵ A qualified exception to this is the "Commination." In the 1549 prayer book this was a fixed Office for Ash Wednesday; in the 1552 prayer book this became a service for "divers[e] times in the year;" and in the 1662 prayer book it became a service for Ash Wednesday, and "at other times, as the Ordinary shall appoint." The fact this Protestant Service may be said "[sitting in] the reading pew or [standing in the] pulpit" is noteworthy, since in this specific form of a "reading pew" - called in Canon 82 of the 1603 Constitutions & Canons Ecclesiastical "a convenient seat ... for the Minister to read service in," this is a piece of Anglican Protestant church furniture (traceable since 1569).

thing of a legally Protestant monarch and royal family, and also contains some elements unique to a Head of State with regard to such passages as e.g., I Peter 2:17, “Fear God. Honour the king.”

The English Common Law jurist, Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780), records how “in the reign of Henry VIII,” “Papal power was abolished, and the king was declared the Head of the Church of England¹⁴⁶.” The title used by Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547) and Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547-1553) of “Supreme Head” of the Church in England (and Ireland) “as far as the law of Christ allows,” became under Elizabeth I (Regnal years 1558-1603) “Supreme Governor” of the Church in England (and Ireland), and hence the current title is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*. The title is significant as Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, “The King’s Majesty hath the chief power in the Realm of England, and other his Dominions, ... whether ... Ecclesiastical or Civil, ... and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. ... The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm” This isolates a fundamental *raison d’être* for the *Accession Service*. The highest liturgical honour of the Anglican Church, which is a red-letter day with its own Office / Service, has always been limited to Protestant figures; and in the case of the *Accession Service* we remember that because the Sovereign is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, nobody else is, including therefore the Roman Pope. It is because “The King’s Majesty hath the chief power ... whether ... Ecclesiastical or Civil,” that “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction” (Article 37, 39 Articles). This therefore is the element of Protestantism especially safeguarded by the *Accession Service*.

A monarch as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith* is required to give his allegiance to the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and 39 Articles. We thus celebrate a constitutionally Protestant monarch, but we do not thereby necessarily endorse anything that the particular monarch in question has done, or will do. Indeed, within reasonable bounds as royalists, we may be critical of some of the actions of a given monarch, and still celebrate *Accession Day* because we accept the propriety of the big thing, namely, a constitutionally Protestant monarchy.

In this context, I have previously expressed some of my concerns about the heir apparent, Prince Charles¹⁴⁷. His desire to move the monarchy from being *Defender of the Faith* to “Defender of faith” i.e., making this applicable to such religious “Faiths” as Judaism or Mohammedanism, is a most serious concern¹⁴⁸. *Let us pray. O heavenly*

¹⁴⁶ Sir William Blackstone’s *Laws of England*, Vol. 1, (1765 A.D.), pp. 284-285 (abbreviated as 1 Bl. Com. 284-5).

¹⁴⁷ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “(3) The ‘Father’ Huddelston Saga.”

¹⁴⁸ This has sometimes been misreported as “Defender of Faiths,” something the Prince has never agreed to. But his view about being a “Defender of faith” means he will defend various forms of faith, e.g., the infidel faith of the Jew or Mohammedan, and he also works with the inter-Faith compromise between Christian and non-Christians.

Father, turn the heart of Prince Charles to thee with saving faith in thy Son Jesus Christ. Lead and guide him to humbly seek to do thy directive will in all matters of State and Church, that he may be a fit and proper person to become Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith. And this we ask in the precious name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the power of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

I also now express my deep concern that the royal marriage of Prince William to Miss Kate Middleton in 2011 was to a woman whose spirituality at 29 years of age was so low that she had not been Confirmed, although we can be glad and relieved to learn that she was then Confirmed at St. James's Palace on 10 March 2011, just afore the marriage on 29 April 2011 at Westminster Abbey in London. However, Miss Middleton did not vow to "to obey" her "husband" as found in *The Solemnization of Matrimony Service* of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (Eph. 5:24; Col. 3:18; I Peter 3:5,6). But more than this, *The Solemnization of Matrimony Service* says that one of the reasons "Matrimony was ordained" is "for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ's body" (I Cor. 7:2-7).

Prince William married a woman with whom, it is public knowledge that he carnally knew her afore their marriage. E.g., at the time of their announced marriage, Prince Charles referred to them having been "practicing long enough" as man and wife¹⁴⁹. Did she carnally know any other man before her marriage? Camilla Parker Bowles who married Prince Charles in 2005 is the first woman; and Kate Middleton in 2011 is now the second woman; who though not a virgin has married a close heir apparent to the throne, since Henry VIII wisely introduced a law forbidding this. The law was introduced after the scandal surfaced of how Henry VIII's fifth wife, Catherine Howard, had not been a virgin on her marriage bed with Henry. That is because a women who is not a virgin on her marriage bed, by her fornication commits pre-emptive adultery against any other man she then subsequently marries (Deut. 22:13-21; Matt. 1:18-21; 5:32; 19:9). Thus on 11 February 1542 Parliament passed a Henrician law declaring it treason for a woman who was not a virgin to marry the king. Two days later the unchaste Catherine Howard was justly executed at the Tower of London¹⁵⁰.

This is clearly an unsatisfactory position for one to hold who will, in the normal course of events, become *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*. Let us pray God, through Jesus Christ, that the Lord yet turns the Prince's heart to uphold the Protestant Christian faith to the exclusion of all others. "Our Father, ... Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven ... Amen" (Matt. 6:9,10,13).

¹⁴⁹ "Word Needed in Prince William's Ear," *English Churchman*, A Protestant Family Newspaper, 3 & 10 Dec. 2010 (EC 7807), p. 1.

¹⁵⁰ While as a general rule I would not support capital punishment for such an offence in the Christian era, I would certainly make it a divorce cause where there has been no condonation. I would also support execution in those rare and unusual cases where there was the added element of the public interest. Thus with Henry VIII's fifth wife this added element of the public interest meant that to simply divorce her for pre-

In an age when there are many marital breakups, and these are in part related to the values of feminism which seeks to subvert patriarchy and e.g., cause tensions between the objectives of the husband's career and those of a wife's career, or the creation of festering sores in marriage since the man is denied his God given capacity to call upon his wife to obey him, or allows numerous women to divorce for frivolous and unnecessary reasons (which they may later regret) due to her economic independence; and also in an era where fornication has resulted in callousness of human hearts so that conjugal rights within marriage no longer act to bond a man and his wife together as strongly as they once did; there must surely be real concerns for these unwarranted departures from the Biblical doctrine found in *The Solemnization of Matrimony Service* by the irregularities in the marriage service of Miss Kate Middleton and HRH Prince William. I am also concerned that their example acts to say to others, "It's okay if a woman doesn't vow to obey her husband; or if you fornicate before marriage, because William and Kate did." *Let us pray. O Almighty God, bring William and Kate to a true repentance of their sins, that turning to thy Son, Jesus Christ in saving faith, that may loathe themselves for their former conduct, and move forward by putting themselves under thy directive will, and by being careful to obey all thy holy commandments; and this we ask in Jesus name. Amen.*

Certainly one should not think that this type of thing with Prince Charles or Prince William is a new or novel concern with regard to monarchs. E.g., Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), sadly entered a mixed marriage, and also engaged in acts of adultery which resulted in the births of various bastards.

Or George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820), engaged in adultery. He sought a divorce, but was advised against it, in part because of his own adulterous relationship. An unpopular Bill to remove the title of "Queen" from his consort, Caroline, was withdrawn; although she was excluded from the coronation at Westminster Abbey on 19 July 1821. Caroline fell ill on that day, and died shortly later on 7 Aug. 1821.

George IV proved to be a weak and unreliable king. When the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill was presented to him on 29 Jan. 1829, he signed it *under duress* from the Duke of Wellington. Then after discussion with his brother, the Duke of

emptive adultery before their marriage would leave a former queen around as a focal point of disloyalty and possible rebellion against the Crown, and this, together with the very bad example that it gives to the people, which might have been an ongoing example encouraging sexual immorality which would bring further disgrace to the Crown, (even though she would by this time be a former wife,) means that I consider the execution of Catherine Howard was a fair usage of the death penalty. But the absence of this element of the public interest in most cases of this type, would mean that in my opinion, in general such a penalty would not be appropriate in the Christian era.

Cumberland, the king rightly withdrew his approval which had been given under duress. The anti-Protestant and pro-secularist Cabinet resigned *en masse* on 4 March. *They had done the king a favour by resigning, and he should have been glad to be rid of them, turning as required to various Members of the Lords and Commons to put together a better government, perhaps followed by fresh elections for the Commons.* But George IV, a known drunkard, instead (metaphorically speaking,) collapsed like a drunkard on the ground; and gave this dreadful secularist Bill his Royal Assent on 13 April 1828. Thus Popish “idolatry” (Gal. 5:19-21) and the false gospel of justification by a combination of faith and works (Gal. 1:6-9) rather than justification by faith alone (Gal. 3:12), together with all the hazards and dangers of the Antichrist operating with a legal freedom (Matt. 24:5,23,24; II Thess. 2:1-12; I Tim. 4:1-5; I John 2:18,22; 4:1-3; II John 7), now came to the United Kingdom. At the time of his death, the newspaper, *The [London] Times* of 15 July 1830, said, “There never was an individual less regretted by his fellow-creatures than this deceased king. What eye has wept for him? ... If he ever had a friend ... we protest that the name of him or her never reached us¹⁵¹.”

Yet would such concerns with regard to Charles II have stopped good Anglican Protestants from using the Office celebrating *Royal Oak Day* on 29 May before 1859? Or would such concerns with George IV have stopped good Anglican Protestants from using the Office celebrating *Accession Day* on 26 June during the reign of George IV? *Absolutely not!* For in doing so, we would be celebrating a constitutionally Protestant monarchy, even if the person holding that office was something less than fully worthy of so great an honour and privilege, for which reason it would be the duty of those living under his reign to pray God for his repentance; as indeed it is our duty today, to e.g., pray for Prince Charles’ repentance and turning God-ward in Christian faith, whereby he seeks the defence of the Protestant Christian faith *alone!*

Indeed, the same is true for Elizabeth II, who has not been without blemish. E.g., one particular concern is her longstanding support for the inter-faith compromise with non-Christian religions. For instance, Marcus Braybrooke says, “in 1953, in response to Queen Elizabeth II’s request at the time of her coronation that people of all religions pray for her, a public [prayer] service was arranged. Thereafter, for many years, the World Congress of Faiths arranged an Annual All Faiths Service¹⁵².” Moreover, it is known that Elizabeth II has attended “multi-faith worship” or “inter-faith worship” services at Westminster Abbey in London, which include infidels and heathens who make no profession to be Christians. Indeed, this is “Britain’s largest inter-faith service¹⁵³.”

¹⁵¹ “George IV,” *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_IV_of_the_United_Kingdom).

¹⁵² Braybrooke, M., “Wider Vision: A History of the World Congress of Faiths, 1936-1996,” section, “Interfaith prayer” (<http://www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=3378&C=2779>).

¹⁵³ “Science to be at the heart of Britain’s largest inter-faith gathering,” *The Gambia Echo*, Online Newspaper, Tues. 18 Oct., 2011 (<http://www.thegambiaecho.com/Homepage/tabid/36/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/1>).

Furthermore, the Queen's actions in May 2007 show both the ecumenical compromise with non-Protestant Christian Churches who deny the Gospel (Gal. 1:6-9; 3:12) such as Roman Catholics who engage in what Galatians 5 calls "idolatry" and various "heresies" (Gal. 5:19-21; cf. I Cor. 11:19; II Peter 2:1); and the inter-faith compromise with those who make no profession to be Christian (Mark 16:15,16; Eph. 2:12; Rev. 21:8). The *Three Faiths Forum* (TFF) Newsletter of Spring 2007, which seeks to bring together Mohammedan infidels, Jewish infidels, and "Christians" whether they be apostate (e.g., Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox) or "orthodox" (although, of course, no religiously conservative Protestant who unites with them is truly orthodox); reported "Leaders of the nine major faiths were present at Buckingham Palace on 18th May 2007 when ... Elizabeth II was presented with a specially struck interfaith Gold Medallion with diamond. The award was conferred ... for the lead the Queen has given personally in the search for mutual tolerance, respect and brotherhood." "Those present" "included" "Bishop Tom Butler" of the "Church of England," "Mark Fisher" of the "Free Churches Group," "Archbishop Kevin McDonald" of the "[Roman] Catholic Church," a "Jewish" "Chief Rabbi Sir Jonathan Sacks," and representatives from, e.g., the "Interfaith Network," "Muslim College," "Sikh Organisations," the "Bahai's," the "Zoroastrian Community," the "Jain Community," and the "Hindu Community"¹⁵⁴."

These matters are necessarily most grievous to us, and are a serious dereliction of duty by the Queen in her duty to be *Defender of the Faith as Supreme Governor of the Church of England*. What saith the Word of God as to how we are to deal with this?

When one looks at the OT kings of Israel and Judah, one finds a mixture. E.g., on the good side, for instance, "Josiah" "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in all the way of David his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left" (II Kgs 22:1,2). But on the bad side, for instance, "Ahaz" "did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord his God, like David his father. But he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, yea, and made his son to pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel. And he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree" (II Kgs 16:1-4). In between, we read of some kings who generally did good, but to this the qualification was made that they tolerated the inter-faith compromise. For instance, "Jehoash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all his days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him," to which the qualification is then made, "But the high places were not taken away: the people still sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places" (II Kgs 12:2,3). Similar qualifications are then made for Amaziah (II Kgs 14:1-4) and Azariah (II Kgs 15:1-4).

[830/Default.aspx](#)).

¹⁵⁴ "Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II receives Interfaith Gold Medallion," *Muslim · Christian · Jewish Dialogue*, The Newsletter of the Three Faiths Forum, Spring 2007 (http://www.threefaithsforum.org.uk/PDF/TFF_0607.pdf).

It seems to me that when we look at the record of Elizabeth II, she has been like this third group, a mix of good and bad. If she is judged within the paradigm of one who considers the role of the monarch is essentially titular or ceremonial, then she may be relieved of much of the responsibility for many bad and immoral decisions in church and state that have occurred during her reign. Yet this is still not entirely so.

For example, in her 2011 Christmas Message broadcast in Australia on 25 Dec. 2011 with a number of family pictures around her, including one of her father, George VI, we see both the good and bad side of the Queen on Christian matters. On the upside, e.g., she referred to “this great Christian festival,” “God-given love,” and gave a free quote of Luke 2:10,11 from the Authorized Version. The Queen also said, “God sent into the world a unique person, ... a Saviour with the power to forgive. Forgiveness lies at the heart of the Christian faith” And as a band played the Christmas Carol “O little town of Bethlehem” in the background, she said, “in the last verse of this beautiful carol, ‘O little town of Bethlehem,’ there’s a prayer, ‘O holy child of Bethlehem, descend to us we pray, cast out our sin, and enter in, be born in us today.’ It is my prayer, that on this Christmas Day, we might all find room in our lives for the message of the angels and for the love of God through Christ our Lord. I wish you all a very happy Christmas.” *We thank God for these type of positive Christian statements.*

But there is also a tragic downside. E.g., in this same Christmas Message of 2011, the Queen gratuitously gave coverage and Christian recognition to a Romanist School in London¹⁵⁵. *We pray God that the Queen might repent of suchlike.*

Personally, I consider that a person in the Queen’s position has a duty to be something more than a titular or ceremonial rubber stamp when it comes to matters of clear Protestant Biblical principles, so that e.g., in the area of the State, I consider she should have moved to inhibit coloured immigration or immigration of non-Protestant whites into the UK, refused Royal Assent to anti-race discrimination or anti-sex discrimination legislation, refused Royal Assent to abortion legislation etc., and done likewise in Australia. And in the area of the *Church of England*, she should have moved to restrain to the maximum that she could, Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, religious liberals, the ordination of women priests; and to correspondingly do what she could to the maximum to nurture, foster, and encourage traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglicans who uphold the absolute authority of Scripture, believe in the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost (or new birth), and the orthodox Anglican teachings of the 39 Articles and *Book of Common Prayer*. I consider the non-elected position of a monarch is one of the checks and balances to allow for this type of thing. Nevertheless, even if judged within the paradigm of a largely ceremonial or titular monarchy, a human being is not a puppet, and must be held accountable before God for actions that clearly violate his holy Word and commandment. In this context, something like the ecumenical compromise with non-Protestants such as Roman Catholics, or the inter-faith

¹⁵⁵ St. Joseph’s Romanist Infants’ School, Pitman Street, Camberwell, London, SE5 OTS. (This snippet of a Roman Catholic School also acted to promote multi-racial images, contrary to the white race based nationalism of Gen. 10:1-5.)

compromise, is entirely unacceptable, and in my opinion, inexcusable.

Hence on the one hand, the Queen has, like Azariah, done “that which was right in the sight of the Lord” (II Kgs 15:3) in a number of things, e.g., her general dress standards, her clean and dignified manner of public speech, her acceptance and endorsement of the legal Protestantism of the throne as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, her positive references to Christian faith in some of her Christmas messages, and her endorsement of the King James Bible in her 2010 Christmas message which included a positive reference to the 400th anniversary of the King James Version in what was then the following year of 2011. She has indicated she prefers the more simple Low Church Anglican forms of worship, and she has lived a clean married life in which she has been free from any personal scandal such as engaging in adultery, a cheap divorce, or having an abortion. Rather, she has sought to present a dignified, positive, image of Queen, which has always included the trappings of the legal Protestantism of the throne, as further discussed below.

But on the other hand, like Azariah, “the high places” of the inter-faith compromise “were not removed” (II Kgs 15:4). Moreover, in the movement from the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State to the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State, I maintain that she should have been something more than “a mere rubber stamp” for lawmakers in the e.g., the UK, Canada, or Australia, who repealed God’s laws and put in their place so called “human rights,” libertinism, and flooded these countries with non-white and non-Protestant peoples. I do not say that a monarch might not remain titular or ceremonial in the general running of the government, but I do say that when these type of moral issues come to the fore, *every one of us must do what he can to uphold God’s laws, and not abdicate that responsibility by “taking the easy way out” of acquiescence.* Men have died, or paid high prices for their obedience to God, and while a monarch so acting risks great unpopularity with the Type 2 Secularist political apparatus, I believe each Christian must do what he can within his limited circle to advance the truth of God, and we must pay whatever price is necessary to DO RIGHT. God has given us his expected standard in Ps. 2:10-12, and the “kings” and “judges of the earth” need to listen “with trembling.”

Yet should such concerns stop good Protestants from remembering Queen Elizabeth’s *Accession Day* on 6 February or *Queen’s Birthday* in June? *Surely not.* In the first place, we are commanded in Scripture to “Honour the King” (I Peter 2:17). In the second place, we may still celebrate a legally Protestant Christian monarchy, even if the person holding that office is, in varying degrees depending on the monarch, something less than fully worthy of so great an honour and privilege. Of course, in doing so we still pray for their repentance and turning God-ward in Christian faith.

Let us pray.

O Lord God, heavenly Father, we pray for our Queen, Elizabeth II. We thank thee for the legal Protestant Christianity of the throne. We thank thee for the good she had done in upholding Christian values in her personal life of marriage, and in her

general dress and decorum, and dignified clean public speech. We thank thee for her acceptance and endorsement of the legal Protestantism of the throne as Supreme Governor of the Church of England. We thank thee that at times she has spoken of her Christian faith in Christmas Messages, and for her support of the King James Bible in her 2010 Christmas Message. But we pray thee, O Lord, that she repent of her involvement in the ecumenical and inter-faith compromises, turning instead to uphold, nurture, and foster, the religiously conservative Protestant Christian faith alone; for we ask thee that in this, and in all matters, she turns to put her life under thy directive will as set forth in thy Infallible Book, the Holy Bible. Be pleased, O Lord, to surround her with wise counselors. In this we pray, 'Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.' And all this we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

Both before and after 1859, *Accession Day* is attached to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* by Royal Warrant of the reigning Sovereign; as were the Offices / Services for *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, *Royal Oak Day*, and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* before 1859. Any such day is also referred to at the front of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer after the section entitled, "Days of Fasting, or Abstinence," and before the section entitled, "A Table to Find Easter Day." Thus e.g., in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer as published in the reign of Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901), before 1859 this read in a section entitled, "Certain Solemn Days, for which particular Services are appointed":

- I. The Fifth Day of *November*; being the Day kept in Memory of the Papists' Conspiracy.
- II. The Thirtieth Day of *January*; being the Day kept in Memory of the Martyrdom of King *Charles* the First.
- III. The Nine and Twentieth Day of *May*; being the Day kept in Memory of the Birth and Return of King *Charles* the Second.
- IV. The Twentieth Day of *June*; being the Day on which Her Majesty began her happy Reign¹⁵⁶.

But after 1859 this section before "A Table to Find Easter-Day" read in different printings of the Victorian prayer book, either, "A CERTAIN SOLEMN DAY FOR WHICH A PARTICULAR SERVICE IS APPOINTED"¹⁵⁷, or "A SOLEMN DAY, FOR WHICH A PARTICULAR SERVICE IS APPOINTED"¹⁵⁸, or "A *Solemn Day, for which*

¹⁵⁶ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland*, Published by Whittaker & Co., London, 1838 (British Library copy).

¹⁵⁷ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Published by William Collins, Sons, & Company, Publishers of Bibles, Prayer Books, and Church Services," [undated, but clearly after the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, so between 1871 and 1901]. This is one of three BCPs to come down to me from Victoria's time via my matrilineal grandmother and mother.

¹⁵⁸ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of*

*a particular Service is appointed*¹⁵⁹:

The Twentieth Day of *June*, being the Day on which Her Majesty began her happy Reign.

In Edwardian prayer books of Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901-1910), this reads after “A SOLEMN DAY, FOR WHICH A PARTICULAR SERVICE IS APPOINTED”:

The Twenty-second Day of *January*, being the Day on which His Majesty began his happy Reign¹⁶⁰.

In Georgian prayer books of George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936), this reads after “A SOLEMN DAY, FOR WHICH A PARTICULAR SERVICE IS APPOINTED”:

The Anniversary of the Day of the Accession of the Reigning Sovereign¹⁶¹.

England, WM Collins, Sons, & Co. Limited, [undated, but with handwriting in the front referring to “St Bedes ... Drummoyne Sydney” in “1901,” this is probably one of the last BCPs printed with Victoria’s Royal Warrant for the Accession Service]. This is one of three BCPs to come down to me from Victoria’s time via my matrilineal grandmother and mother.

¹⁵⁹ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Printed by Eyre & Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen’s most Excellent Majesty, London; *The Teacher’s Prayer Book* by the Right Rev. Alfred Barry, Assistant Bishop of Rochester, Late Bishop of Sydney, and Metropolitan Primate of Australia & Tasmania, with A Glossary by the Rev. A.L. Mayhew, Eyre & Spottiswoode, Queen’s Printers, London [undated, but with handwriting in the front referring to it being presented as a gift in “June 1894”]. This is one of three BCPs to come down to me from Victoria’s time via my matrilineal grandmother and mother.

¹⁶⁰ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, WM Collins, Sons, & Co. Limited, Oxford at the University Press, [undated, but containing the 1901 Royal Warrant of Edward VII for Accession Day, between 1901 and 1910]; and *Common Prayer* [i.e., 1662 BCP] with a *Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer*, 3rd edition, Revised & Enlarged, Longmans, Green, & Co. London, 1904. [The prayer book itself is undated, with no title page. But it contains the 1901 Royal Warrant of Edward VII for Accession Day. It also has an award sheet glued in the front from St. Barnabas’ Broadway in the City of Sydney which reads (showing in italics those parts added to this award sheet in handwriting), “St. Barnabas’ Sunday School, ... *First Prize*. Presented to *Alma Goode* for regular attendance and good conduct. 18th October, 1905 ... *M.E. Burrow* Teacher. Rev. W.A. Charlton, Rector ... ”.] These two BCPs come down to me from Edward VII’s time via my matrilineal grandmother, Alma Davis, and my mother.

¹⁶¹ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Oxford at the University Press, [undated, but containing the 1910 Royal Warrant of George V for Accession Day]. This BCP comes down to me from George V’s time via my matrilineal grandmother and mother.

It is to be noted that this Georgian prayer book goes from a specific Accession Day of the Sovereign as seen for Victoria and Edward VII, *supra*, to a general statement, “The Anniversary of the Day of the Accession of the Reigning Sovereign.” This revised formulae of words has been retained since that time. Thus in the Georgian prayer books of George VI (Regnal Years: 1936-1952), this also reads after “A SOLEMN DAY FOR WHICH A PARTICULAR SERVICE IS APPOINTED”:

The Anniversary of the Day of the Accession of the
Reigning Sovereign¹⁶².

So too, in the Elizabethan prayer books of Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952), we find this general formulae of words. My three printings of the BCP with a Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II for Accession Day vary slightly between printers, one places the title section in lower case, with a comma after “A Solemn Day¹⁶³,” another places the title section in upper case, with a comma after “A Solemn Day¹⁶⁴,” and the other places the title section in upper case, without a comma after “A Solemn Day¹⁶⁵.” Thus we find this still now reads per George V’s Accession Day, *supra*, “A SOLEMN DAY, FOR WHICH A PARTICULAR SERVICE IS APPOINTED”:

The Anniversary of the Day of the Accession of the Reigning Sovereign.

Forms of the *Accession Service* existed with, for instance, Queen Elizabeth I (1576) (Regnal Years: 1558-1603) or Charles I (1626). Under Cranmer’s Elizabethan

¹⁶² *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Cambridge Printed at the University Press [undated, but given to my Mother as a wedding day present from my grandparents, which includes the date of the marriage, “12th January 1952.” This would be one of the last BCPs to contain the 1947 Royal Warrant of George VI for Accession Day, revoking his earlier Royal Warrant of 1937, since he died less than a month later, with Elizabeth II acceding to the throne on 6 Feb. 1952]. This BCP is the property of my Mother.

¹⁶³ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Oxford at the University Press, [undated, but containing the 1953 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II for Accession Day, between 1953 and 1958]. This is one of two BCPs to come down to me from Elizabeth II’s time via my mother.

¹⁶⁴ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Oxford at the University Press, [undated, but containing the 1958 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II for Accession Day, this was in the house when I was a boy, and being born in 1960, this thus dates from either the later 1950s or early 1960s]. This is one of two BCPs to come down to me from Elizabeth II’s time via my mother.

¹⁶⁵ *The Book of Common Prayer, ... According to the use of the Church of England*, Cambridge University Press, Standard Edition, 2004, Reprinted 2008. I purchased this BCP from Elizabeth II’s time and it is my present working copy.

prayer book of 1559, *The New Calendar* of 1561, as revised 1578, includes at 17 November, after Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln (a black letter day), a reference to Elizabeth I. This says, “As upon this day, began most prosperously our most Sovereign Lady QUEEN ELIZABETH, to reign over us, *anno*. 1558, whom we beseech God long to continue in that government¹⁶⁶.” And indeed, Bray says, “17 November, the date of Queen Elizabeth’s accession in 1558, ... remained a holiday long after her death. Of course, there was an additional reason for this, in that it represented the restoration of Protestantism, and not just the accession of the monarch¹⁶⁷.” Indeed, 17 November celebrations were revived on two or three occasions with associated Bonfires from c. 2006-2008, though have now ceased. During this time, celebrations started with a church service of Evensong in the Anglican Church, and climaxed with a bonfire in which an effigy of Satan was burnt¹⁶⁸. Following the events of 1605, this type of sentiment was taken up in *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.), which in this sense more generally became the successor to “Queene’s Day” (17 Nov.), and in varying degrees continues to this day with e.g., Bonfire Night on 5 November throughout England.

But not only did the more widespread remembrance of 17 November continue for a long time after Elizabeth I’s death. The idea of celebrating *Accession Day* was an Elizabethan tradition adopted by subsequent monarchs, so that Accession Service Forms of Prayer were also issued for James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) (for 24 March) or Charles I (Regnal Years 1625-1649) (for 27 March)¹⁶⁹. However, in the case of Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), the

¹⁶⁶ *The Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth 1559*, With an Historical Introduction by Edward Benham, John Grant, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1909, pp. 194-205, *The New Calendar of 1578* (I have modernized spellings).

¹⁶⁷ Bray, G. (Editor), *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947*, Church of England Record Society in association with The Ecclesiastical Law Society, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, Suffolk, England, UK, 1998, p. 560, fn. 29.

¹⁶⁸ “Queene’s Day,” *Wikipedia* (Dec. 2009) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queene's_Day). These last two sentences now modified from Feb. 2012 edition by update 2015: I have since learnt from contact with the Parish Minister of the Rectory, Northgate, Totnes, that he has 8 churches in his parish, of which St. Mary’s *Church of England* Berry Pomeroy is one. He advised me in Aug. 2012 that Queene’s Day was no longer celebrated there; and for more details I could contact the Church Warden of Berry Pomeroy, Bernard Hawkins. Bernard Hawkins advised me in Aug. 2012 that there had been 2 or 3 such celebrations with associated Bonfires from c. 2006-2008, after they had been revived by a lay-preacher there, Charlie Lewis. But Charlie Lewis then died about 5 years before the time Bernard Hawkins so advised me of this i.e., c. 2008/9, at 41 years of age, leaving a widow and children.

¹⁶⁹ Fideler, P.A., & Mayer, T.F., *Political Thought & the Tudor Commonwealth*, Routledge, London, UK, 1992, p. 26 (D.R. Woolf).

Restoration of the King's Service was deemed sufficient, bearing in mind that his Accession Day of 30 January was the day of the martyrdom of his father which was remembered on *King Charles the Martyr's Day* in which there was also a secondary focus on Charles II in that Office. So too William III of Orange (Regnal Years: 1689-1702; joint reign with Mary II, 1689-1694), was remembered after his accession in modifications made to *Papists' Conspiracy Day*.

The *Accession Service* of James II (1685) (Regnal Years: 1685-1688), was modified from the time of Queen Anne (Regnal Years: 1702-1714) and with slight modification remained the same till Queen Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901). This included some elements subsequently removed from 1901. E.g., under the 1837 Royal Warrant as preserved under the 1859 Royal Warrant, instead of the Venite (Psalm 95) at Mattins (Matins), there was a Hymn that included the words, "Behold, O God our defender: and look upon the face of thine anointed" (Ps. 84:9, Psalter, 1662 BCP). Or the prayer, "Most gracious God, who hast set thy Servant Victoria our Queen upon the throne of her ancestors, we most humbly beseech thee to protect her on the same from all the dangers to which she may be exposed; hide her from the gathering together of the froward, and from the insurrection of wicked doers; do thou weaken the hands, blast the designs, and defeat the enterprizes of all her enemies, that no secret conspiracies, nor open violences, may disquiet her reign; but that, being safely kept under the shadow of thy wing, and supported by thy power, she may triumph over all opposition: that so the world may acknowledge thee to be her defender and mighty deliverer in all difficulties and adversities; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

Or, with the words "the defence of thy Faith" alluding to the monarch's title as, "Defender of the Faith," and the words "duty to promote the spiritual welfare" and "the temporal interest of their people" looking to something more than a largely ceremonial or titular monarch in church and state, one of the Collects removed from the revised *Accession Service* from 1901 said, "Blessed Lord, who hast called Christian Princes to the defence of thy Faith, and hast made it their duty to promote the spiritual welfare, together with the temporal interest of their people; we acknowledge with humble and thankful hearts thy great goodness to us, in setting thy Servant our most gracious Queen over this Church and Nation; Give her, we beseech thee, all those heavenly graces that are requisite for so high a trust; let the work of thee her God prosper her hands; let her eyes behold the success of her designs for the service of thy true religion established amongst us; and make her a blessed instrument of protecting and advancing thy truth, wherever it is persecuted and oppressed; let hypocrisy and profaneness, superstition and idolatry, fly before her face; let not heresies and false doctrines disturb the peace of the Church, nor schisms and causeless divisions weaken it; but grant us to be of one heart and one mind in serving thee our God, and obeying her according to thy will: and that these blessings may be continued to after-ages, let there never be one wanting in her house to succeed her in the government of this United Kingdom, that our posterity may see her children's children, and peace upon Israel. So we that are thy people, and sheep of thy pasture, shall give thee thanks for ever, and will always be shewing forth thy praise

from generation to generation. *Amen.*”¹⁷⁰

The present *Accession Service* which we now have by 1958 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II, is the revised service that was first issued for Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901-1910) by Royal Warrant of 1901; and thereafter issued by Royal Warrants of successive monarchs. It has sadly removed some of the more robust Christian language such as seen e.g., in the above prayer for Victoria, (or if there is not a crowned Queen, changing “her” to “his” for a King,) “let hypocrisy and profaneness, superstition and idolatry, fly before her face; let not heresies and false doctrines disturb the peace of the Church, nor schisms and causeless divisions weaken it.” Such prayer was an important qualification to the Prayer for Unity retained after 1901. Sadly the secularists wanted removal of such references to the monarch coming to “the defence of” the “Faith” on “idolatry” and “heresies,” although God’s Word clearly warns, “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these,” “idolatry,” “heresies,” and “they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21). We cannot doubt that under the secular state much idolatry and heresy has sadly come to e.g., the *Church of England* with the rise of the Puseyites (by which I also mean semi-Puseyites). Let the reader consider, e.g., the issue of nodding at the holy Table. This is a 19th century Puseyite throw back to Laudian circle notions of genuflecting at the Communion Table or nodding at the name of Jesus. Some I have spoken to who follow this Puseyite practice say they do not know why they do it, other than that they were taught to do so; and others I have spoken to seek to justify this Puseyite practice through reference to the courtroom practice in which when one enters or exits a courtroom, one “acknowledges the bench” by nodding at it. But this is actually an acknowledgement of the judge or judicial officer!¹⁷¹ Therefore to nod at the Communion Table presumes some kind of

¹⁷⁰ A modified form of this Collect may be found at the start of my Dedication Sermon for this Volume 4, in Appendix 5. The modifications include, e.g., changing “thy true religion established amongst us” to “thy true religion as established by the law in the *Church of England’s* historic formularies of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion and Book of Common Prayer;” as the Anglican Church is not established in Australia. I was here influenced by the words, “The Church of England ... has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, [and] the Book of Common Prayer,” in 1) “The Ordination or Consecration of a Bishop,” *The Alternative Service Book* (ASB) 1980, Services for use in the Church of England in conjunction with The Book of Common Prayer, and the ASB’s replacement in 2) the Preface of *Common Worship* (CW) 2000, which also states, “*The Book of Common Prayer* remains the permanently authorized provision for public worship in the Church of England,” i.e., “the new liturgies” are optional (and in general I do not endorse the ASB or CW); and in the words, “by law,” from the Queen’s Coronation oath to “maintain in the United Kingdom the Protestant Reformed Religion established by the law,” *infra*.

¹⁷¹ See e.g., “Entering the courtroom.” “When you enter and exit the courtroom, it is usual to acknowledge the presence of the judge, federal magistrate or judicial officer. You should pause briefly at the door and nod your head while looking towards the judge or federal magistrate. You will also notice lawyers acknowledge the Bench in this manner;” from “Family Law Courts” of Australia, “Court Tour” (emphasis

consubstantiation or transubstantiation presence of God at the Table, and in fact this type of thing comes from the Romish era when a so called “tabernacle” was over the so called “altar” containing the “reserved sacrament.” Whether or not such a “tabernacle” is present, and whether or not consecrated elements are on the Communion Table, the thinking is thus of some “special presence of God” at the Communion Table, which for the Christian is superstitious and idolatrous. While it is often called, “The Communion Table,” in the *Book of Common Prayer* reference is made simply to “the Table,” “the holy Table,” or “the Lord’s Table,” because it only becomes a *Communion Table* when used for this purpose during *The Communion Service*, and at other times it is simply a Table used for religious purposes as the Minister thinks fit. Little wonder then that so many of these Puseyites set aside the Final Rubric of The Communion Service which says, “no adoration ... ought to be done ... unto the sacramental bread or wine ..., for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians”

So too some of the language more strongly interlocked the pre-1901 *Accession Service* to the other three services removed in 1859. For instance, referring to the monarch as the Lord’s “anointed” (Ps. 84:9); interlocks with references in the Office of *King Charles the Martyr* in which one of the Lessons is II Samuel 1 in which the Amalakitite guilty of regicide is said to “have slain the Lord’s anointed” (I Sam. 1:16); or the Office of *The King’s Restoration* on Royal Oak Day in which prayer is made to “God ... who ... by thy miraculous providence didst deliver us out of our miserable confusions; by restoring to us ... King Charles the Second, notwithstanding all the power and malice of his enemies,” and so we are now “promising all loyal and dutiful allegiance to thine anointed servant now set over us” . So too, the prayer that no “open violences, may disquiet” the Sovereign’s “reign” is cross-referable to instances of such former “open violences” remembered in the Offices of 30 January and 29 May; and the words of the prayer that “no secret conspiracies ... may disquiet” the Sovereign’s “reign” is cross-referable to instances of such former conspiracies as those remembered in the Office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* on 5 November.

Also reflecting the desire to move to a largely titular or ceremonial monarchy, in which the Sovereign simply did as the Parliament or Church Convocations required, such words as those of the prayer found in e.g., referring to the monarch’s “duty to promote” both the “spiritual” and “temporal” “welfare” and “interest of the people” were removed, so too the words that “she may triumph over all opposition,” were evidently adjudged as potentially capable of being applied to the Parliament in a *Sovereign verses Parliament* conflict of the type found in e.g., a piece of legislation, and thus of the type and kind that could occur when the monarch was not very largely titular or ceremonial.

Something of this concern also appears to be reflected in the fact that that before 1901 the three Proper Psalms in the *Accession Service* were Psalms 20, 21, & 101; but after 1901 they became, Psalms 20, 101, & 121. In what looks like a typical “politicians trick,” the removal of the reference to Psalm 21 might be missed by the careless observer since it was replaced with a reference to Psalm 121. It is noteworthy that Psalm 21

contains the words of verses 7 & 8, which in the Book of Common Prayer's Psalter read, "And why? Because the King putteth his trust in the Lord: and in the mercy of the most Highest he shall no miscarry" or in the words of the Authorized Version, "the king trusteth in the Lord, and through the mercy of the most High he shall not be moved" (emphasis mine). It is also noteworthy that this Psalm further refers to *the doctrine of hell* which became somewhat *unpopular with the secularists*, for the next two verses, verses 8 & 9, read in the Book of Common Prayer's Psalter with reference to God, "All thine enemies shall feel thine hand: thy right hand shall find out them that hate thee, Thou shalt make them like a fiery oven in time of thy wrath: the Lord shall destroy them in his displeasure, and the fire shall consume them" (emphasis mine). Such so called "extreme words," showing to the King what secularists may regard as "expressions of political opinion and excessive loyalty" as Ps. 21:7, such "denunciations of 'a fiery oven' and 'the fire' that 'shall consume them'," were seemingly "uncomfortable" in the ears of secularist politicians and churchmen who being potential political enemies of the monarch in the Parliament (and possibly also the *Church of England*,) on any given issue, did not want these types of words coming to haunt them in any potential conflict with the monarch, whom they wanted to be basically titular or ceremonial in both Church and State. Of course, these words of Psalm 21:7 spoken of the King of Israel NEVER meant that a human Sovereign of England was beyond *a reasonable level of criticism* in e.g., the to'n'fro conflicts of Parliament-Sovereign politics. But in fairness to the secularists, the words of Ps. 21:8,9 are absolute condemnations of the ungodly who are to be turned into "a fiery oven," and the secularists who worked so hard to act contrary to the purposes of God as set forth in Holy Writ, would be understandably uneasy at such warnings about hell-fire.

However, it should also be noted that the 1901 revised *Accession Service* retains much from the pre-1901 *Accession Service*. This includes some remaining points of intersecting agreement between the Office of *Accession* and the pre 1859 Offices of 30 Jan., 29 May, and 5 Nov. . . In the three red-letter days that had *Church of England* Offices before 1859, and the one surviving Office after 1859, there is the overall common theme of being subject to the lawful authority in general, coupled with a celebration of the lawful Anglican Protestantism of the Crown. Thus both the Offices of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* and *The King's Restoration Day* (or *Royal Oak Day*) that went in 1859, and that of *Accession Day* which remained after 1859, include a Communion reading of I Peter 2:13-17, with the words, "Fear God. Honour the king." And both the Office of *Royal Oak Day* which went in 1859, and the Office of *Accession Day* which remains, have a Communion reading of Matt. 22:16-22 which includes Christ's words, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." And one of the Communion readings in the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* which went in 1859 (Rom. 13:1-7), and one of the readings at Mattins and Evensong in the Office of *Accession Day* which remains to this day (Rom. 13:1-10), as well as one of the readings in the red-letter day of the *Fourth Sunday after Epiphany* in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (Rom. 13:1-7), includes the words of Rom. 13:1-7, which says, e.g., "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers" (Rom. 13:1), "Render ... to all their dues: tribute to who tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour" (Rom. 13:7).

On the one hand, as a Communion Epistle reading for the *Fourth Sunday after Epiphany*, this usage of Rom. 13:1-7 in the Caroline prayer book of 1662 long precedes the martyrdom of King Charles in 1649, being found for that day in Cranmer's Edwardian prayer books of 1549 and 1552, and then the Elizabethan prayer book of 1559, and Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book of 1559 & 1604. But on the other hand, the *Fourth Sunday after Epiphany* always falls either on 30 January, as it did e.g., last year in 2011, or near 30 January, as it did e.g., this year on 29 Jan. 2012. Hence by integrating this reading from Rom. 13 into both the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* which went in 1859, and the Office of *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch which remains to this day, the Anglican Church has given an application of Rom. 13:1-7 to the monarch, that makes its earlier traditional usage on the *Fourth Sunday after Epiphany*, peculiarly appropriate for remembering Charles I after 1649, since Epiphany 4 always falls on or near 30 January.

The salient point to emerge from this commonality of readings in the Offices of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.), *The King's Restoration Day* (29 May), and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) which all went in 1859, and the Office of *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch (presently 6 Feb. for Elizabeth II) which remains to this day, is that there are important points of intersecting agreement in theological emphasis. Specifically, in the first place, the recognition of the lawful authority of the monarch; and secondly, these Offices remind us of the legal Protestantism of the Crown as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, even if some monarchs are more, and others less, worthy recipients of such honours than others. We thus find an important point of continuity amidst change, in the retention of the Office of *Accession Day* after 1859, as modified since 1901, which is now the lone surviving red-letter day with its own Office.

Significantly, the Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II of 26 July 1958 for the *Accession Service* revoking the earlier Royal Warrant of 12 June 1953 for the *Accession Service*, did so for one reason only. It was required in order to change the prayers for the Royal Family in this Office that refer to the heir apparent, Charles, from "Charles Duke of Cornwall" in the 1953 Royal Warrant, to "Charles Prince of Wales" in the 1958 Royal Warrant. On the day that this 1958 Royal Warrant was issued, Charles was named Prince of Wales, although he was not invested as Prince of Wales till some eleven years later on 1 July 1969¹⁷².

King Edward I (Regnal Years: 1272-1307), was known as "Longshanks" because he was 6 foot 2 inches (or 188 cm) tall. He became Overlord of Ireland, and conquered Wales. He then invested his eldest son, at the time an infant, as the Prince of Wales in 1301, at Caernarfon (pronounced "Carnarfon") Castle in Wales. In turn, the title was

¹⁷² Prince Charles remained Duke of Cornwall as well. If as in the case of Prince Charles, he is the Sovereign's eldest son, the heir-apparent to the throne is automatically the Duke of Cornwall. This entitles him to certain livings from the Duchy of Cornwall.

given to his son, Edward II (Regnal Years: 1307-1327), before he became king. From this time, by long standing tradition, the eldest son and heir apparent to the throne, has usually, though not always, been made “Prince of Wales” by the monarch. When a Prince of Wales becomes King, the title falls into disuse till the monarch grants it to the next eldest son. Thus in the normal course of events, if and when Prince Charles becomes King Charles III, he will grant the title, “Prince of Wales,” to his eldest son, William.

The *Accession Service* spans three broad eras. Firstly, it was found in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* during the era of the Protestant Christian State, and while I do not consider the Protestant Christian State of England from the 16th to early 19th centuries was perfect or could not be improved upon, I maintain on the Biblical Establishment Principle that the Protestant Christian State is the preferable type of political state to have and live in. Secondly, this red-letter day with its own Office was found under the State 1 Secular State, being the lone survivor of three other (or in Ireland, four other), such days. That is because, unlike the Type 1 Secular State in the United States of America, the Type 1 (Christian morals) Secular State in countries like the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, still saw value in the retention of the idea of a Christian society with a white Christian monarch, evident in the symbol of the crown with a cross on top of it; in order to bolster the idea that as a general, though not absolute rule, Christian morals should remain in the law and society, with such morals being justified in law and politics on the basis of natural law or reason.

But under the Type 2 (“human rights” & libertinism) Secular State starting in the post World War Two era, the secular state has sought to remove such Christian morality, replacing it with a French Revolution derived type of “human rights” and libertinism. Thus e.g., in Australia, reference to the Crown as *Defender of the Faith* went in the 1960s (from Australian coins) and 1970s (from the monarch’s title used in Australia)¹⁷³. And in Australia the national anthem, “God Save the Queen,” was replaced by one that denied both God and the Queen, although “God Save the Queen” remains as a song, as opposed to a national anthem, which since that time has still sometimes been sung in e.g., churches.

¹⁷³ Compare the *Royal Style and Titles Act*, 1953 (Cth [= Commonwealth of Australia]), “Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Australia and Her other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith;” and the *Royal Style and Titles Act*, 1973 (Cth), “Elizabeth II by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth”. *Defender of the Faith* is also gone from Australian military medals. E.g., of Father’s twelve medals, while not all of the older ones contain reference to this title (e.g., no such reference is on his 1939/45 Star or Pacific Star), some of them do (so found on his: Defence Medal, Long Service and Good Conduct Medal, & Meritorious Service Medal); but none of his newer medals contain this title (Australian Service Medal 1945/75; Defence Force Service Medal; & Australian Defence Medal).

Nevertheless, even under the Type 2 Secular State the role of the monarch remains important because the legal Protestantism of the throne points us to what *should be*, even if there has been an ever widening gap between what *should be* and *what is*. Furthermore, the Sovereign is both a spiritual and temporal power. Even though the Crown is largely titular or ceremonial in both Church and State, the fact that the Queen is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and Head of State, means that nobody else is. Thus the symbolism remains that of a legally Protestant throne in which the monarch wears a Christian cross on their crown. The fact that the Crown has a vast geographical temporal realm with e.g., Australia, Canada, and the UK, as well as a spiritual realm in England as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*; means that there is, in human terms, a counter-balancing force to the claims of the Roman Pope, who is also a spiritual and temporal power, and claims a so called “universal” jurisdiction in the church. While we Protestants ultimately look to Christ as the great counter-balance, since he alone is the *universal bishop* whom we acknowledge as the “Bishop of ... souls” (I Peter 2:25), and “the head of ... the church” universal (Col. 1:18; Eph. 5:23); nevertheless, in human terms here on earth, the fact that the monarch of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, acts to more easily and readily expose the false claims of the Roman Pope to a “universal” jurisdiction in the church; and thus as a clearly identifiable legally Protestant figure, the monarch helps to counteract and counterbalance these deadly dangerous Papal claims. The symbolism of a Protestant Christian monarch further acts to uphold the symbolism of Christianity against various infidel religions and images such as those of Mohammedanism, Judaism, and Sikhism, as well as various heathen religions and images such as those of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Thus, for example, this legal Protestantism was evident when Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II opened her first Parliament at Westminster in November 1952. At that time she declared: “I do solemnly, and in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare, that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of enactments which ensure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my Realm, uphold and maintain the said enactments to the best of my power according to law.” Then at the Queen’s Coronation Service in the *Church of England’s* Westminster Abbey on 2 June 1953, the Archbishop of Canterbury asked her, “Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Law of God and the true profession of the Gospel? Will you to the utmost of your power maintain in the United Kingdom the Protestant Reformed Religion established by the law?” To which Her Majesty replied, “All this I promise to do.”¹⁷⁴

And when Queen Elizabeth II was crowned in Westminster Abbey on 2 June 1953, a King James Version of the Bible was handed to her, and the Presbyterian Moderator of the *Church of Scotland* said, “Our gracious Queen, to keep Your Majesty ever mindful of the law and the Gospel of God as the rule for the whole of life and government of Christian princes, we present you with this Book, the most valuable thing

¹⁷⁴ Cited in, “The relevance of the term PROTESTANT,” *Faith & Freedom*, Errol Stone (Editor), P.O. Box 1118, Innaloo City, W.A., 6918, Australia (Website: www.faithandfreedom.com.au), October 2009, p. 8.

that this world affords. Here is wisdom, here is the royal law. These are the lively Oracles of God.” And commenting on this, Bishop David Samuel of the *Church of England (Continuing)* says, “What majestic words, said in Westminster Abbey, as a copy of the Bible was handed to the Sovereign of the nation¹⁷⁵.”

When I was in London on one of my five trips there between 2001 and 2009, I got a copy of the royal warrant from the British Library in London for the three services annexed to the original 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* “as revised and settled at the Savoy Conference.” (During the reign of Charles II the Office of *The King’s Restoration* on 29 May, together with the secondary focus on him in *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* which fell on his Accession Day of 30 Jan. was regarded as sufficient, and so there was not an additional *Accession Service* for 30 Jan. .) This Caroline Royal Warrant of Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), is dated 2 May “in the 14th year of our reign,” that is, the 14th regnal year since his accession on the day of his father’s death on 30 January 1649, which made his 14th regnal year from 30 January 1662 to 29 January 1663. Hence the fact that 1662 is called the “14th year” of Charles II’s reign, is a reminder that the Interregnum Ordinances of the Puritan republican regime seeking under the illegal oath known as the “Solemn League and Covenant” to prohibit Anglicanism in England, were in fact unconstitutional since they did not pass both Houses of Parliament and then receive Royal Assent. In broad terms, it would be like if today in Australia, the House of Representatives passed a Bill, and then said, “We don’t need the Senate to agree to this Bill, we don’t need the Governor-General of Australia to give the royal assent to this Bill, we’re gonna’ use the troops to enforce this Bill, even though it hasn’t gotten the approval of either the Senate or Governor-General.” Trying to enforce that Bill as though it were an Act of Parliament, would be unconstitutional; and this is the type of thing the English Puritan republican regime did, since they made Ordinances in the House of Commons, that had not been through the House of Lords, and had not received Royal Assent. So they were unconstitutional Ordinances.

Thus 1662 was the “14th year” of Charles II’s *de jure* reign. In part this Caroline royal warrant of 1662 says, “Our will and pleasure is, that these three forms of prayer and service made for the fifth of November, the thirtieth of January, and the twenty-ninth of May, be forthwith printed and published, and for the future annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the Church of England, to be used yearly on the said days, in all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chappels, in all Chappels of Colleges of Eaton and Winchester, and in all Parish Churches and Chappels within our Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and Town of Berwick upon Tweed.” Before the Union of 1801 creating the United Kingdom, there were first the three Kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland before 1707¹⁷⁶, and then from 1707 to 1800 the Kingdom of Great

¹⁷⁵ “‘Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people.’ Proverbs 14:34, A Sermon by David Samuel,” *English Churchman*, (EC 7782) 18 & 25 December 2009, p. 10.

¹⁷⁶ Before the Union between the Kingdoms of England and Scotland, the Great

Britain made up of England and Scotland; and a separate Kingdom of Ireland; and so the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* were separately established Anglican Churches at that time, and so a similar Irish warrant was issued for the Church of Ireland's 1666 prayer book. Since Wales was a Dominion of the Kingdom of England, it was part of the Established Church of England and so it is mentioned in this royal warrant. Berwick-on-Tweed was also specifically mentioned in, for instances, the Royal Warrants of Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901-1910) and George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936)¹⁷⁷.

The Royal Warrant of 23 June 1910 of George V referred to "Churches and Chapels in England and Wales, and in the Town of Berwick-on-Tweed." But following the sad Disestablishment of the *Church of England* in Wales in 1920, George V issued a new Royal Warrant for the *Accession Service*. His Royal Warrant of 8 Dec. 1925 revoked his earlier Royal Warrant of 23 June 1910, and the earlier reference to "Churches and Chapels in England and Wales and ... the Town of Berwick-on-Tweed," was changed to "Churches and Chapels within the Provinces of Canterbury and York"¹⁷⁸. This form has then been retained in the subsequent *Accession Service* Royal Warrants of later monarchs. E.g., (though both the accession and abdication of Edward VIII in 1936 meant that he never had an *Accession Service* in a Church), we read in the Royal Warrant of George VI (Regnal Years: 1936-1952), dated at Sandringham on 22 January 1937, "Whereas by a Royal Warrant of His former Majesty King Edward the Eighth dated the Seventeenth day of February, One thousand nine hundred and thirty-six, certain Forms of Prayer and Service were made for the Twentieth day of January to be ... annexed to the Book of Common Prayer ... of the Church of England to be used yearly in all Churches and Chapels within the Provinces of Canterbury and York: Now our Will and Pleasure that the said Royal Warrant be revoked, ... and that the Forms of Prayer and Service hereunto annexed be ... annexed to the Book of Common Prayer ... to be used yearly on the Eleventh day of December in all Churches and Chapels within the Provinces of Canterbury and York"¹⁷⁹.

Seal of England was used (which seal was discarded in the River Thames by James II as evidence of his *de facto* abdication in 1688. But the Union with Scotland Act of 1706 provided that after 1707 there would instead be one Great Seal for Great Britain, which was used for sealing writs to elect and summon the Westminster Parliament, for sealing treaties made with other nations, instruments and order dealing with the whole of Great Britain, public Acts, and all other matters that related to England in the same way as the Great Seal of England had been used before this time. It was placed in the custody of the Lord Chancellor.

¹⁷⁷ See Appendix 5: "Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb. 2012)."

¹⁷⁸ *The Book of Common Prayer ... of the Church of England ... with Additions & Deviations* approved in 1927, printed in 1927 (British Library Copy: Shelf mark 3408 F 29).

¹⁷⁹ *The Book of Common Prayer ... of the Church of England*, Oxford at the University Press [undated but between 1937 & 1947, as in 1947 George VI issued a new Royal Warrant] (British Library copy). The Princess Elizabeth (later Queen Elizabeth

Ogden's *Source-Book* (c. 1985)¹⁸⁰ highlights the section in the 1662 Act of Uniformity referring to "Berwick upon Tweed." Next to it, an asterisk refers to a footnote supplied by the Reverend Mr. Ralph Ogden which says, "Berwick is north of the river, which is otherwise the boundary between England and Scotland."

Berwick-upon-Tweed is an England-Scotland border town, and since the Tweed became the English-Scottish border in the 12th century its possession was long disputed between the Kingdoms of Scotland and England, but finally in 1482 its possession was settled with the Kingdom of England. In terms of Anglican church history, its distinction is that its Anglican Church of Holy Trinity was one of the few successfully built during the Interregnum. To some extent this may relate to the politics of its border-town status, since though it is in England, the Kingdom of Scotland *de facto* stayed under the Crown into 1650/1. In 1641 King Charles I gave some money for the old Anglican Church there to be replaced, and together with other monies collected for it was completed in 1652. Then in 1662, under Charles II it was consecrated by the Bishop of Durham as an Anglican Church, and still contains the Lord's Table placed in it for that 1662 consecration. And so this reference to Berwick-upon-Tweed remind us of the location of the northern English border, and also the place of both Charles I and Charles II in building and consecrating the Anglican Church there. And this terminology of the 1662 royal warrant of Charles II finds a sequel in the 1662 Act of Uniformity itself, since this states it is to apply, "in all Parish-Churches and Chapels, within the Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed."

The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* is a Restoration prayer book, and thus, for

II), married Philip on 20 Nov. 1947, and on the eve of the wedding King George VI conferred on Philip the title, "Duke of Edinburgh," *et al.* To include the new Duke of Edinburgh in the Prayers for the Royal Family required a new Royal Warrant. Thus on the following day of 21 Nov. 1947, George VI revoked his earlier Royal Warrant of 22 Jan. 1937 for the *Accession Service*, and issued a new Royal Warrant at Saint James's Palace in London for the *Accession Service*, which in the Prayers for the Royal Family, included after the name of "the Princess Elizabeth," and before the words "and all the Royal Family," the new and additional words, "the Duke of Edinburgh".

¹⁸⁰ This work is discussed in Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," section 7) "*m) Royal Oak Day Dedication." I procured Ogden's *Source-Book* from St. Philip's Church Hill when in the 1980s and 1990s it was a church strongly committed to the 1662 BCP whose parish bulletin entitled, "The Parish Church of Saint Philip Church Hill. 3 York Street, Sydney. Parish Established 1802," always said, "SERVICES AT ST. PHILIP'S are according to the Book of Common Prayer (1662);" and this included reading all Lessons from the AV. But from the 2000s it has become a church which sadly relegated the BCP to a minority of services, and connected with this it also tragically lost its former commitment to the AV.

example, the Preface refers to the Interregnum's "late unhappy confusions" and Charles II's "happy Restoration." During the 1640s and 1650s civil wars and Interregnum era, one of Oliver Cromwell's Generals was General Monck. In 1650 he raised five companies from Newcastle and five companies from Berwick, and mustered them near Berwick to form what was officially known as "Monck's Regiment of Foot." At the time, General Monck and his regiment were very great sinners who set aside such Scriptures as I Peter 2:17, "Fear God. Honour the king." And so they wickedly attacked the King's Majesty, and indeed General Monck who was a very talented general, used this regiment to militarily defeat Charles II at the Battle of Dunbar in Scotland in September 1650.

But with the Lord there is "mercy" and "forgiveness" of "sins" to those who show "repentance" (Matt. 9:2,13). Significantly then, General Monck and "Monck's Regiment of Foot" came to repent of their terrible sin of sedition against the Crown. They turned to the law of God to see their sin. Now we read in I Timothy 1:8 & 9 that "the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but the lawless and disobedient," and one of those then so itemized are "murders" or "manslayers." But after itemizing a series of terrible sins, St. Paul says in I Cor. 6:11, "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." And so turning in repentance, General Monck became an important figure in the Caroline Restoration of Charles II in 1660. On 1 January 1660, the now repentant General George Monck led "Monck's Regiment of Foot" from the place known as "the Coldstream" in Berwickshire on a five week march to London, arriving in February. Under Monck, they restored law and order, repressing the riots which characterized this latter era of republican rule.

Charles II returned to England via Dover, and joyously entered London on 29 May 1660; and in May he inspected the Regiment that before their repentance, had wickedly sought his death, but which now moved by the power of the Holy Ghost unto repentance, humbly gave their allegiance to him. The Restoration Caroline Parliament moved to disband Cromwell's Roundhead army in general, but made an exception for "Monck's Regiment of Foot," which they decided to keep till the last. The task being almost complete, in January 1661 riot was afoot in parts of London, and "Monck's Regiment of Foot" was called upon to quell the rebellion. It was then decided that this regiment would be kept permanently as a body guard for the monarch. Charles II already had one body-guard, which we now know as the British Grenadiers, and so it was decided to make Monck's Regiment a second such bodyguard. In February 1661 the Regiment paraded at London's Tower Hill where they first did lay down their arms, and then took them up again in the name of the King. In order to remember their march from Coldstream in Berwickshire, they were given the name, "The Coldstream Regiment of Foot Guards," and they are known to this day as the "Coldstream Guards."

Their story, is the story of repentance from sin by their commanding Officer, General George Monck, and reminds us that even though men may be terrible sinners, as indeed General Monck had been, they may still repent and find mercy at the throne of grace. And their skills and abilities which they had formerly used to attack the good,

may then be turned to defend it. Judged by the standards of God's holy law, the Ten Commandments of Exodus 20, all of us have committed great sins, all of us need the forgiving power which is only gotten through the atoning blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Man is lost in his sins, and humanly speaking, his case before God is hopeless. But the good news is that we are told in John 3:16, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Earlier in his Holy Gospel, St. John records the witness of St. John the Baptist in John 1:29, when he said with reference to what was then Christ's future atoning work, but which is now his past atoning work at Calvary, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." And this same St. John the Evangelist says in I John 1:8,9; 2:1,2, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." All of us need, like General George Monck did, to repent of our sins, and use our influence to uphold God's holy ways, rather than fight against them. The Coldstream Guards now hold a place of honour in the British army, and if we turn from our sins to serve the living God through saving faith in Jesus Christ our Lord, who died for our sins, and rose again the third day, then we will hold a place of honour in heaven's sight, for Jesus said in Luke 17:7,11, "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth;" and "I say unto you there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."

And so, in this 350th anniversary year of the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, and this 60th Diamond Jubilee anniversary of Queen Elizabeth II in 2012, (and also at a later time if a reader should read it after 2012,) let us remember this important Gospel message of repentance from sin, found in the godly example of General George Monck, who first repented, and then led his entire regiment to likewise repent of their sin of rebellion against the Crown, turning instead, to heed the words of such Scriptures as Matthew 22:21, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

6) *60 Regnal Years - Only three monarchs: George III, Victoria, & Elizabeth II.*

Regnal Years are counted from the Day of Accession, so that from the time a monarch accedes to the throne till their first Accession Day, is counted as Regnal Year 1. E.g., Edward VIII reigned from 20 Jan. 1936 to 11 Dec. 1936, which is less than a year, (and so there was never an *Accession Service* observed for him,) but this entire period is referred to as his first Regnal year, so that statues during this time might be called, "1 Edward VIII." There are only three monarchs which have reached 60 Regnal years: George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820), Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901), and Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952).

This means that George III, is the only king to have reached 60 Regnal years; and Elizabeth II is one of only two crowned queens to have reached 60 Regnal years. While George III seems to be likely to hold his record as the longest reigning English *king* into

the foreseeable future, if the Lord tarries, and if the Lord so wills it, in another three to four years, the Queen of the United Kingdom, the Queen of Australia, and elsewhere, will become both the longest reigning crowned Queen, and longest reigning monarch.

On 23 July 1802, a “Government and General Order” of His Excellency, the Governor of New South Wales, Philip Gidley King was issued. This stated:

His Excellency is pleased to direct that in all spiritual, judicial, and parochial proceedings, transactions, deeds, instrument, and registers, that the districts of Sydney, Petersham, Bulanaming, Concord, and Liberty Plains, be comprised with a parish to be henceforward named “Saint Phillip,” in honor of the first Governor of this territory; and that the districts of Parramatta, Banks’ Town, Prospect Hill, Toongabbie, Seven Hills, Castle Hill, Eastern Farms, Field of Mars, Northern Boundaries, Ponds, and Kissing Point, be comprised with a parish to be henceforward named “St. John’s,” in honor of the late Governor, Captain John Hunter; and the churches now building at Sydney and Parramatta be respectively named Saint Phillip and Saint John¹⁸¹.

But when the new parish church was built, “St. Phillip’s” with a double “l” in memory of Arthur Phillip, was renamed and consecrated in 1856 as “St. Philip’s” with a single “l” in memory of the Apostle Philip (e.g., Matt. 10:3), who is remembered on the BCP Calendar on 1 May in the red-letter day of *Saint Philip and Saint James’s Day*. Thus *St. Phillip’s* became *St. Philip’s*. Since it was renamed “St. Philip’s” in deference to the earlier name of “St. Phillip’s,” it is thus now named after the Apostle, Philip, in deference to Arthur Phillip. There is also a memorial bust of Arthur Phillip and associated plaque at the “Oranges and Lemons” church of St. Mary-Le-Bow, near St. Paul’s Cathedral, London, which I inspected on my fourth trip to London (Oct. 05-April 06) in April 2006.

Last year, on Queen Elizabeth II’s 59th Anniversary, which commenced her 60th Regnal year on 6 February 2011, I attended a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer Service* at St. Philip’s Church Hill, York Street, inner City of Sydney. This service saw the convergence of three red-letter days, *Accession Day*, *The Fifth Sunday after Epiphany*, and *Richard Johnson’s Day* (a black letter day on the Australian Calendar as 3 Feb., by local tradition at St. Philip’s which has the *Richard Johnson Chapel*, transferred to the former / following Sunday when 3 Feb. is not a Sunday, and raised to a red-letter day, as discussed at “5,” “Accession Day Principles,” *supra*). It being *Accession Day*, I wore the pink Queen Elizabeth rose in my lapel, which is named after Elizabeth II.

Items on display before and after the service included some Communion patens given by George III in 1803; and the King James Bible of the first Chaplain to the Colony of New South Wales, the Reverend Richard Johnson (1753-1827), an Evangelical

¹⁸¹ Bladen, F.M. (Editor), *Historical Records of New South Wales*, Printed by Authority, Charles Potter, Government Printer, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, 1896, Vol. 4, p. 802.

Anglican clergyman. This Bible was presented to Richard Johnson when he was commissioned as Chaplain to the First Fleet on the *Eve of Accession Day* (24 October) in 1786 (George III's *Accession Day* was 25 Oct.). Bearing the words, "Botany Bay" inside the cover, was autographed by "Elizabeth R[eginal]" i.e., Elizabeth II on her "1954" Royal Visit. It had also been autographed by "Edward P" in "1920" i.e., Edward Prince of Wales, who later became King Edward VIII (Regnal Year: 1936); by "Albert" in "1927" i.e., the year Canberra was opened as the national capital, Prince Albert, Duke of York, who later became King George VI (Regnal Years: 1936-1952); and by "Henry" in "[19]34" i.e., Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester, the third son of George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936), who later served as Governor-General of Australia (1945-1947). It was further autographed by e.g., Prince "Charles" in "1983," and Prince Charles' brother, Prince "Andrew," in the bicentennial year of "1988" (1788-1988).

Also on display was a Georgian printing of Johnson's 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* from the time of George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820), which read on its covers, "COMMON PRAYER. BOTONY BAY. DECEM. 14th 1786". This was autographed in the front by both "Elizabeth R" i.e., Elizabeth II, and her consort, "Philip" Duke of Edinburgh, on their Royal Visit in "1954". At the back of this I looked at the Offices for "Gunpowder Treason" or "Papists' Conspiracy" Day (5 Nov.), "King Charles the Martyr" (30 Jan.), "The King's Restoration" (29 May), "A FORM of PRAYER with THANKSGIVING to Almighty God, to be used ... every Year, upon the Twenty-fifth Day of October" i.e., Accession Day for George III.

After this service I walked up to the area of Hyde Park to inspect Government House. This was formerly the residence of New South Wales Governors who are the State representative of the Crown. It is no longer the Governor's residence, but it is still sometimes used for State occasions involving the NSW Governor.

Earlier in the year, in January 2011 I visited the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney (500 Harris St., Ultimo). I there saw the NSW Governor's Carriage. This railway carriage was built in 1891. Before Federation in 1901, it was e.g., used to convey Governor Jersey (7th Earl of Jersey; Governor of NSW, 1890-1892). Or after Federation in 1901, the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall & York arrived in Australia in May 1901 in order to open the first Commonwealth Parliament. During this Royal Visit, the carriage was used by the Duchess on trips from Sydney to Katoomba in the Blue Mountains. The Duke later became King George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936), and the Duchess became his consort, Queen Mary.

Also during the Queen's 60th Regnal Year, among a number of 1662 BCP services I attended at St. Philip's York Street, I attended one on Sunday 20 November, which was the black letter day of *King Edmund* (d. 870). (There is a statue of King Edmund on the west front of Salisbury *Church of England* Cathedral.) Edmund was a Saxon King of East Anglia (Regnal Years: 855-870). After offering brave and fierce resistance, he was wounded in battle and taken prisoner by pagan Viking Danes. Under their pagan Viking leaders, Ubba and Inguar, they gave Edmund the option of living provided he renounced his Christian faith in favour of heathenism and made his kingdom

a vassal to these pagan overlords. Edmund refused and he was correspondingly then slain, according to tradition, by being shot to death by arrows. His killing was quickly remembered, for we have from the end of the ninth century “St. Edmund pennies” referring to this event. In the 10th century Edmund’s remains were translated to a Church at Boedricesworth in the English County of Suffolk, and in the eleventh century the town was renamed in memory of this honour as, *Bury St. Edmund’s* town. The town received a Royal Charter of Incorporation in 1606 under King James I (Regnal Years Regnal Years: 1603-1625) of the King James Bible. On Sunday 20 November 2011, *King Edmund’s Day*, I took a photograph of the white office building at St. Philip’s (see my Textual Commentaries webpage, <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>). Notably, this new late 20th century building which stands in contrast to the older mid 19th century sandstone church, was Dedicated on the 20th *Accession Day* (1952-1972) of Elizabeth II, 6 February, 1972, at the commencement of her 21st regnal year.

While Sunday 20 November 2011 was the black letter day of King Edmund, it was the red-letter day of Trinity 25 i.e., the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, and so the BCP Collect for Trinity 25 was read. However, just two Sundays before, on Sunday 6 Nov. 2011, I had attended a 1662 Book of Common Prayer Service at St. Swithun’s Pymble on Trinity 20 i.e., the Twentieth Sunday after Trinity, and so the BCP Collect for Trinity 20 was read. To the question, “Why was 20 Nov. 2011 which was just two weeks after 6 Nov. not regarded as “Trinity 22?,” the answer is that it was the Sunday before the start of the Advent season, and so on this Sunday one always goes to Trinity 25 even if that means jumping over certain Sundays, in the case of 2011, Trinity Sundays 22-24.

For those who like myself, have a background in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, there are some anecdotal stories we might tell about it. For example, back in the early 1980s when the 1662 Book of Common Prayer was more widely used in the *Diocese of Sydney*, and there were more housewives around, Christmas puddings were still made by some housewives, rather than being bought as they generally are now. In the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, on the Sunday before Advent, the readings are those for the 25th Sunday after Trinity, *supra*. The Collect for that day, which was read at St. Philip’s on Trinity 25, 20 Nov. 2011, is: “Stir up, we beseech thee, O Lord, the wills of the faithful people; that they, plenteously bringing forth the fruit of good works, may of thee be plenteously rewarded; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.” Because this Collect starts with the words, “Stir up,” the Sunday was known among Anglicans as “Stir up Sunday.” Officially on the church board it was always called, “The Twenty-Fifth Sunday after Trinity” or “Trinity 25” or “Sunday before Advent,” but among those who used to use the BCP, it was generally known by an in-house Anglican tradition as “Stir up Sunday,” because when those words were heard from this Collect, it meant it was time for the housewives to stir up the Christmas pudding.

Sadly, the 1662 prayer book is no longer widely used in the Diocese of Sydney, and Christmas puddings are now usually bought rather than made by housewives, so this terminology of “Stir up Sunday” has now generally fallen into disuse. Of course when it was more widely used, no-one was thereby suggesting that this was the original intent of

the words “Stir up” in the Collect for Trinity 25. Rather, a Christmas pudding had to be made and stirred up sometime around then, it could be a week or so before or a week or so after that time; and so it came about as a quaint coincidence, that these words at the beginning of the Collect for Trinity 25, “Stir up,” gave rise to this in-house *Book of Common Prayer* Anglican tradition of calling it “Stir up Sunday,” and using it to remind housewives to “stir up” the Christmas pudding. I.e., there was both a spiritual sense in which it was “Stir up Sunday” relative to the words of the Trinity 25 Collect in which people prayed God to “Stir up” “the wills of thy faithful people;” and a temporal sense in which it was “Stir up Sunday” relative to the need to stir the Christmas pudding.

Thus after the church service I spoke to both of the Ministers about the Collect, and when I mentioned those words, “Stir up,” one of them immediately said it was “Stir up Sunday.” And I also spoke to a lady parishioner behind me who was aware of the fact that it was “Stir up Sunday.” Thus following this BCP Service at St. Philip’s on Sunday 20 Nov. 2011, I was pleased to find that there were still some BCP using Low Church Evangelical Anglicans who remember that Trinity 25 is “Stir up Sunday.”

The interested reader will find some relevant photos of these events in 2011 during the Queen’s 60th regnal year, at my Textual Commentaries webpage (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

7) *The Royal Visit to Australia in October 2011.*

Together with His Royal Highness, Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II made a Royal Visit to Australia in October 2011. They were based in, and made public appearances in the national capital of Canberra in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). They also made day trips by plane for public appearances at Brisbane in Queensland (Mon. 24 Oct.), and Melbourne in Victoria (Wed. 26 Oct.), before then flying to Perth in Western Australia on Thurs. 27 Oct., for a *Commonwealth Heads of Government* (CHOGM) Meeting (Fri. 28 Oct.). The Royal Couple then departed from Australia on Sat. 29 Oct. 2011¹⁸². Other Royal Visits have been made by the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh to Australia in 1954, 1963, 1970, 1973, 1974, 1977, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1986, 1988, 1992, 2000, 2002, and 2006.

A record of some of these and other Royal Visits by various members of the Royal family is to some extent preserved in their autographs of Richard Johnson’s King James Bible and 1662 Book of Common Prayer (discussed at section 6, “60 Regnal Years - Only three monarchs: George III, Victoria, & Elizabeth II,” *supra*). Some relevant photos of these which I took at St. Philip’s York Street on Accession Day, 6 Feb. 2011, may be seen on my Textual Commentaries webpage (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

While I have seen reports of Royal Visits, e.g., I recall seeing pictures of the

¹⁸² “The Royal Visit as nation rolls out red carpet,” *The Canberra Times* (Newspaper), Wed. 19 Oct. 2011, p. 9.

Queen giving her Royal Assent to the *Australia Act* on the 1986 Royal Visit, by contrast, I have physically seen Queen Elizabeth II in person on only a few Royal Visits. E.g., in March 1977 when I was 17 years old and in Year 12 (or Sixth Form) at Cumberland High School in Carlingford, western Sydney, I rode my Honda CB 200 motorbike from Sydney to Canberra and back to see the Royal Visit of the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh. This was the Silver Jubilee Royal Visit (1952-1977). Using a Kodak instamatic 33 camera (that took square shaped photos), I was, by the grace of God, able to get some good photos of e.g., the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh on the steps of the old Parliament House, a military flypast by the Royal Australian Air Force, and as I stood on a ledge at the old Parliament House, a picture of the Royal Couple passing by in an Australian army Land Rover. When they later came to Sydney I also got some photos of e.g., The Britannia at Circular Quay, the Queen opening the Queen Elizabeth Walk's Western Gate at Hyde Park, and the Queen coming out from an Anglican Service at St. Andrew's Cathedral and meeting various Anglican Church bishops in their white surplices, black preaching scarves, and red rochets. (The interested reader will find some of these photos at my Textual Commentaries webpage.)

I also recall seeing the Queen either in the 1980s or 1990s in Sydney. I watched as she went up Macquarie Street to the New South Wales State Parliament. I recall talking to someone there about how monarchy was preferable to a republic.

On their 2011 Royal Visit, the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh arrived in Canberra on Wed. 19 October. They made only two public appearances in Canberra. One was by a barge, known as, The Admiral's Barge, going to the Floriade on Thurs. 20 Oct.; and the other was their entry and exit to the National War Memorial on Tues. 25 Oct. .

Roads between Sydney and Canberra are now greatly improved, for whereas it used to take about 5½ hours to drive by car (or ride by motorbike) between Canberra and Sydney when I moved back to Sydney with my parents and brother in 1975; using the M7 and connected roads, the Canberra-Sydney trip now takes me (depending on traffic) about 3¼ to 3½ hours by car. I arrived in Canberra from Sydney on Wed. 19 Oct., and spent the night there, in order to see the Royal Couple on Thurs. 20 Oct., 2011.

The Floriade is a flower show of flowers grown in the Commonwealth Park Gardens. It was closed to the public during the Royal Visit, but I was able to see a part of this outside of a fence on Wed. 19 Oct. . This is on one side of Lake Burley Griffin, and on the other side, crossed by the nearby Commonwealth Bridge (on Commonwealth Avenue), is the National Library of Australia. The Commonwealth Bridge contains some granite stone chairs cut from London's Waterloo Bridge which crosses the Thames, as constructed in 1817, although this older Waterloo Bridge was replaced by a reinforced concrete bridge in 1942.

On the morning of Thurs. 20 Oct., 2011, I took up a position along the Central Basin of Lake Burley Griffin on the National Library side, just in front of the Library. I had a clear view of Black Mountain Tower, Commonwealth Bridge, and the water route on which the Queen was to come on The Admiral's Barge; and could see across the Lake

to Commonwealth Park behind the Captain Cook Memorial Jet (a water fountain jet), which is where the Queen's barge was to go.

While I was there, a radio reporter approached me from Radio 2CC, and told me this was a local radio station in Mitchell, ACT. A series of short questions and answers included: my name, and though I was told I only had to give my first name, I gave my surname also i.e., "Gavin McGrath." I was asked, "Why?" I was there; to which I replied that the Bible says in I Peter 2 that we should "Honour the king," and so as a Christian I was there to *Honour the Queen*. I was also asked what I thought was the significance of this Royal Visit?; to which I replied that due to the Queen's great age, it was possibly, though not definitely her last visit to Australia; and I also referred to it in the context that coming up soon on 6 February 2012 would be the Queen's Accession Day for her 60th Diamond Jubilee.

I do now know how many people listened to this on 2CC Radio in Canberra. But I hope and pray that this Christian radio witness will give glory to God, in harmony with the teaching of his Word, "Fear God. Honour the king" (I Peter 2:17).

It was a beautiful sun-shining day, and I observed some black swans swimming quietly by. Then, about 15 or so minutes before the Queen arrived, the Captain Cook Memorial Jet was turned on, shooting water up into the sky about 140 metres or 460 feet. In conversation with those around me, we all took this to be a sign that the Queen was about to come, since they did not want her to see the Lake without the water jet on. "After all, we must keep up appearances!"

The Queen and Duke of Edinburgh were to sail by on The Admiral's Barge, and then the barge was to cross over to the other side to inspect the Floriade. The Admiral's Barge is a *Royal Australian Navy* barge. It is a 12 metre (or c. 39 foot) vessel, built in Brisbane, Queensland, in 1993; and is normally based at HMAS Waterhen in Sydney¹⁸³. A number of people waiting were waving Australian Flags. Suddenly the barge appeared from around the corner, and like others, my digital camera was turned on. I thank God I managed to get one very good picture of the barge with the Queen waving, the Duke of Edinburgh looking over, and a Royal Australian Naval Officer standing and looking across.

The interested reader will find some relevant photos taken at Canberra of this 2011 Royal Visit to Australia at my Textual Commentaries webpage. These include that part of the Floriade I was able to see from behind a fence on Wed. 20 Oct. (with a Ferris-wheel in the background), and the Royal Couple *en route* to The Floriade, passing by along Lake Burley Griffin on The Admiral's Barge on Thursday 20 Oct. 2011.

¹⁸³ "Navy personnel take barge on dry run before big day out with VIP ...," *The Canberra Times* (Newspaper), Wed. 19 Oct. 2011, p. 9.

8) *An Englishman, an Irishman, & a Scotsman, at a NSW Union Church.*

*Union Churches: An Englishman, an Irishman, & a Scotsman,
at a NSW Union Church.*

There was an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman. They were all clergymen who immigrated to rural New South Wales in Australia. The Irishman was a Reformed (Low Church Evangelical) Anglican, the Reverend Mr. Patrickson. The Scotsman was a Presbyterian in a Free Presbyterian Church, the Reverend Mr. McAndrew. And the Englishman was a Puseyite with a hyphenated surname, Feeble-Keble¹⁸⁴, who called himself, “Father” Feeble-Keble.

The borders of the parishes of Mr. Patrickson and “Father” Feeble-Keble happened to meet in the grounds where the Union Church was built. Both had three other churches in their rural parishes, and both laid claim to the Union Church. Seeking to avoid controversy, in what turned out to be a controversial “land-mark decision,” Bishop Fence-Sitter the Sixth, had decided that both could use the Union Church and regard it as part of their respective parishes. Various newspaper articles had been written about Bishop Fence-Sitter VI’s decision. “My aim was to avoid controversy,” Bishop Fence-Sitter kept saying, “but now I find myself in the eye of a storm!”

Thus they all used the same Union Church, booking it out for different times. It was a fibro building, and in the hot Australian summer sun a nearby bushfire was ignited, and the fires started to move towards the Union Church. Word of the fire’s movement spread quickly by bush-telegraph¹⁸⁵.

The Reverend Patrickson raced inside, and getting out said, “It’s okay, I’ve grabbed the old Caroline *Book of Common Prayer of 1662* printed in 1851, and the church’s original, 151 year old, *King James Version* pulpit Bible!” The Reverend McAndrew quickly ran in and out, and said, “All’s well. I’ve got the 150 year old illustrated copy of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* that I brought with me from Scotland, and I read to the Sunday School children; plus a 170 year old copy of the Caroline *Psalter* of 1650 that I got in Scotland.

Then just as the fires reached the Union Church, and it started to burn down, “Father” Feeble-Keble arrived. He was a long-standing member of the Puseyites’ *gin’n’lace brigade*. Pulling a bottle full of gin from his pocket as he ran up to the Union Church’s door, he yelled out, “Don’t worry, I’ll hose it down usin’ my gin as a fire-extinguisher, before I get out what really matters!”

¹⁸⁴ John Keble (1792-1866) was an early Puseyite leader, whose feeble theology was poison to the Protestantism of the Anglican Church.

¹⁸⁵ “Bush-telegraph” is an Australian colloquialism, meaning “word of mouth.”

Shortly later he emerged. “Phew!” he said, “I’ve done it!” holding up one of the church’s plain glass windows. “I’ve saved this,” he said, “so that in all those Romish vestments I wear, if I and the others get all hot and sticky and smelly from all the candles and incense we burn, ... WE CAN STILL OPEN A WINDOW!”

***9) Accession Day – 60th anniversary: Diamond Jubilee.**

A couple of days after *Gunpowder Treason Day* on 5 November 2010, my Mother showed me an old programme from the Hunter’s Hill Junior Music Club in Sydney, for Saturday the 4th of Nov. 1972, for an event starting at 7.30 p.m., that was held in the “ALL SAINTS [Anglican] CHURCH HALL, HUNTER’S HILL”. This was on the Eve of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* when I was 12 years old, and in my first year of High School at Macquarie Boys’ High (at North Parramatta in western Sydney¹⁸⁶). The programme states at the top that what was then the national anthem, “GOD SAVE THE QUEEN” was played by “Gavin McGrath” on the “Trombone;” and later I played a “Sonatino” i.e., a small sonata, “in C” by “Kullak” on the “PIANO.” I recall that I also used to play “God Save the Queen” on a wind instrument known as the Recorder. On the one hand, I have not practiced playing these two musical instruments since my school days back in the 1970s, and “God Save the Queen” is sadly no longer the National Anthem of Australia, although it remains a song sometimes sung. But on the other hand, I still like to “trumpet out” the values of “God Save the Queen,” for “if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?” (I Cor. 14:8). That is because these are Biblical values. Indeed we are commanded by God himself in Scripture to both make “prayers” “for kings” (I Tim. 2:1,2), and “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17).

As noted at section “5) Accession Day Principles,” *supra*, there is a commonality of Lessons in the Offices of *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* (30 Jan.), *The King’s Restoration Day* (or *Royal Oak Day*) (29 May), and *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) which were removed from the prayer book in 1859, and the Office of *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch which remained in the prayer book after 1859, and these remain in the present *Accession Service* as revised in 1901. These common Bible readings of Matt. 22:16-22 (29 May & *Accession Day*), Rom. 13:1-7 (5 Nov. - Rom. 13:1-7; & *Accession*

¹⁸⁶ This school was last open to students in 2009 and was closed from 2010.

Day - Rom. 13:1-10); I Peter 2:13-17 (30 Jan., 29 May, & *Accession Day*), manifest important points of intersecting agreement in theological emphasis. Firstly, there is the recognition of the lawful authority of the monarch; and secondly, these Offices remind us of the legal Protestantism of the Crown as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, even if some monarchs are less worthy recipients of such honours than others. We thus find an important point of continuity amidst change, in the retention of the *Accession Service* after 1859, as revised since 1901, which is now the lone surviving red-letter day with its own Office, and thus the lone surviving recipient of the Anglican Church's highest liturgical honour for a day on her Calendar.

I Peter 2:17 says to "Honour the king;" and in referring to e.g., "tribute" (Matt. 22:17), Christ says, "Render ... unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" (Matt. 22:21). Notably, both ideas are present in Rom. 13:7, "Render .to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; ... honour to whom honour." Moreover, the teaching of Gal. 5:19-21 that those involved in "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God," is also echoed in the Rom. 13:2 teaching that "whosoever ... resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." In this context, the further citation of some of the precepts of the Holy Decalogue, including, "Thou shalt not kill" at Rom. 13:9 is also instructive. Thus the Rom. 13:1-7 passage, or Rom. 13:1-10 passage encapsulates much that is in the other passages, and so it is notable that Rom. 13:1-10 is one of the Proper Lessons set in the *Accession Service* for Mattins and Evensong; and that I Peter 2:13-17 and Matt. 22:16-22 are the Epistle and Gospel readings respectively at The Communion Service in the *Accession Service*.

As I note in this commentary at Matt. 21:7, St. Matthew has a special emphasis on the kingly elements of Christ. He is called by St. John the Divine, the "KING OF KINGS" (Rev. 19:16). It is thus with a certain appropriateness that my first three textual commentary volumes of St. Matthew's Gospel have been dedicated to God with special reference to Protestant monarchs of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Thus Volume 1 on Matt. 1-14 was Dedicated on *King Charles I's Day* 2008 and the Revised Volume 1 on Matt. 1-14 was Dedicated on *King Charles I's Day* 2010 in special memory of King Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649); Volume 2 on Matt. 15-20 was Dedicated on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* 2009 in special memory of King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) of the King James Bible, and King William III of Orange (Regnal Years: 1689-1702; joint reign with Queen Mary II, 1689-1694); and Volume 3 on Matt. 21-25 was Dedicated on *Royal Oak Day* 2010 in special memory of the Restoration of the legally Protestant King and Royal Family in 1660 under King Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685). And now some four years after the original Volume 1 in January 2008, this Volume 4 in February 2012 on Matt. 26 to 28 is therefore no exception, but fits within these same types of parameters, since it is Dedicated to Almighty God on the *Accession Day* of Queen Elizabeth II's Diamond Jubilee on Monday 6 February, 2012 (Regnal Years: since 1952).

During this Queen's Diamond Jubilee Year of 2012, no doubt many will focus their attention for this on a variety of things that the Queen either has done over her life,

or has done during this year of 2012. E.g., in London, UK, Greenwich is being made a Royal Borough as part of the 2012 Diamond Jubilee celebrations in London. The Royal Observatory at Greenwich, Greenwich Park, London, has been visited by myself on a number of occasions, and it is the point at which one finds the world's Prime Meridian. In the Greenwich Park grounds, next to Queen's House, I have also inspected a statue of Captain James Cook (1728-1729), a navigator and the discoverer of eastern Australia in 1770. Upon his return to London, in celebration of his safe return and discovery of eastern Australia, the bells of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, an Anglican Church overlooking London's Trafalgar Square, were rung all day. In the 1980s these bells were to be melted down as they were worn out, but they were then saved by donations in 1987, and given as a gift to the City of Perth in Western Australia in 1988 to mark the Australian Bicentennial of 1788-1988, with new bells then going into St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. St. Martin's-in-the-Fields and St. Martin Orgar Church in Martin Lane, London, are both regarded as "the bells of St. Martin's" in the Nursery Rhyme, "Oranges and Lemons," with the words, "'You owe me five farthings,' said the bells of St. Martin's." On Queen Elizabeth II's Royal Visit to Australia in 2011, the city of Perth in Western Australia was the Queen's final destination and departure point from the Land of the Southern Cross.

Thus on the one hand, I too have made some limited references to matters that the Queen either has done over her life, or during this year of 2012. For example, the making of Greenwich into a Royal Borough, *supra*; or section "7) The Royal Visit to Australia in October 2011," *supra*; or reference to the Queen's "positive references to Christian faith in some of her Christmas messages, and her endorsement of the King James Bible in her 2010 Christmas message which included a positive reference to the 400th anniversary of the King James Version in what was then the following year of 2011," at section "5) Accession Day Principles," *supra*.

But on the other hand, such personal details, though they may be quite interesting and informative, are not my primary focus with regard to *Accession Day*. Rather, my principle interest and focus is on the legal Protestantism of the Crown, which as both a spiritual and temporal power has a vast temporal territorial realm in the combined world-wide geographical size of countries such as Australia, Canada, and the UK; and also a spiritual realm in the *Church of England*. In this context, the *Accession Service* contains an important celebration of Protestant theology, namely, that the monarch is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*. That is because in the words of Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles, "The King's Majesty hath the chief power in the Realm of England, and other his Dominions, ... whether ... Ecclesiastical or Civil, ... and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction ...," for which reason, "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm" This is a fundamental feature of the *Accession Service*.

For these purposes, it does not ultimately matter that the monarch is now largely a titular or ceremonial figure in both Church and State. But it does matter that in the battle of images for we who look to Christ as the only *universal bishop* as "Bishop of ... souls" (I Peter 2:25), and the only *Head of the universal (catholic) Church* (Eph. 5:23); for we thus repudiate the false and spurious claims of the Roman Pope to be such as "universal

bishop” (Decree of Phocas in 607, making the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, the first Pope), or “Vicar of Christ and the visible head of the whole Church” (*Dogmatic Constitution of the Church*, 18, Vatican II Council, 1963-5¹⁸⁷). That is because in human terms here on earth, in this battle of images, the image of the monarch acts as a helpful and useful counter-balance to the Papal Antichrist’s claims. For the Bishop of Rome is also both a temporal and spiritual power, and his claim to a “universal jurisdiction” in the church is to some extent counteracted and counter-balanced in this battle of images by pointing to the temporal Sovereign of the UK, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere, who as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* also has a spiritual realm, and thus highlights the falsity of these Papal claims. The reality is, that when a Roman Catholic Papal Visit is made to a country like e.g., Australia, great crowds go out to see him; and so too, when the monarch of England and elsewhere makes a Royal Visit to a country like e.g., Australia, great crowds go out to see the Sovereign. Thus an important counter-balance is provided in the battle of images, by the legal Protestantism of the Crown.

Furthermore, the Crown has a Christian cross on top of it, both in the actual crown worn by the monarch, and in heraldic crests of it. Thus the legal Protestant Christianity of the Crown upholds a Christian standard and thus acts to also counter-balance and counteract various images of infidel and heathen religions. God has given us the legally Protestant Christian monarchy of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Canada, and elsewhere, with both a vast temporal realm and also a spiritual realm in England. God has given us this legally Protestant Christian monarchy which is required at law to be Protestant and uphold the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and *Thirty-Nine Articles* as a standard of Protestant Christianity (whether or not in practice given monarchs do or do not do this as they should). God has given us this legally Protestant Christian monarchy under the Establishment Principle of Isaiah 49:22,23, “Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people.” “And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers,” “and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me.”

And hence e.g., we read in the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version of 1611 that “James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, ... and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.” was such a “tender and loving nursing father” (Isa. 49:23) in his “caring for the Church,” e.g., “by writing in defence of the truth,” “which hath given such a blow unto that man of sin [II Thess. 2:3], as will not be healed.” For the “labours” of these King James translators were set against a backdrop in which the Word of God being translated by them could be used to defend such truth against both “Popish persons at home or abroad, who ... malign us,” and also against “selfconceited brethren” who “maligned” them or us. God has given us this legally Protestant Christian monarchy, so let us pray, “Holy Father, we thank for this legally Protestant Christian monarchy, and

¹⁸⁷ Flannery, A. (Ed.), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Costello, New York, USA 1977, p. 370.

pray that we may use it as best we can to thy honour and glory, and this we ask through the atoning merits of Jesus Christ, in the power of the Holy Ghost, three Persons and one God, world without end. Amen.”

Accession Day of the reigning Sovereign,
Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, on
the occasion of her 60th Diamond Jubilee
Anniversary (1952-2012), and
commencement of her 61st Regnal Year.
Monday 6 February, 2012.
Mangrove Mountain Union Church,
New South Wales, Australia.