

# CHRISTIAN WATCH

A PROTESTANT BIBLICAL WITNESS

**"And what I say unto you**

**I say unto all, Watch"**

**Mark 13:37**

**OCTOBER 2010  
NEWSLETTER**

October 2010

To all Christian Watch Members

Dear Friends,

We firstly wish to convey our apologies for the late delivery of our September Newsletter; this was due to an administrative error at the printers.

We are in constant need of the Lord's help and guidance if we are to serve Him rightly and also provide you with information that will be helpful and profitable to you. We are thankful for the encouragements we receive from time to time, particularly relative to the spiritual items we include. We need to be constantly aware of the endeavours of the devil and his agents, who seek to undermine every aspect of true Christian religion.

The times in which we are living are clearly identifiable with the Biblical testimony of the "last days" and the events that will precede the physical return of the Lord Jesus Christ to this earth. We have recently witnessed the Pope of Rome's first official visit to the United Kingdom, since the Reformation. This, together with other events in the world, has caused us to further consider what the Word of God provides for us to identify these present times. We read in 2 Thessalonians chapter 2 concerning the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and the other events that will take place both before and at that time. For example, "*for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.*" (verse 3).

We also read in verses 8 to 12 of the same chapter, "*And then shall that Wicked be revealed ... whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish. .... And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.*" Is not this exactly that which has occurred during the Pope's recent visit, with HM the Queen and many members of her Government, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, making obeisance to him and taking heed to his deliberations?

Pastor Shaun Willcock has prepared for us an excellent article on the Pope's recent visit to the UK, which we include, entitled, **Antichrist in the UK 2010**. Although it is a longer article than those we normally include, we consider its contents to be particularly current and relevant and therefore trust you will find it helpful in identifying the work of the devil in the events which have recently taken place.

We include details of the Autumn Conference of the **UNITED PROTESTANT COUNCIL**, which is to be held on the 6<sup>th</sup> November, God willing. An address is to be given by Mr Cecil Andrews under the title of **EVANGELICALISM AND ROMANISM**. Mr Andrews is Director of "Take Heed Ministries" of Northern Ireland. We also include his personal testimony which details how the Lord called him by grace, thus enabling him to choose "*rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season*" Hebrews 11:25.

We include two further articles. Firstly, concerning the Archbishop of Canterbury - **Dr Rowan Williams tells 'The Times'** (newspaper) **he has "no problem" with homosexuals being bishops, but gay clergy must be celibate** and, secondly, **Referendum drive moves up a gear**, which relates to the European Union. Both of these articles are self-explanatory.

We pray the Lord will keep and bless all our Members in these evil and increasingly solemn times.

Yours, in the Lord's service,



**David Crowter**

**Management Committee**

Mr D Boyd; Mr M Brockes (Hon Treasurer/ Co Secretary); Mr A Busk; Mr D Crowter (Chairman);  
Mr I Henderson; Mr R Jupp; Mr D Lawson; Mr M de Semlyen; Mrs J Cummins (Secretary).

# Antichrist in the UK 2010

by Shaun Willcock

The Roman Antichrist, Benedict XVI, visited the United Kingdom in September 2010. This was the first official *state visit* by a pope of Rome to the country since the Reformation, when King Henry VIII broke with Rome in 1534 and the so-called “Church of England” (the Anglican institution) was established with the King as its head. Although Benedict’s predecessor, John Paul II, visited Britain in 1982, it was not an official state visit, but was billed as a “pastoral visit” by the spiritual leader of Britain’s Roman Catholics, coming to visit his flock. Even so, however, John Paul II was received by Queen Elizabeth II, and so it *was*, still, a political visit, even if not *officially* a “state visit.” The pope of Rome, as the head of a political state – Vatican City – travels, always, as both a political and a religious leader. But in 1982 there was a pretence of the visit being merely pastoral. This time round it was all out in the open: Benedict XVI was coming on an official state visit to the United Kingdom. Very evidently the time was deemed ripe, and there was confidence that, 28 years after the last visit, the Roman pontiff could be welcomed officially, without much protest. This time it is openly (because the climate is deemed safe) what papal visits are: a claim to being the supreme head of all Christians, and of all countries. From the earliest times popes have had political pretensions. Boniface VIII (1294-1303), in one of his papal proclamations said, ‘Listen to the Vicar of Christ, who is placed over kings and kingdoms.’ In 1570, Pope Pius V, in a bull (formal written statement) against Queen Elizabeth I, with gross impudence claimed to be ‘prince over all nations and kingdoms.’ The “Church” of Rome believes itself to be the *only true Church on earth*,<sup>2</sup> and that all human beings should be subject to the Roman pontiff. Truly, Antichrist can never say, with the Lord Jesus Christ, “My kingdom is not of this world” (Jn. 18:36). Antichrist’s kingdom is most definitely a worldly kingdom.

## *The Purpose of the Papal Visit*

Former prime minister, Gordon Brown, personally issued the invitation to Benedict to visit the UK on a state visit. The question is: why? Politicians always do everything for their own political advancement, and this invitation was no exception: Brown “was desperate to curry favour with Scottish Catholics, and to damage the rival Scottish National Party, inconveniently gaining ground among that Catholic constituency (traditionally faithful to [Brown’s] Labour [Party]). And so the state invitation was sent in the Queen’s name (as head of state, it is Queen Elizabeth who formally issues such invitations).”<sup>3</sup>

But why was the Vatican so eager to have its pope visit the UK? The press could harp on and on about his visit being to “improve strained relationships between Anglicans and Roman Catholics”, but that does not in any sense capture what this visit was all about. The coming of the Antichrist to the shores of Britain at this time was nothing less than a victory journey by this man, who is now so confident of Britain soon falling like a ripe fruit into the lap of Rome. And everything that took place during the visit was geared towards that objective. Everything. From the symbolism, to the speeches, to the “beatification” of John Henry Newman, a sinister, devious Romish cardinal. More about him a little later.

That Benedict could travel to Britain as a head of state is shocking, and shows just how far Britain has fallen. The Queen, even though unbiblically declared by law to be the head of the “Church of England”, nevertheless should *never* have welcomed Benedict to British shores, for the Papacy has been fanatically committed to destroying the British monarchy, British government, Britain’s “State Church”, and British Protestantism, ever since the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century when the land ceased to be officially Roman Catholic, and it has sought to do this by any and every means possible, fair or foul – especially foul. The history of the last four and a half centuries is replete with the Papacy’s attempts to regain control of Britain, and especially England. As I wrote in my book, *Satan’s Seat*: England “became the Jesuits’ main target.... They established seminaries on the continent, for the purpose of training Roman Catholic missionaries to work in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Working secretly, they spread throughout England, hearing confessions, preaching, etc. They clandestinely printed and distributed tracts against the queen and the ‘Church of England.’ While some were at times caught, others succeeded in infiltrating the government itself.”<sup>4</sup>

In the words of a nineteenth-century Papist cardinal, Manning: “If ever there was a country in which there is much to do, and perhaps much to suffer, it is here [England]. I shall not say too much if I say that it is for us to subjugate and subdue, to conquer and to rule, an imperial race. We have to do with a will which reigns throughout the world, as the will of old Rome reigned once; and it is for us to bend or break that will, which nations and kingdoms have found invincible and inflexible. Were heresy [i.e. Protestantism] conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world. All its lines meet here; therefore, in England the Church of God [i.e. Roman Catholicism] must be gathered in all its strength. You have a great commission to fulfil, and great is the prize for which you strive.”

Again from *Satan’s Seat*: “One of Rome’s primary objectives has been the conquest of England. To achieve this it was necessary to destroy the Anglican denomination, the so-called ‘Church of England’. The Jesuits did their work well: the ‘Romeward Movement’ within Anglicanism gained momentum through the 19th century, and into the 20th”<sup>5</sup>

This “Romeward Movement” within the Anglican institution was known by different names: the Oxford Movement; the Tractarian Movement; Puseyism. And the man Benedict came to the UK to beatify, a cardinal named John Henry Newman, was one of its leading lights.

### ***The Symbolism, the Sovereign and Her Speech***

The symbolism of the place where the Queen officially welcomed the pope of Rome was very pointed and very deliberate. Queen Elizabeth II welcomed Benedict at the palace of Holyroodhouse, her official residence in Scotland and the former home of Britain's last Roman Catholic queen! Now why choose such a place to welcome the pope of Rome? It was definitely not coincidence. The last Papist queen lived there, and now she who will almost certainly be the last nominally "Protestant" queen officially welcomed a triumphant Benedict, coming to reclaim the UK for himself!

Very significantly, and in another of those highly symbolic gestures which Rome loves, it was reported that "An actor has been hired by the Catholic Church to play the part of John Knox [the famous Scottish Reformer of the sixteenth century] in front of the pope-mobile as it proceeds along Princes Street [Edinburgh, Scotland]. Here Knox must be presented falsely, for the real John Knox did not kowtow to any Roman Catholic prelate nor even greet such persons.... By presenting Knox in pageantry, the Papacy is attempting to portray him as a visible herald of Scotland's impending return to the papal fold. Thus, like a conqueror, the Pontiff is to parade along Princes Street. Knox is being used as a sop to the ecumenists."<sup>6</sup> What arrogant triumphalism! The Papacy was so confident of itself, and of its growing influence over the UK, that it could plan to depict the leader of the Scottish Reformation as a herald of the Antichrist's victorious arrival!

In her welcoming speech, Elizabeth addressed Benedict as "Your Holiness" and said she was "delighted" to welcome him to the UK. "I recall with great pleasure the memorable pastoral visit of the late Pope John Paul II to this country in 1982," she said. "I also have vivid memories of my four visits to the Vatican, and of meeting some of your predecessors on other occasions."<sup>7</sup> How disgraceful, that the woman sworn to uphold the Protestant constitution of Britain should so warmly welcome the representative of Britain's greatest enemy to the country. Not that Elizabeth is a true Christian, of course, and nor is the "Protestantism" of the "Established Church of England" biblical; but nevertheless, as Queen she has betrayed her coronation oath and is helping take the country back to Rome.

Revealing either her gross ignorance of factual history or possibly revealing a deliberate and sinister purpose behind her words, she then said, "In this country, we deeply appreciate the involvement of the Holy See in the dramatic improvement in the situation in Northern Ireland." What a betrayal of the Irish Protestants, long known as her most loyal subjects! The Vatican's involvement in Northern Ireland through the decades was to enthusiastically, financially, and morally support the terrorist Roman Catholic organisation, the IRA, against the Protestants of Northern Ireland.<sup>8</sup> Rome has done nothing but stir up the Papists of Northern Ireland, inflame them with hatred, and put the weapons in their hands that have caused such suffering in that province – and yet the Queen *praised* the pope of Rome for his involvement! Her words were despicable and shocking.

She also said that Benedict's presence "reminds us of our common Christian heritage"<sup>9</sup> There is *no* common Christian heritage between Roman Catholicism and biblical Christianity, but tragically the Queen's Anglican institution is *not* a Christian church, and there is *much* in common between it and Romanism.

Turning to the beatification of Romish cardinal, John Henry Newman, the Queen said: "I know that reconciliation [between different faiths] was a central theme in the life of Cardinal John Henry Newman, for whom you will be holding a Mass of Beatification... his contribution to the understanding of Christianity continues to influence many." This was all nonsense. Newman was not interested in "reconciliation" between faiths, he was committed to moving the Anglican institution – the very "church" of which Elizabeth is called, unbiblically, the Supreme Governor – towards *absorption back into the Roman fold*. Newman had *no* understanding of true Christianity at all, but a very shrewd understanding of Anglicanism and Romanism, and how to bring the former into subjection to the latter, as will be seen later in this article.

She also said, "I am pleased that your visit will also provide an opportunity to deepen the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the Established Church of England and the Church of Scotland." There should be *no* relationship between them! And if the Queen was true to what she must know of her own country's history, of its long and bloody struggle with the Papacy, she would never have said such a thing.

### ***Antichrist's Speech: Urging the UK Back to Its Romish Roots***

In his first speech, his greeting to the Queen, Benedict made the point, very strongly, that Britain should remember its "Christian" past, its "Christian" faith. But always keep in mind – never would this man be referring to Britain's *Protestant* past and faith, only to its pre-Reformation, *Papist* past and faith! For what Benedict, and indeed the entire Popish hierarchy, desires, is for Britain to once again be a full Roman Catholic state, devoted to the Papacy as it once had been before the Reformation.

Note what Benedict said in his speech to the Queen regarding the palace of Holyroodhouse: "The name of Holyroodhouse, Your Majesty's official residence in Scotland, recalls the 'Holy Cross' and points to the deep Christian roots that are still present in every layer of British life."<sup>10</sup> The word "rood" means "cross" in old English. Note that Benedict made the point that Britain should return to that *ancient* faith – the Roman Catholic faith – that once had dominated every sphere of life in that land. If in any doubt, consider his next words:

"The monarchs of England and Scotland have been Christians from very early times and include outstanding saints like Edward the Confessor and Margaret of Scotland. As you know, many of them consciously exercised their sovereign duty in the light of the Gospel, and in this way shaped the nation for good at the deepest level. As a result, the Christian message has been an integral part of the language, thought and culture of the peoples of these islands for more than a thousand years. Your forefathers' respect for truth and justice, for mercy and charity come to you from a faith that remains a mighty force for good in your kingdom, to the great benefit of Christians and non-Christians alike." It was so obvious! – a thousand years ago the "faith" of Britain was the Roman Catholic faith and no other! *This* was the "faith" Benedict was referring to – not the Protestant faith.

Then this man, with the subtlety of the serpent, said: “We find many examples of this force for good throughout Britain’s long history. Even in comparatively recent times, due to figures like William Wilberforce and David Livingstone, Britain intervened directly to stop the international slave trade. Inspired by faith, women like Florence Nightingale served the poor and the sick and set new standards in healthcare that were subsequently copied everywhere. John Henry Newman, whose beatification I will celebrate shortly, was one of many British Christians of his age whose goodness, eloquence and action were a credit to their countrymen and women. These, and many people like them, were inspired by a deep faith born and nurtured in these islands.”

Note how he slid smoothly and slickly from praising Protestants, Wilberforce, Livingstone and Nightingale – even referring to their “deep faith”, which must have been hard for him to even utter – to the wicked, lying, deceitful, sneaky double agent for Rome, John Henry Newman. Wilberforce and Livingstone would doubtless be disgusted to know that their names were mentioned in this way by the Antichrist of Rome, and in almost the same breath as Newman. As we shall see, there was *nothing* Christian about this man, nothing good, and he certainly was not a credit to his countrymen. He was a spiritual traitor.

Again evincing the serpent’s subtlety, Antichrist spoke, in his speech to the Queen, of the evil of “Nazi tyranny that wished to eradicate God from society and denied our common humanity to many, especially the Jews, who were thought unfit to live.... As we reflect on the sobering lessons of the atheist extremism of the twentieth century, let us never forget how the exclusion of God, religion and virtue from public life leads ultimately to a truncated vision of man and society”.

That Nazi tyranny was in fact *a tyranny supported and promoted by the Vatican itself at the time!* – as history makes so abundantly clear. The Vatican supported Hitler, Franco and Mussolini and was fully behind the Nazi atrocities against the Jews.<sup>11</sup> And as for Communism, the “atheist extremism” condemned by Benedict, that monstrous ideology too has been *massively supported and promoted by the Vatican!* – again, as history makes abundantly clear for those willing to look for the evidence.<sup>12</sup> But the Roman pontiff was so sure that almost no one today knows the true history of the Vatican’s support for Nazism and Communism, that he was able to piously condemn these very ideologies which his evil predecessors on the papal throne supported to the hilt.

### ***The Papal Pot Calling the Kettle Black***

Benedict was determined to use this visit to constantly push the theme of Britain’s Roman Catholic past, and of the need to revive that ancient faith so as to combat secularism and atheism in society. The pope of Rome well knows that the battle is on between Roman Catholicism and secular humanism in Europe and indeed the world, and he is determined to squash the latter. At the open-air mass held on the evening of the first day of his visit, on the outskirts of Glasgow, Benedict said in his speech that the evangelisation of culture “is all the more important” because of “a dictatorship of relativism”. And: “There are some who now seek to exclude religious belief from public discourse, to privatize it or even to paint it as a threat to equality and liberty. Yet religion is in fact a guarantee of authentic liberty and respect”. He urged Scottish Roman Catholic professionals, politicians and teachers to work hard in their spheres to advance the Roman Catholic religion.

He was right about what secular humanism is seeking to do against religion, but no true Christian should ever think that common cause can be found with Rome to fight against such secularism. Rome has its own agenda in all this, and Christians are never, ever to unite with the Lord’s enemies to fight a common enemy. “Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord?” (2 Chron. 19:2); “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers... Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord” (2 Cor. 6:14-17). And it sure was rich to hear the leader of the world’s greatest religio-political dictatorship condemning the “dictatorship of relativism”, the leader of a religion utterly opposed to religious liberty saying religion (meaning Roman Catholicism) is a guarantee of liberty and respect!

### ***Unity, Unity...Like the Good Ol’ Days of Papal Power***

He deliberately referred to Scotland’s mediaeval Roman Catholic universities founded by the popes of Rome, and to Popish “saints” such as the so-called “St.” Ninian, who came to Scotland as “one of the very first Catholic missionaries”, and “St.” Mungo, patron saint of Glasgow, “St.” Columba and “St.” Margaret.

At this open-air mass, Benedict spoke of the “greater trust and friendship” now existing between Roman Catholics and “the members of the Church of Scotland, the Scottish Episcopal Church and others.” Yes, Rome’s ecumenical movement has done its work well. He spoke of them all working for “a brighter future for Scotland based upon our common Christian heritage.” Once again the same theme, the theme of “unity”; and yet Rome does not in truth desire unity, which would be evil enough, but the absorption of all other religious bodies into itself. The fact is that Scotland had a far brighter future when it was Protestant, and recognised the pope of Rome as the Antichrist. Today, having by and large set aside that conviction, its future looks bleak indeed: a future in which Scotland will be dominated by the increasingly authoritarian power of Rome.

Continuing the theme of ecumenism, note how Benedict smoothly changed the focus: “This year marks the 450th anniversary of the Reformation Parliament, but also the 100th anniversary of the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, which is widely acknowledged to mark the birth of the modern ecumenical movement. Let us give thanks to God for the promise which ecumenical understanding and co-operation represents for a united witness...” See? A nod to the historical fact of the 450th anniversary of the Reformation Parliament, “*but also*” (and far more importantly to Rome) the 100th anniversary of the birth of the ecumenical movement.

### ***Rome and Canterbury: Mother and Wayward but Penitent Daughter***

On the second day of his visit Benedict met, of course, with Rowan Williams, the Anglican archbishop of Canterbury and the spiritual head of the Anglican institution. Williams, a hypocrite of the first order who was, when he became archbishop, *an honorary pagan Druid priest*,<sup>13</sup> must know that Anglicanism has lost, it is beaten, and that the Papacy has triumphed at last. Then again, maybe he himself has been secretly working for this very thing, as so many Anglicans leaders have done before him and are still doing. He just cannot be trusted.

Showing Williams' utter blindness to the true Gospel, he and Benedict "affirmed the need to proclaim the Gospel message of salvation in Jesus Christ, both in a reasoned and convincing way in the contemporary context of profound cultural and social transformation, and in lives of holiness and transparency to God," said the communiqué released after the event.<sup>14</sup> What "gospel" does the Papacy proclaim? And what holiness is lived by a man such as Benedict or any of his minions? Roman Catholicism preaches an entirely false "gospel" of salvation by man's own works, a devilish lie that has damned multiplied millions to hell. As for "holiness", what is holy about a religion which has abused children on a massive scale; which finances and supports revolutions around the world; which has massacred millions and millions of people through the centuries; which is filled with every vice and every filthy and abominable deed? (Rev. 9:20,21; 18:2). But Williams could affirm this joint communiqué with Benedict because birds of a feather flock together! Anglicanism is a spiritual harlot daughter of the Mother Whore of Rome. *It, too*, proclaims a false "gospel" of the lie of baptismal regeneration, of Anglo-Catholic works-salvation via ritual, and it too is an unholy, ungodly mixture that is an abomination in the eyes of the Lord. This is not a time for mincing words. The truth must be told. Like mother, like daughter.

During the meeting, the two men spoke of the importance of improved ecumenical relations. What a joke. Rome is not interested in "unity" with Anglicanism, only in *absorbing* Anglicanism – and it is well on the way to doing precisely that. Rome makes all the right noises, but the truth is that Anglicanism is pretty much finished. It is on its way out. A triumphant Papacy is marching across Anglicanism's home turf, and there is nothing, nothing whatsoever, that Canterbury can do about it. It's too late. It's the end game.

Williams, in his speech to the Anglican and Papist bishops gathered for the event, said, "We do not as churches seek political power or control, or the dominance of Christian faith in the public sphere". What a lie! This, coming from a man who is the spiritual head of a so-called "church" which proudly boasts of its "State Church" position in England, a "church" where the English monarch is its head and is officially known as "Defender of the Faith"! Anglicanism has exerted varying degrees of political influence over England for centuries! And then there is Rome – a religio-political harlot which has most definitely, and aggressively, and ruthlessly, sought for political power and control *across the whole earth* for many centuries! A "church" which, if it had its way, would allow no religion to exist in a country except itself. A "church" whose pontiff is not only a spiritual leader, but a head of state *and was received in England on this visit AS a head of state!* Yet Williams says, "We do not as churches seek political power or control, or the dominance of Christian faith in the public sphere"! But it didn't stop there.

### ***Canterbury's Archbishop Prepares the Way for Further Papal Advancement***

Williams, during his evening prayer address, said: "Christians in Britain, especially in England, look back with the most fervent gratitude to the events of 597, when Augustine landed on these shores to preach the gospel to the Anglo-Saxons at the behest of Pope St Gregory the Great." But Augustine was not a true Christian, he was a violent and wicked man, an ambassador not of Christ but of the pope of Rome! Yet Williams praised him and Gregory who sent him. Going on, Williams sunk even lower: "For Christians of all traditions and confessions, St Gregory is a figure of compelling attractiveness and spiritual authority – pastor and leader, scholar and exegete and spiritual guide." Yet what does history actually reveal of this Roman pontiff of "compelling attractiveness", and of his servant Augustine? The following extracts are from *The Story of the Light that Never Went Out*:

"Gregory the Great was a most ambitious pope; nothing but the conquest of the world to Rome would satisfy him." "Gregory the Great had chosen the right man to accomplish this work; Augustine was as ambitious as he was to see the world brought under the sway of the fast developing kingdom of papal Rome.... Gregory despatched more missionaries [to England], and loaded them with vestments and church ornaments, and a quantity of rags and bones – supposed to be the relics of saints and martyrs, to which the increasing superstition of the times attributed many absurd and fabulous miracles. With these relics Augustine might hope to overawe and vanquish the English!" And when the professing church in Britain refused to submit to the authority of the Roman pontiff, Augustine said to them: "if you will not receive brethren who bring you peace, you shall receive enemies who will bring you war. If you will not unite with us in showing the Saxon the way of life, you shall receive from them the stroke of death."<sup>15</sup> And the military power of Rome was used to subdue England by bloodshed.

*These* were the men – Gregory and Augustine – whom Williams praised so highly in his address to the Roman Antichrist! But he wasn't done; he had to sink lower still. He said: "The fact that the first preaching of the Gospel to the English peoples in the sixth and seventh centuries has its origins in his [Gregory's] vision creates a special connection for us with the See of the Apostles Peter and Paul; and Gregory's witness and legacy remain an immensely fruitful source of inspiration for our own mission in these dramatically different times." Williams needs to brush up on his history (or was it a deliberate smokescreen again?): the Gospel reached Britain *long before* Gregory ever sent Augustine to that land. But by saying this Williams gave the impression that Britain has Popery to thank for the arrival of the "Gospel"! Plus, he referred to Rome as "the See of the Apostles Peter and Paul" – another historical inaccuracy as Peter was never actually in Rome, and Paul never had a "See" there. Once again Williams was pointing out the special, unique role of the Roman pontiff over all Christendom, by virtue of being, supposedly, the "successor of Peter" – a great falsehood.

Williams then went on to praise the life and work of the evil Roman Catholic “saint”, Benedict, founder of the Benedictine order of monks, and the man whose name Joseph Ratzinger chose for himself when he became the Roman pope, Benedict XVI. Williams said British culture had tragically lost sight of that original Benedict’s “vision”, but that the present Benedict had made a huge “contribution to a Benedictine vision for our days”.

When Williams then spoke of the meaning of the role and mission of the pope of Rome, it was very evident that he conceded a unique place to the pope of Rome within the “universal Church” (which of course is not the *true* universal Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, but the many *false* “churches” worldwide). This is what he said:

“Christians have very diverse views about the nature of the vocation that belongs to the See of Rome. Yet, as Your Holiness’s great predecessor [John Paul II] reminded us all in his encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*, we must learn to reflect together on how the historic ministry of the Roman Church and its chief pastor may speak to the Church catholic – East and West, global north and global south – of the authority of Christ and his apostles to build up the Body in love; how it may be realised as a ministry of patience and reverence towards all, a ministry of creative love and self-giving that leads us all into the same path of seeking not our own comfort or profit but the good of the entire human community and the glory of God the creator and redeemer.”<sup>16</sup>

Cutting through all the sweet-talk, what Williams was saying was that the role of the Roman Catholic institution and its pope is a very special one, and unique. And his words were well understood by Roman Catholic journalist, Robert Moynihan, who said: “Of course, Williams is not saying here that he and his fellow Anglicans will recognize without qualification the Bishop of Rome’s ministry as the head of the Christian Church. But... he is clearly linking the two concepts of ‘the Roman church and its pastor’ (that is, the Pope) and ‘a ministry... towards all’ (that is, a universal ministry). The implicit suggestion is that, for Williams, there is, in fact, a mission ‘towards all’ which must be carried out by ‘the Roman church and its chief pastor.’”<sup>17</sup> Williams was opening the door towards some as-yet undefined submission to the See of Rome as time goes by.

And even though Benedict was in the UK to beatify John Henry Newman, an Anglican who converted to Rome and who did such damage to Anglicanism and such good work for Rome, Williams managed to speak well of the man, saying Newman “decided that he must follow his conscience and seek his future in serving God in communion with the See of Rome”<sup>18</sup> Even though Benedict was there to triumphantly rub the nose of Anglicanism in the dirt, Williams spoke meekly of Newman’s “conscience” and of “serving God in communion with” Rome! One doesn’t hear *Romish* bishops or archbishops speaking of ex-Papists as “following their conscience and seeking their future” in Protestant churches. They are never that generous, that magnanimous. The generosity and magnanimity are always from the non-Papist side.

### ***John Henry Newman: the Man Beatified by Benedict***

And so we come to the actual beatification of John Henry Newman in Birmingham on the final day of Benedict XVI’s trip to the United Kingdom. This was done at an open-air mass attended by some 60,000 people.

When the Papacy “beatifies” some dead person, it means Papists may from then on refer to that person as “Blessed”. This brings that person one step closer to being declared a “saint” by Rome. The Bible says that *all* true *living* Christians are the Lord’s saints (e.g. Acts 9:32,41; Rom. 1:7; 15:25; 1 Cor. 1:2; 14:33; etc.). But according to Rome, the only ones who are “saints” are dead Papists whom Rome officially pronounces to be “saints” after certain tests. And Papists are permitted to pray to them, seeking their aid and their intercession with God, which is heretical as the Lord Jesus Christ alone is the Mediator between God and men (Jn. 14:6; 1 Tim. 2:5). It is praying to the dead, forbidden in Scripture for only God can hear and answer prayer! – Deut. 18:10-12. It is nothing but the ancient heathen belief in demigods, but under a “Christian” name. It is rank heathenism with no basis in the Bible. By beatifying Newman, Benedict brought him that much closer to being declared “Saint” Newman in due course.

We need to know about Newman himself, and why he was, and still is, so important to the Papacy. As I said earlier, quoting from my book, *Satan’s Seat*: “One of Rome’s primary objectives has been the conquest of England. To achieve this it was necessary to destroy the Anglican denomination, the so-called ‘Church of England’. The Jesuits did their work well: the ‘Romeward Movement’ within Anglicanism gained momentum through the 19th century, and into the 20th”.

The “Romeward Movement” within Anglicanism was known as the “Oxford Movement”, and also the “Tractarian Movement” (so called because of a series of tracts which were written in support of Anglicanism becoming increasingly pro-Roman Catholic). And John Henry Newman was at the centre of it, although by no means was he the only one. Rome, of course, sees the Oxford Movement very differently. It airily declares that it “aimed to help the Church of England return to its Catholic roots.”<sup>19</sup> This hides the real, sinister purpose behind it.

Newman was at first an Anglican priest. He is known for the hymn, “Lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom”, a hymn which no Protestant should sing and yet which, shockingly, is found in many Protestant hymnbooks. Another of his hymns found in various Protestant hymnbooks is “Praise to the Holiest in the height”, which is from his “Dream of Gerontius”, a poem about Purgatory!<sup>20</sup>

He was greatly influenced by a man named Hurrell Froude, who was fanatically opposed to Anglicanism and favourable to Roman Catholicism. Newman, possessing great powers of persuasion, convinced Anglican priests of the “High Church” persuasion (i.e. committed to a ritualistic, sacramental, Popish version of Anglicanism) that Roman Catholicism was far superior to even their “high” Anglicanism. They began to despise their Anglican heritage, the Reformation, etc., and to look with longing eyes towards Rome, from which the “Church of England” had separated itself at the Reformation. This was the start of what history knows as the Oxford or Tractarian Movement, but what

can equally be termed the Anglo-Catholic Movement: an Anglican Romeward direction which would continue to gain momentum in the years that followed. Anglo-Catholicism, essentially, is as much of Roman Catholicism within the Anglican institution as Anglo-Catholics feel they can get away with at any given time. It was a thinly disguised “web of deceit and intrigue”<sup>21</sup> and has the stamp of the Jesuit Order all over it.

In 1833 Froude and Newman sought to join the Roman Catholic institution while on a visit to Rome. “Newman’s subsequent activities while still in the Church of England were bent towards making this submission national rather than merely personal.”<sup>22</sup> In other words, he devoted his energies to bringing all of England back within the fold of Rome.

Newman and those who worked with him were very subtle, with the subtlety of the serpent himself. They worked to insinuate Romish doctrines and practices into the “Church of England”. But they were very careful about it, and while introducing Romish doctrines via their tracts, they also denounced Rome and the Papacy in other tracts – a tactic which Newman himself later admitted was adopted so as to hide their real intentions!<sup>23</sup> They were thus secret Papists pretending to be Anglicans. They were liars and deceivers, and were working for the Vatican itself, but doing so from *within* the Anglican “Church”, as secret agents for the pope of Rome.

In time, when he felt that it was opportune to do so, Newman nailed his colours to the mast, coming out openly and officially joining the Roman Catholic “Church”; and as a reward for his secretive services while still operating as a Popish agent within the Anglican “Church”, he was elevated to the position of a cardinal of Rome.

Newman has been praised by Papists and Anglo-Catholics, as well as many who should know better. Instead of being exposed for the wolf in sheep’s clothing which he was, the subtle secret agent for Rome, he is generally “seen as a gentle man of integrity, a martyr to conscience, who made the great sacrifice of leaving his beloved Anglican Church in order to venture out through the encircling gloom to reach the haven of the Roman Catholic Church. But Newman had no love for the Church of England and he says as much in his writings.”<sup>24</sup>

For the Papacy to “beatify” someone, they must usually be able to attribute at least two miracles to that person after his or her death. Jack Sullivan, an elderly Roman Catholic deacon from Massachusetts, USA, prayed to Newman for the healing of his crippling spinal condition, and claims to have been healed as a result.

However, even many Roman Catholics regard the beatification of Newman as “unsatisfactory”, for a number of reasons. Firstly, Newman himself expressly did not wish to be declared a “saint”. Secondly, Newman supposedly “has only performed one miracle since his death in 1890, and that seems to some people to be less than decisive. Jack Sullivan... has been cured of back and leg pain after praying to Newman, and doctors have testified that there is no medical explanation for his cure. But is one such miracle enough? And doesn’t back pain sometimes heal itself spontaneously?”<sup>25</sup> Quite so.

Thirdly, the homosexual lobby claims that Newman was a homosexual. He was buried with the man he openly said he loved more than anyone else in the world, a priest named Ambrose St John. And as far back as 1933, author Geoffrey Faber wrote of Newman’s “characteristically feminine nature”, and stated that Newman’s Oxford Movement was “homo-erotic.”<sup>26</sup> It would not surprise us at all if Newman was a sodomite, as so many (perhaps as many as 40% or more) within the Roman Catholic priesthood are sodomites. But in the light of the worldwide priestly sex scandals of recent times, which have greatly embarrassed and angered countless Roman Catholics, beatifying a possibly homosexual cardinal seems, to many of them, to be a very foolish move at this time.

### ***The Jesuits’ Hands on the Oxford Movement and on Newman***

Was the Oxford Movement, and Newman himself, under secret *Jesuit* control? There can be no doubt about it, given the fanatical hatred of the Jesuit Order at all times for England and for English Protestants, and their ceaseless plots to bring England back under Rome<sup>27</sup> and destroy English Protestantism, and given what is known of Newman himself. Look at the evidence:

The greatest book ever written against the Oxford Movement was *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, by Walter Walsh, in the 19th century. And this meticulous author was convinced that the Jesuits had their fingers deep in the Oxford Movement. The following quotation from the book, though lengthy, should be very carefully read in the light of the Papal Antichrist’s 2010 visit to the UK and his beatification of Newman. Walsh wrote (italics added):

“But I certainly am inclined to attach a good deal of importance to the revelations made by the late Rev. Dr. Desanctis, formerly parish priest of the Madallena, Rome, Professor of Theology, Official Theological Censor of the Inquisition, and subsequently Minister of the Reformed Italian Church at Geneva. Desanctis was a man of high personal character, and from the offices he held while at Rome was enabled to obtain an intimate acquaintance with the inner workings of Romanism and Jesuitism. In his work on *Popery and Jesuitism in Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, a translation of which was published in London, in 1852, he gives a great deal of valuable information concerning the secret and inner working of Tractarianism, which, at that period, was popularly known in England and abroad as Puseyism. ‘My Jesuit Confessor,’ says Dr. Desanctis, ‘was Secretary to the French Father Assistant [of the Jesuit Order], and as he esteemed me much, and accounted me an affiliated member of the Society, he made many disclosures to me.’ Amongst these disclosures were the following:–

‘Despite all the persecution they [the Jesuits] have met with, they have not abandoned England, where there are a greater number of Jesuits than in Italy; that there are Jesuits in all classes of society; in Parliament; *among the English clergy*; among the Protestant laity, even in the higher stations. I could not comprehend how a Jesuit could be a Protestant priest, or how a Protestant priest could be a Jesuit; but my Confessor silenced my scruples by telling me, *omnia munda mundis*, and that St. Paul became as a Jew that he might save the Jews; it was no wonder, therefore, if a Jesuit should feign himself a Protestant, for the conversion of Protestants. But pay attention, I intreat you, to my discoveries concerning the nature of the religious movement in England termed Puseyism [Newman’s movement!].



‘The English clergy [i.e. those in the Anglican ministry] were formerly too much attached to their Articles of Faith to be shaken from them. You might have employed in vain all the machines set in motion by Bossuet and the Jansenists of France to reunite them to the Romish Church; and so the Jesuits of England tried another plan. This was to demonstrate from history and ecclesiastical antiquity the legitimacy of the usages of the English Church, whence, *through the exertions of the Jesuits concealed among its [Anglican] clergy*, might arise a studious attention to Christian antiquity. This was designed to occupy the clergy in long, laborious, and abstruse investigation, and to alienate them from their Bibles.’

‘On another occasion [writes Walsh] a Roman priest was asked by Desanctis:— ‘But do you not think it would be for the greater glory of God, that all the Puseyites should become Catholics?’ The reply to this question was:—

‘No, my son, the Puseyite movement must be let alone that it may bring forth fruit. If all the Puseyites were to declare themselves Catholics, the Movement would be at an end. Protestants would be alarmed, and the whole gain of the Catholic Church would be reduced to some million of individuals and no more. From time to time it is as well that one of the Puseyite leaders should become a Catholic [i.e. openly admit to what he was secretly before, which is precisely what Newman did!], in order that, under our instructions, the Movement may be better conducted; but it would not be desirable for many of them to come over to Catholicism. Puseyism is a living testimony to the necessity of Catholicism in the midst of our enemies; it is a worm at the root which, skilfully nourished by our exertions, will waste Protestantism till it is destroyed.’<sup>28</sup>

As yet further evidence of the Jesuit control of the Oxford Movement: the man who succeeded Newman as leader of the Tractarians, William George Ward, another Anglican priest, diligently studied Roman Catholic works of theology; and his son wrote of him, “Both in ascetics and in dogmatics, the Jesuits were his favourite reading”! As author Walsh correctly states: “We need not wonder at this now, though at the time it was kept strictly secret. What an excitement it would have caused in 1840, had it been publicly known that the favourite study of one of the leaders of the Tractarians was the writings of the Jesuits! That kind of study is far more common now [when Walsh wrote his book in 1896] amongst modern Ritualists than it was fifty-six years since, and the Romeward Movement is now far more under Jesuitical influence than ever it has been hitherto. Mr. James R. Hope-Scott [Newman’s friend in the movement]... frequently visited the Jesuits at Rome, and in his now published letters shows how any feeling which he may have entertained against them gradually wore itself away. On March 27th, 1841, he wrote to his brother:— ‘The General of the Jesuits I continue to visit, and am grown very fond of him.’”<sup>29</sup>

Pusey himself, another Tractarian leader, praised the Jesuit founder, Ignatius Loyola, in his own publications.<sup>30</sup>

And Newman believed that there were times when to lie was perfectly acceptable! “For myself,” he wrote, “I can fancy myself thinking it was allowable in extreme cases for me to lie, but never to equivocate”; and that under certain circumstances when driven into a corner, “I should have a right to say an untruth.”<sup>31</sup> This reveals Newman’s Jesuitical subtlety, and indicates the hand of the diabolical Jesuits upon Newman and the Oxford Movement. Indeed, another Tractarian, Isaac Williams, wrote: “I have lately heard it stated from one of Newman’s oldest friends, Dr. Jelf, that *his mind was always essentially Jesuitical*.”<sup>32</sup>

### ***The Success of Newman and the Oxford Movement Evident in the UK Today***

How successful was John Henry Newman in his insidious intrigues? Very successful indeed. We can see the evidence for the tremendous success of the Oxford Movement everywhere: in the doctrinal confusion prevalent within Anglicanism, with its ordination of homosexuals and women, the denial of fundamental Christian doctrines by so many of its leaders, etc.; in the many Popish teachings and practices so totally accepted within Anglicanism, such as the use of altars, the calling of ministers “Father”, the masses and the confessions held within this institution, etc.; in the massive shedding of membership occurring within Anglicanism, with splits looming; in the acceptance, by so many Anglicans, of the pope of Rome’s offer for a “home” for Anglicans who move over to Rome; and in many other ways. I have written at length about these things.<sup>33</sup>

The following summary of Newman’s evil legacy, written by Maurice G. Bowler, is absolutely correct: “Newman’s legacy in our day is a nightmare reversal of values in the understanding of religious history. Roman Catholicism, the most bigoted and cruel regime of corruption and terror that the world has ever seen, is presented as the champion of tolerance and righteousness. The Protestant cause, which, under God, brought Europe and especially this country [England] out of a thousand years of darkness into light, which set it free to worship and serve God in the light of a newly-opened Bible, is vilified as narrow and outdated, a hindrance to progress and freedom.”<sup>34</sup>

And the Romanizing change within the UK can also be seen, not just within the Anglican institution but on the population of the UK at large. Even an English secular historian like David Starkey has seen it, and he wrote about it in the London *Sunday Times*.<sup>35</sup> How true his statements are:

“During the 20th century the ritual and ceremonial aspect of the faith flourished: the church [i.e. Anglicanism] evolved into a national fest of English respectability, church on Sundays, prayers during assembly. The courtly display at the coronation of Elizabeth II was the defining moment of this English kind of Shinto.

“[A]nd then, disaster.... Instead of [the “Church of England”] being a national institution, it degenerated into a disunited collection of quarrelling Christian sects.... And Britain had changed, too. Out had gone the Protestant stiff upper lip. In had come ‘Dianafication’: the advent of mass emotion, outpourings of hysteria. The Strictly Come Dancing generation is all smells and bells in a soft, fluffy, Blairite world, a world that is superficially, as the Blairs themselves demonstrate, sympathetic towards Catholicism...“Today the [Anglican] Church is a shadow of what it used to be, rotten from within.”

Astoundingly, Starkey discerned what so many gullible, naive Anglicans and Protestants just cannot or will not see: the true face of Roman Catholicism. He concluded by stating: “But perhaps they [those sympathetic towards

Romanism] have not tasted the hard edge of the faith. They have not encountered its magisterium, the power to impose doctrine at will, papal infallibility. Up till now, Rome has been handling Anglicanism with the velvet glove. Traditionally, however, it has a very iron hand. Pope Benedict XVI was the ‘panzer cardinal’, the gritty enforcer behind the friendly public face of John Paul II. As Pope, he’s turned into a teddy bear – but it would serve the Anglican high order well to remember that this particular teddy bear is not fuzzy around the edges. Eventually, the noose will tighten.”

### ***Vatican Victory***

The reason the Papacy so badly wanted to beatify Newman was because he did so much to turn Britain Romeward, and the Papacy wants to celebrate that and encourage the further re-Romanisation of Britain. Creating a “saint” out of such a man, who worked to return Britain to Romanism, will greatly promote this Vatican goal. “By choosing to elevate John Henry Newman towards ‘Sainthood’ with a thoroughly Roman Catholic ecclesiastical event ... Benedict is seeking to demonstrate to the world that the Church in England is being brought back to its pre-Reformation status of submission to the Church of Rome.”<sup>36</sup>

By beatifying Newman, the Roman pope has done two major things. He has beatified a man who started out as an Anglican and then became a Papist, thereby encouraging many other Anglicans today to take the same step, to convert to Rome. And he has beatified a man who worked with subtlety and dishonesty to undermine the Anglican institution and turn it Romeward in its doctrine and practice, thereby preparing it for eventual return to the Roman fold. By beatifying such a man at this time, the Antichrist has sent a clear message to England’s Anglicans and even to England’s political leaders: it is time for you to return to Rome.

Truly, Benedict XVI was in a triumphant mood. In his homily at the vigil of the beatification of Newman on September 18, He said: “This is an evening of joy, of immense spiritual joy, for all of us. We are gathered here in prayerful vigil to prepare for tomorrow’s Mass, during which a great son of this nation, Cardinal John Henry Newman, will be declared Blessed. How many people, in England and throughout the world, have longed for this moment! It is also a great joy for me, personally, to share this experience with you. As you know, Newman has long been an important influence in my own life and thought, as he has been for so many people beyond these isles.”<sup>37</sup> Well might he have gloated. It was a time of great victory for Rome, a major step towards re-conquering Britain for the Papacy. In the words of a Roman Catholic journalist, Edward Pentin: “For me personally as a British Catholic, to see the Vicar of Christ passing such familiar landmarks [in his pope-mobile in the London procession] as Horse Guards Parade, Buckingham Palace and the Mall and then leading the Benediction in Hyde Park was an almost surreal experience and something I personally never imagined I’d see. Perhaps more than the speech in Westminster Hall yesterday, it was during these moments that it seemed to me the Catholic Church had once again truly become acceptable in Britain, that a new chapter for British Catholics had begun, and the country’s troubled past with the Church – an institution to which this country owes its deepest roots – had finally come to an end.”<sup>38</sup>

As far as the Vatican is concerned, its victory over the United Kingdom, and over the “Church of England”, is almost complete. Four and a half centuries of Papist intrigue, it feels certain, are soon to pay off. These are momentous times, and it becomes the Lord’s true people to be much in prayer as they watch these things unfold, to understand the times, to witness for Christ and preach His glorious Gospel of grace, and to cleave to His Word, the Bible, so as not to be deceived by all that is taking place.

September 2010

---

### END NOTES

1. *Bible League Quarterly*, Issue 442, July-September 2010.
2. See *Rome Still Claims to be the One True Church*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2007 (article). [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
3. *The Independent*, July 5, 2010. [www.independent.ie](http://www.independent.ie).
4. *Satan’s Seat*, by Shaun Willcock, pgs.38-9. Bible Based Ministries, fourth edition 1995. [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
5. *Satan’s Seat*, pg.55.
6. *Biblical Protest and Witness Await Pope’s UK Visit*, by Richard Bennett. Berean Beacon, undated. [www.bereanbeacon.org](http://www.bereanbeacon.org).
7. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 17 September 2010. [editor@insidethevatican.com](mailto:editor@insidethevatican.com).
8. See, for example, *Catholic Terror in Ireland*, by Avro Manhattan, Chick Publications, 1988; and *The IRA and Ethnic Cleansing in Ulster Today*, by Ronald Cooke, published by the author, Max Meadows, Virginia, USA, 1997.
9. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 17 September 2010.
10. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 17 September 2010.
11. See, for example, the following books by Edmond Paris: *The Secret History of the Jesuits*, Chick Publications, translated from the French 1975; *Convert...or Die!* Chick Publications, undated; *The Vatican against Europe*, the Wickliffe Press, 1988; as well as *Hitler’s Pope*, by John Cornwell, Penguin Group, 1999; among others.
12. See, for example, *The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance*, by Avro Manhattan, Chick Publications, 1986; and *Holy War” Against South Africa*, by Shaun Willcock, First Century Ltd., 2003
13. *The Bible Based Ministries Magazine*, Issue 98, 2003. Bible Based Ministries, South Africa.
14. *Zenit.org*, September 17, 2010.
15. *The Story of the Light that Never Went Out*, by Augusta Cook and W. Stanley Martin, pgs.7-13. Morgan and Scott, London, 1904; reprinted by Protestant Publications, Australia, 1993.
16. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 19 September 2010. [editor@insidethevatican.com](mailto:editor@insidethevatican.com).

17. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 19 September 2010.
18. *Zenit.org*, September 17, 2010.
19. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 19 September 2010.
20. *The Legacy of John Henry Newman*, by Maurice G. Bowler, pg.6. The Protestant Truth Society, London (undated).
21. *The Legacy of John Henry Newman*, pg.5.
22. *The Legacy of John Henry Newman*, pg.5.
23. *The Legacy of John Henry Newman*, pgs.5,6.
24. *The Legacy of John Henry Newman*, pg.8.
25. *The Independent*, July 5, 2010.
26. *The Independent*, July 5, 2010.
27. *Jesuit Plots from Elizabethan to Modern Times*, by Albert Close. The Protestant Truth Society, London. Undated.
28. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, by Walter Walsh, pgs.32-34. Swan, Sonnenschein and Co., London, 1898.
29. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, pgs.274-5.
30. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, pg.289.
31. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, pg. 265.
32. *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, pg. 271.
33. See the following articles at the Bible Based Ministries website, all by Shaun Willcock: *Rome Still Claims to be the One True Church*; *The Anglican Institution Continues to Unravel – and Rome Benefits*; *From the Thames to the Tiber: Rome Builds a Bridge for Anglicans to Cross Over*.
34. *The Legacy of John Henry Newman*, pg.8.
35. The London *Sunday Times*, October 25, 2009. [www.timesonline.co.uk](http://www.timesonline.co.uk).
36. *Christian Watch Newsletter*, August 2010. [www.christianwatch.org.uk](http://www.christianwatch.org.uk).
37. *Inside the Vatican Newsflash*, 19 September 2010.
38. *Zenit.org*, September 18, 2010.

## **Dr Rowan Williams tells *The Times* he has “no problem” with homosexuals being bishops, but gay clergy must be celibate.**

The Archbishop of Canterbury has declared that he has “no problem” with homosexuals being bishops, in his first explicit statement on the subject since taking office.

In an exclusive interview with *The Times*, Dr Rowan Williams goes farther than ever before by indicating his personal support for the consecration of gay bishops in the Church of England. But he makes clear that he will never endorse gay clergy in active relationships because tradition and historical “standards” dictate that gay clergy must remain celibate.

His comments provoked a furious response from campaigners for gay equality and risked deepening divisions within the Church of England and the wider Anglican communion.

Liberals who already regard his support for the conservatives as a betrayal will be angered further by the Archbishop’s explicit acknowledgement that celibacy must be compulsory for homosexual clergy while not for heterosexuals. Conservatives were equally angry, arguing that he was putting himself at odds with 2,000 years of church teaching.

In the interview, Dr Williams explains in the greatest detail to date why he has stood with conservatives against homosexuality when it come to official church policy. He says that he had to make the judgment against endorsing gay relationships for clergy and bishops because “the cost to the Church overall was too great to be borne at that point”.

The Archbishop says that from his appointment to Canterbury eight years ago he was “conscious” of the issue of homosexuality as “a wound in the whole ministry”.

Today he also admits that one of the most tortuous periods in his eight years at Lambeth Palace came during the unsuccessful elevation of Jeffrey John to the post of Bishop of Reading. He confesses that he let down Dr John, who was instead appointed Dean of St Albans. This year, Dr John made it on to a shortlist to be the next bishop of Southwark, but his name was later expunged from the list.

Dr. Williams’s revelations put in peril the unity scheme due to be agreed soon, based around a new covenant that sets out teachings on which all can agree.

In *The Times* today, the Archbishop also reveals that he will retire early but does not give any indication of when. Asked if he will go the full term, giving him another ten years, he says: “No, I will not be doing this job when I’m 70.”

In his struggle to keep the Church together, Dr Williams has baffled many of his friends. In 1989 he wrote: “If we are looking for a sexual ethic that can be seriously informed by our Bible, there is a good deal to steer us away from assuming that reproductive sex is a norm.”

When this was put to him by *The Times*, he replied: “That’s what I wrote as a theologian, putting forward a suggestion. That’s not the job I have now.”

Challenged that he was not therefore allowed to be true to himself, he said: “I think if I were to say my job was not to be true to myself that might suggest that my job required me to be dishonest and if that were the case then I’d be really worried. I’m not elected on a manifesto to further this agenda or that. I have to be someone who holds the reins for the whole debate.

“To put it very simply, there’s no problem about a gay person who’s a bishop. It’s about the fact that there are traditionally, historically, standards that the clergy are expected to observe. So there’s always a question about the personal life of the clergy.”

Peter Tatchell, the human rights campaigner, said: “Rowan is not being consistent. On the one hand he says that he doesn’t have a problem with gay bishops and on the other hand he blocked the appointment of celibate Jeffrey John.

“Yet again, Rowan is sitting on the fence regarding gay clergy...I don’t know how Rowan sleeps at night. Before he became Archbishop of Canterbury, he supported gay inclusion and equality. Now he victimises gay clergy like Jeffrey John and goes out of his way to accommodate some of the most hateful Christian homophobes in the world. In his eyes, Church unity is more important than the human rights of lesbian and gay people.”

David Virtue, the conservative US commentator, said: “The Church doesn’t have a problem; Dr Williams does. The Church has been consistent for 2,000-plus years, add 4,000 if you want to include the Old Testament. It has never blessed, accepted or approved of any kind of sexual relationship outside of heterosexual marriage.

“If the Anglican Communion finally comes apart – and we will know more fully by which primates turn up in January in Dublin – then the signal will be clear. At the end of the day it will be Dr Williams who will be answerable to God and the Church, especially those faithful Anglicans who have stood by Scripture and tradition.”

A spokeswoman for Lambeth Palace said: “In 1991 the House of Bishops’ statement on human sexuality affirmed that sexual orientation is no bar to ordination in the Church of England.”

Reproduced from ‘The Times’

## **UNITED PROTESTANT COUNCIL**

Chairman: David Carson

### **AUTUMN CONFERENCE**

Will be held (D.V.) on

**SATURDAY, 6<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER, 2010**

Subject:

### **EVANGELICALISM AND ROMANISM**

**1 pm. UNPICKING THE DOUBLE-SPEAK**

**3 pm. UNMASKING THE DECEIVERS**

Speaker:

**MR. CECIL ANDREWS**

(Director of “Take Heed” Ministries – a Christian apologetics ministry)

**ST. JOHN’S WOOD ROAD BAPTIST CHURCH, NW8 8QX**

(nearest Tube Stations: St. John’s Wood or Warwick Ave)

### **PERSONAL TESTIMONY OF THE UNITED PROTESTANT COUNCIL SPEAKER - MR. CECIL ANDREWS (“Take Heed” Ministries)**

Very briefly – Christian parents raised me and for my first 20 years I attended church regularly. In my early teenage years I attended classes held by the church and at the conclusion of those, having given the right answers to a number of questions, I was deemed worthy to receive communion. However my interest in sport (field hockey and cricket) began to dominate my life and my leisure time. So, after the age of 20, I stopped going to church and indulged myself in my sport and the social life that went with it. That was a very active social life including tours/trips to foreign parts and always included an abundance of alcohol resulting in much ungodly and sinful behaviour.

However in 1984 (at age 38) things were to change. In the months leading up to my conversion I had been reading a number of books by a Christian author – mainly concerned with his views of what would happen just prior to the return of the Lord. I then began to read another book by the same author that outlined how the life and death of Jesus Christ was foreshadowed by many passages in the Old Testament. The verse that began to impact upon me was Leviticus 1:4 ‘And he [THE SINNER] shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering [THE SUBSTITUTE] and it [THE SUBSTITUTE] shall be accepted for him [THE SINNER] to make atonement [SALVATION] for him [THE SINNER]’.

The reality of my sin and its consequences (eternity in hell) became very real to me. I thought perhaps I could ‘sweet-talk’ my way into heaven on the basis that I wasn’t really too bad but then I read in James 2:10 ‘For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point [even one small “white lie”] he is guilty of all’. I realised that it

only takes one sin to send a person to hell and I more than qualified. Fearful of the consequences of my sin I decided to attend a church service on the evening of 19<sup>th</sup> August 1984. I can't recall what the preacher spoke about but I know that during the service God revealed to me that the sinless life and substitutionary death of Jesus Christ would solve my problem.

HE was righteous ["CHRIST is the end of the law for righteousness" Romans 10:4] and I needed HIS righteousness. I deserved punishment for my sins and HE didn't for HE was sinless but HE suffered in my place ["For Christ also hath once suffered for sins [the substitute] the just for the unjust [the sinner] that he [by his sinless life and substitutionary sufferings and death – no work on my part] might bring us [not assist us to get there by our own works/endeavours] to God" 1<sup>st</sup> Peter 3:18.

Here I saw Christ fulfilling the role of SUBSTITUTE as pictured in Leviticus 1:4 but the missing piece of the 'jig-saw' revealed to me by God was this. Before Christ was nailed to the cross He was stripped and the last garment removed was "his coat; now the coat was without seam [a picture of perfect righteousness] woven from the top throughout [the God-man who came to earth]" John 19:23. God revealed to me that not only was Christ taking "our [my] sins in his own body on the tree" 1<sup>st</sup> Peter 2:24 but He was also in exchange giving me His robe – His righteousness to cover me "the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe" Romans 3:22.

That night I was clothed in the righteousness of Jesus Christ by faith and in consequence I knew I was "accepted in the beloved" Ephesians 1:6. Why did I know and understand all this? Because the Spirit of God had graciously "quickened" me [John 6:63 & Ephesians 2:1], I went out of that service having been "born again" – I was like the man born blind in John 9 who declared in verse 25 "one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see". I knew that Christ had given me a perfect and permanent righteousness [HIS] and that ALL my sins had been removed from me because "HE was wounded for our [my] transgressions, HE was bruised for our [my] iniquities...and the Lord hath laid on HIM the iniquity of us all [me]" Isaiah 53 5&6. That is the glorious and full gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ [His sinless life] and Him crucified [His substitutionary death] and because of HIS work one day I will join the chorus in Heaven to sing "unto HIM that loved us [me] and washed us [me] from our sins in his own blood" Revelation 1:5. May God bless you as you read of what HE has done for this unworthy wretch.

## Referendum drive moves up a gear

**A new group seeking a vote on UK membership of the EU must become a genuine mass movement to overturn the supine acceptance shown by all governments since we joined the EEC.**

With disillusion – not to say irritation – over the European Union spreading through the populations of the continent, and particularly in Britain, the pressure for a referendum on continued UK membership is steadily building.

Out doing the rounds of the party conferences this month is a new organisation calling itself The EU Referendum Campaign, which aims "to give the British people the opportunity to decide in a referendum whether Britain remains a member of the European Union or establishes a new type of relationship".

We've heard this before, of course, with results that are only too familiar. The political establishment has simply ignored referendum demands and continued to claim that it is looking out for British interests in Europe, to promise to rein in the power of Brussels...and to bow to the European statist machine at every opportunity.

The arguments of the new campaign sound familiar, too: "With the EU now making the vast majority of laws we must obey and with new plans to take control over the tax and spend policies of its member countries, the British people must be given the right to decide where ultimate political power lies; in Brussels or with our elected parliament.

"Unless we win the right to vote on Britain's membership of the EU within the near future, our democracy is in danger of falling under the total control of the Brussels elite and disappearing for all time.

"We want to trade and co-operate on a range of issues with the nations of Europe and, most importantly, with countries beyond the EU.

"We can do that without being members of the European Union. Norway and Switzerland, the two most economically successful countries in Europe, have chosen to remain outside the EU. These self-governing countries enjoy trade with those inside the EU but do not have to hand over huge sums of money to the EU. Nor do they impose all the regulations that come out of the EU that we have to obey.

"We exist to bring about a new future for an independent Britain. We must restore power from the clutches of an unelected, corrupt organisation in Brussels to the British people where it rightfully belongs."

Those have been the ambitions of all the referendum-seekers from UKIP onwards. The EURC, however, appears to be well-funded and better organised and seems to have developed a strategy that the political classes might find more difficult to dismiss.

“Now is the time to turn the tables and direct intense pressure on those holding, and wishing to hold in future, public office,” it says. “The EU Referendum Pledge campaign will do this by registering the public support of everyone who demands the right to be consulted directly.

“As the number of people taking The Pledge increases we will inform the government, sitting MPs, as well as the prospective candidates of rival parties in their constituencies, of the running total of voters in each seat demanding our Referendum.

“We will be naming and shaming MPs and candidates who refuse to commit as well as publicising and praising the names of those who have themselves signed The Pledge.

“We will go into marginal constituencies and challenge the local politicians and prospective candidates at public meetings to account for their respective positions on this key issue. Leaflets will be distributed door to door keeping constituents informed about where the local politicians stand.

“In this way, we will create a dilemma for those MPs and parties that want to continue resisting our democratic rights on the European question.

“Unless they concede to our Referendum demand, they risk losing the support of those local voters who have taken the Referendum Pledge. In a volatile political situation in which support for all three parties is very shallow and uncertain, the politicians will do this at their peril.

“Equally, our campaign will reward those MPs and candidates of all parties who do the right thing and publicly declare that they will vote in the House of Commons for an EU Referendum Bill.”

Making things personal in this way seems to be the only method of persuading the political classes to act these days. MPs and candidates who are made to see that their futures might really be in doubt are more likely to listen to what the majority of their voters are telling them.

Yet the campaign can hope to succeed only if it becomes a genuine mass movement and to do this it must overcome the apathy and dull resignation that infect the British public when it comes to the EU. Then there might be a chance of overturning the supine acceptance that has characterised all governments since we joined the EEC.

Though many people and MPs might dream of regaining control over our own destiny, we have become so used to the EU that there is a widespread fear of our being left out in the cold if we dare to leave it.

It is a fear that is groundless, yet previous referendum campaigns have failed to overcome it. What the EURC must do is present a complete, coherent and confident picture of what Britain would be like freed from the costly, authoritarian and stultifying hand of the EU.

We need a real manifesto for an independent Britain, widely distributed and publicised to give our people back their pride and independent spirit. We at *eurofacts* are happy to assist.

*eurofacts* 17<sup>th</sup> September 2010      Contact address: PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon. TQ9 7WA

## CHRISTIAN WATCH ANNUAL PUBLIC MEETING

CHILTERN HOTEL, Waller Avenue, Luton, LU4 9RU  
29<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2010 at 7.15pm

SPEAKER: Rev David Blunt

**‘The Antichrist: The Present & Future Threat’**

For further information: **Christian Watch**, PO Box 2113, Nuneaton, CV11 6ZY [www.christianwatch.org.uk](http://www.christianwatch.org.uk)  
davidlawson.uk@gmail.com    Tel: 01462 629965

# Christian Watch Notice Board

*'... ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth' (Acts 1:8).*

## Conservative Party Conference Stand

Activities - Again this year we had the only non-affiliated Protestant evangelical witness at the Conservative Party Conference. Together with the Protestant Truth Society and the Church Society we managed to distribute 1,750 copies of the booklet, **'Why Broken Britain Needs Strong Families'** (free copies still available upon request), to delegates, MPs, peers and even some of the Cabinet. The booklet was well received and many delegates even encouraged us to keep coming back.

We also attended many of the 'fringe' events and asked questions in all but one of those events we attended. These activities are very important and provide us with the opportunity to challenge or encourage those in the Parliamentary system and also provide access to the 'movers and shakers' which is almost impossible to achieve in any other way, in such a short space of time.

Witnessing - In the Lord's providence we also had many good 'spiritual' conversations and should the Lord enable us to attend another conference we plan to take a wider range of gospel material.

Liberties Defended - Terry Pratchett the well known 'fantasy' author stated in the 'dignity in dying' (euthanasia in all but name) fringe that those with faith should keep their views to themselves. When challenged by me why he should be free to state his views publicly but not those with 'faith', he responded by saying that whilst he felt people with views like mine were *'probably insane'* and our views should be kept to ourselves, I was obviously still free to express them since that was what I had just done.

At the Stonewall (homosexual rights campaigners) fringe I again challenged the panel, why Christians like me are having their liberty to speak out, particularly with regard to homosexuality, inhibited - and was promptly reminded that this wasn't true as I was now speaking in public - uninhibited!

**Our liberties are *not* being taken from us  
we are *willingly* forfeiting them**

I believe the hard truth is this – whilst we may have had many of our precious liberties curtailed in recent years - ***we have NOT (yet) been prevented from speaking out – it is rather that we have chosen not to speak.***

Our Choices - Our choice as a nation, and the outcome, depends on the individual choice of each true believer. Like ancient Israel we have a choice before us, blessings or curses (much of the book of Deuteronomy). What choice will you make dear reader?

Our Duties – God's Word is clear. It is not for us as Christians to wait or rely on others to speak and act for us. **It is EVERY Christian's DUTY** to be a witness as the Lord Himself commanded (Acts 1:8). To be a voice for righteousness in our own homes, in our street, at work, in the local school, prison, old people's home, government office, market place, high street etc - *first* - and then to the uttermost parts of the earth. So...if you need any help in proclaiming, contending or defending the Word of God where you live - contact me urgently.

Every blessing,

Andy Clarke.

Tel: 01778 344130. Email: andy@christianwatch.org.uk



**Additional copies of any article printed in this publication can be obtained in A4 format at cost from:**

# CHRISTIAN WATCH

## **Head Office**

P O Box 2113, Nuneaton, CV11 6ZY

**Email:** [info@christianwatch.net](mailto:info@christianwatch.net)

**[www.ChristianWatch.org.uk](http://www.ChristianWatch.org.uk)**

## **Christian Watch Resources (Orders)**

PO Box 3268, Leamington Spa, CV32 6YA

**Email:** [jean@christianwatch.net](mailto:jean@christianwatch.net)

### **How to Support Christian Watch**

#### **Join as a member**

[www.ChristianWatch.org.uk/register](http://www.ChristianWatch.org.uk/register)

#### **Donate**

[www.ChristianWatch.org.uk/donate](http://www.ChristianWatch.org.uk/donate)

Request membership forms or post cheques payable to 'Christian Watch' to the 'resources' address above.

Some articles may not necessarily reflect the opinions and beliefs of Christian Watch but are there for information only and not as an endorsement.

#### **Published by:**

**CHRISTIAN WATCH, PO Box 2113, Nuneaton, CV11 6ZY.**

**Email:** [info@christianwatch.net](mailto:info@christianwatch.net)

**Web:** [www.christianwatch.org.uk](http://www.christianwatch.org.uk)

**Registered Charity No 1095108**