

Drawing Aside the Purple Curtain

The Papal System Today: an Analysis of the News

The Anglican Institution Continues to Unravel – and Rome Benefits

by Shaun Willcock

When the world's Anglican bishops gathered in Canterbury in mid-July for their once-a-decade general synod, known as the Lambeth Conference, they did so as the leaders of a religious institution in deep crisis. Two issues dominated the meeting, as everyone knew they would; two issues that have split the worldwide Anglican institution into two opposing camps: the issue of the acceptance of sodomites, sodomite “marriage”, and sodomite ordination into the Anglican priesthood; and the issue of women being ordained as Anglican bishops (they are already being ordained as priests). Anglican conservatives are opposed to these things; Anglican liberals, on the other hand, are in favour of both.

The present massive crisis has been building up for many years. First there was the decision, back in the early 1990s, to ordain women priests. Then there was the drawn-out battle over whether or not to permit the ordination of sodomite priests, which resulted in 1998 in the Lambeth Conference issuing a resolution declaring active sodomy (note that! – *active* sodomy only!) to be incompatible with the Bible's teachings. Then came the appointment in 2003, despite this resolution, of Anglicanism's first openly sodomite bishop, Gene Robinson, of New Hampshire in the United States. And lastly came the decision, by the Anglican institution in England, to appoint women bishops. Each one of these were milestones which have caused very serious divisions within the worldwide Anglican body.

The Bible is crystal clear about both these issues. There is no ambiguity whatsoever as to what the Holy Scriptures teach: sodomy is an abomination, it is wickedness, it is vile, it is unnatural, it deserves and will draw down the judgment of God (Rom. 1:24-27; Lev. 18:22,23; Gen. 19; Lev. 20:13-16; 2 Pet. 2:6-8; Jude 7; etc.). One just has to think of what the sin of sodomy is actually all about, and of what the Bible teaches about holiness, purity, true marriage, etc., to know it is an utter abomination as the Scriptures teach! The Lord can and does save people from this great sin, just as He saves His elect from all other sins, freeing them from bondage to them; but no sodomite, while he remains such and unrepentant, shall inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9-11).¹

As for women being ordained as bishops: there is no such thing as an *ordained priesthood* within the true Christian Church anyway; for the Lord Jesus Christ is the only Priest His people need (e.g. Heb. 7 and 8). True Christian ministers are called pastors and teachers in the New Testament, not priests, for they have no special priestly functions. Their work is that of service; of ministry. The entire Anglican priestly system is derived from Roman Catholicism, its spiritual “Mother”, not from the Bible. Also, according to the Bible, a bishop is precisely the same as a pastor or elder (cf. 1 Tim. 3:1; Phil. 1:1; Tit. 1:5,7); whereas within Anglicanism, as within Romanism, a bishop is a *higher order* within their priesthood.

But, the unscriptural nature of the Anglican “ministry” aside, the fact remains that the New Testament categorically teaches that only men may be pastors, ministers of the Word (1 Tim. 2:11-15; 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9; 1 Cor. 14:34,35). Christian women have many vital roles to play within the Church of God, but the pastoral ministry is an office reserved for men.² There is no such office within the true Church of Christ as that of “pastress”. Significantly, although Anglicanism has a priesthood, those women who are ordained into it do not refer to themselves as “priestesses”! Now partly this is doubtless because of the feminist agenda which, to a man (excuse the pun), these women subscribe to, and thus they do not wish to be addressed in any way that is different from the way male priests are addressed. But partly,

too, we suspect, it is because, if they called themselves “priestesses”, this would smack too much of the heathen religions. It just *sounds* heathen. But really, this is what we *should* call them: priestesses! If they claim they are priests, and as they definitely are women, they *are* priestesses. It sounds heathen, and that’s a very good thing, because that is precisely what it is. The entire system, being derived from Romanism, is heathenism dressed up as “Christianity”; and we should by all means call it what it is. The appointment of women within Anglicanism is nothing less than the appointment of *priestesses*.

Let’s look at the matter of sodomy within Anglicanism first.

As things stand now, sodomites are welcome in the Anglican institution, although Anglican priests are not yet allowed to bless sodomite “marriages”. But there is huge debate and division within the worldwide Anglican institution over the issue, as the entire religious body moves increasingly towards recognition not only of sodomites, but of sodomite “marriages” and ordination as well.

South African Anglican archbishop, Desmond Tutu – known as the “Red Bishop” in years gone by for his pro-Communist stance, a man who is an outright liberal both politically and theologically and therefore very much in favour of accepting sodomites – pleaded for unity within Anglicanism. Astounding, isn’t it, how liberal “churchmen” always plead for “unity”, as long as it’s on their terms? Tutu said: “The Anglican church prides itself – and this is one of its greatest attributes – on being the church that is comprehensive, meaning that it includes all kinds of points of view. One of the sadnesses about the current crisis is that we seem to be jettisoning this wonderful inclusivity that is a characteristic of our church.”³

Well, it is precisely this characteristic “inclusivity” (among many other things) that *disqualifies* the Anglican institution from being in any sense a true Christian church! The Bible does not teach that any true church should be “inclusive”; quite the opposite, in fact. A true church’s membership is to be open only to those who profess faith in Jesus Christ, and who show by their doctrine and conduct that they are truly converted. It is thus very *exclusive*, not inclusive at all. The Bible is crystal clear that there are those “within” and those “without” the true Church of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 5:11-13).

In 2003, the United States Episcopal institution (Anglicans are called Episcopalians in the U.S.) “consecrated” an openly sodomite priest, Gene Robinson, as the bishop of New Hampshire. He was the first open sodomite to be made a bishop within the worldwide Anglican institution. He was totally unrepentant, and still is; in fact he is proud of his sodomy. “God is leading us to the full inclusion of gay and lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people,” he said. “I’m doing everything I can to hold the Anglican Communion together. We need each other.”⁴ Robinson obviously worships a very different god from the God of the Bible, for He certainly is *not* leading people to any such inclusivity, so utterly contrary to His own Word! Note how men like Robinson speak with such absolute authority, as if they are prophets of the Lord: “God *is* leading us” to this full inclusivity. On what does he base this authoritative claim? Certainly not on the Word of God. What then? It is based on the changing whims of society. And yet he has the arrogance to expect that we must all agree with him! We must just accept his say-so, for no other reason than that he said it.

Let us, secondly, consider the matter of the ordination of women to the Anglican “ministry”.

In 1992 the Anglican institution decided to allow priestesses, but not bishopesses. At the time, this caused a huge upheaval in worldwide Anglicanism. It was felt that the Anglican faithful should be broken down slowly – first they should get used to the idea of having priestesses, and then later the idea of bishopesses could be introduced. Well, that time arrived this year. First, the mother “Church” in England decided to start appointing bishopesses. This caused about a quarter of all the world’s Anglican bishops – including most of those from Kenya, Nigeria, Rwanda and Uganda – to decide to stay away from the Lambeth Conference, which was held a week later.⁵ But what did they expect? – that women could be ordained as priestesses, but that the time would never come when they would clamour for the further and higher ordination as bishopesses? Were Anglican conservatives really so naive as to believe that women who had been made priestesses would be satisfied with that, and not want more?

Well, in the end, the general synod of the entire “Church of England” (the Anglican institution) decided to follow suit and allow the ordination of she-bishops (we can speak of either “she-bishops” or “bishopesses”, since the dictionary defines a “bishopess” *as* a “she-bishop”). Although a “code of practice” was discussed for those who do not in conscience accept this, it was not clearly defined.⁶

Many Bible-believers, true Christians, may be unclear about the doctrines and practices of the Anglican institution, having never examined it and ignorantly thinking it is a true Christian church; and consequently they might be puzzled by these goings-on within Anglicanism. Why, they would wonder, is there any debate on these issues at all? After all, there really is nothing to debate: the Bible is crystal clear. Sodomy is a gross sin, so how could unrepentant sodomites be welcome within the Anglican institution? And how could the leadership even be considering “blessing” sodomite “marriages”? And how could they consider ordaining them? As for she-bishops, only men may be in the ministry of the Word – once again the Bible is perfectly clear on this. So why is there any debate at all?

But what all true Christians need to understand (and sadly, what so many remain ignorant about through lack of teaching) is that Anglicanism is *not*, in fact, a true Christian church. That which, in the words of C.H. Spurgeon, “with none too much humility calls itself *the Church of England*”,⁷ is not a Christian church at all. *It is a harlot daughter of the Mother of Harlots, the Roman Catholic institution* (see Rev. 17:5). It was born out of Romanism, and it has retained much of the spirit and doctrine of its mother.⁸ Anglicanism is not subject to the Bible as the sole rule of faith and practice, and never has been. In our day it is guided by human opinions and the changing world around us. This is shown by the words of the Anglican archbishop of Cape Town, Thabo Makgoba, who said in connection with the raging debate within the institution: “God has people on two sides and we bring both sides before God. *Our views are informed by the journey of the faithful we lead at the time*” (emphasis added).⁹ That says it in a nutshell. The Anglican institution is not subject to the Word of God. It is guided by the shifting sands of whatever those within it feel at any given time in history, and also (as is clear from its present stance on sodomy) by the shifting sands of society at large. God does *not* have people on both sides! His word is clear that homosexuality is an abomination, a great sin. The sodomite needs to repent! It’s as plain as that. But this so-called “church” bases its stance upon the way the wind of public opinion blows, not upon the sure foundation of the Holy Scriptures. This was also articulated by Anglican priest Duncan McLea, of Kenilworth, South Africa, who said: “We want to listen to the gay voice”.¹⁰ Why? Sodomy is a sin – there’s nothing to listen to. Would he say, “We want to listen to the voice of murderers”, or, “We want to listen to the voice of thieves”? No. Yet all these sins are lumped together, as being among the gross iniquities (1 Cor. 5:9-11; 6:9-11).

Many are inclined to think that the only problems within the Anglican institution have to do with sodomy and she-bishops. Even if this was the case, these matters would be enough to utterly disqualify this religious institution from being a Christian church. But there is much, much more! Anglicanism is just awash in unbiblical teachings and practices, and unfortunately these are often passed by because right now these two particular issues dominate the headlines. This is a great pity, for even in the unlikely event that the day ever comes when Anglicanism declares sodomy to be a sin and she-bishops to be unbiblical, it *still* would not be a true Christian church!

For example, there is its attitude to the Bible. As shown above, and this could be reinforced with innumerable other examples, it is not based upon the sure foundation of the written Word of God. This is not its one and only rule of faith and practice; and therefore it is not a Christian church.

There is its heretical doctrine of “baptismal regeneration”.¹¹ This is a damnable heresy that causes people to base their hopes for eternity on a devilish lie. This doctrine alone disqualifies it from even being considered as a Christian church by true Christians.

There is the whole matter of a priesthood anyway, which as shown above is completely contrary to the New Testament, and gives supposed powers to the priest which no true New Testament minister possesses.

There is its iniquitous support for the diabolical ecumenical movement; its desire to seek unity with Rome, the Mother of Harlots, as well as with other, lesser harlot religious systems.

There is its iniquitous support for the diabolical doctrine of liberation theology, which caused it to pump millions of pounds and dollars into the coffers of Marxist terrorist organisations, which used that money to buy guns and bombs with which they murdered innocent people.¹²

There is not only its unregenerate membership, but its unregenerate leadership, consisting as it does of men who even openly deny some of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, such as the virgin birth of Christ, His bodily resurrection, His Deity, etc.

And there was the appointment, some years ago, of Rowan Williams as the present archbishop of Canterbury – the top Anglican position in the world. Williams, in addition to his ultra-liberal views, was also, at the very time he was appointed, a *Druid priest!*¹³ Imagine it: a man holding the top position in an organisation calling itself a Christian church, who at the same time is a priest in a heathen religion! It is almost beyond belief – and yet it is true.

There is no space, now, to go into any of these things at length. They are merely mentioned here, as yet further evidence of the utterly unchristian nature of this religious harlot.

And as the Anglican institution starts to unravel, who stands to benefit? *Rome*. As increasing numbers of conservative Anglicans realise that their “church” is in freefall, appointing priestesses, bishopesses and sodomites, they cast about for a “church” which presents an image to the world of stability, immutability, and steadfastness, and moreover one which looks as much like their own “church” as possible; and inevitably their eyes come to rest on Rome. It is a false image, but Rome has successfully conned much of the world, and much of the professing “Church”, that it is “ever the same”, solid as a rock, unchanging and unchangeable in the midst of a turbulent world. And huge numbers of Anglicans, disillusioned with their floundering “church”, are viewing Rome as the only logical place to go. Indeed, “many have spoken of a mass exodus of Anglicans headed to the Catholic Church.”¹⁴

They may be disgusted at the direction being taken by Anglicanism but this does not mean they are converted. Far from it! Anglicanism is a daughter of the Romish Harlot anyway and always has been. It is really a small step for traditionalist Anglicans, most of whom are Anglo-Catholic in doctrine anyway, to cross over to Rome.

And there are plenty of signs that this is indeed what is beginning to happen. Anglican bishop, Andrew Burnham of Ebbsfleet, wrote in July that, in the light of the Anglican institution now allowing women bishops, “traditional Anglo-Catholics” now face the decision of staying in the Anglican institution in “what, for a while, will be a protected colony – where the sacramental ministry of women bishops and priests is neither acknowledge nor received – or to leave.” Acknowledging that the decision is not easy, he said: “You don’t become a Catholic, for instance, because of what is wrong with another denomination or faith. You become a Catholic because you accept that the Catholic Church is what she says she is and the Catholic faith is what it says it is. In short, some Anglo-Catholics will stay and others will go.” He added: “As for those who choose to go, like in the early 1990s [when the Anglican institution decided to allow priestesses] these will include some of the finest Anglican clergy. Most of them are not motivated in the least by gender issues but by a keenness to pursue Catholic unity and truth.”¹⁵ He is very wrong there: there will be many who will be motivated by one motive, many by the other, and many by both.

He went on: “What we must humbly ask for now is for magnanimous gestures from our Catholic friends, especially from the Holy Father, who well understands our longing for unity, and from the hierarchy of England and Wales. Most of all we ask for ways that allow us to bring our folk with us.”

He need have no worries about that. The pope of Rome, and his priesthood, will be falling over themselves to facilitate the reception of Anglican priests and their people into the Roman fold. As they say, follow the money. Rome stands to benefit from the abounding confusion within worldwide Anglicanism. It has always been Rome’s desire to destroy or absorb Anglicanism, its wayward daughter. This is what Rome’s Jesuits and others have worked for so tirelessly over the years.¹⁶ And now they stand ready to reap the fruits of their labours. We can be certain that Jesuit agents are playing a major role in the turmoil within Anglicanism. Indeed we can be certain, based on the evidence of history that Jesuits have always secretly infiltrated other “churches”,¹⁷ that there are those holding high positions within the Anglican priesthood who are Jesuit secret agents, serving the interests of the Papacy.

And even while Rome smacks her lips at the prospect of welcoming hordes of disillusioned Anglo-Catholics into her fold, she warns the Anglican institution that its decision to pave the way for the appointment of she-bishops is an obstacle to union with herself.

For although Rome is doing all it can to undermine and destroy Anglicanism, it is using more than one tactic simultaneously. This has always been its way. For centuries it has used the tactic of infiltrating Anglicanism and eroding it from within, so that it ultimately disintegrates and its unhappy adherents return to the bosom of “Mother Church” (as Rome fondly calls herself). But – just in case this tactic

doesn't work out as well as hoped – it has in the last four decades or so also made use of the tactic of *ecumenism*: hiding behind the smokescreen of “seeking unity”, it has had ongoing talks with Anglican leaders the world over, seeking common doctrinal ground, and expressing its “sincere wish” that the day will come when the “separated brethren” within the Anglican institution will enter into full unity with Rome. *Not*, let it be understood well, by compromise from both sides, but by Anglicanism recognising *the full authority of the Roman pope* and accepting “unity” on Rome’s terms alone.

As far as the Vatican is concerned, it really doesn't matter which tactic succeeds in the end, or even if both are successful: as long as the final result is achieved, which is the gutting of the Anglican institution in its present form; in a word, its destruction, whether by absorption or by elimination. The Papacy isn't fussy. Whatever gets the job done.

And as the Anglican institution pushes forward with its plans to ordain bishopesses, and becomes increasingly liberal in doctrine and practice, right now it looks as if the tactic of destroying it from within is achieving the most results.

The Vatican's “Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity” issued a communiqué which said: “We have regretfully learned the news of the Church of England vote that paves the way for the introduction of legislation that will lead to the ordaining of women to the episcopacy. The Catholic position on the issue has been clearly expressed by Popes Paul VI and John Paul II. Such a decision signifies a break with the apostolic tradition maintained by all of the Churches since the first millennium and is, therefore, a further obstacle to reconciliation between the Catholic Church and the Church of England. This decision will have consequences on the future of dialogue, which had up until now borne fruit...”¹⁸

It is indeed a serious setback for ecumenical relations between Rome and Canterbury, the Harlot mother and her harlot daughter. The Vatican newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*, in its July 9 edition, cited experts in Anglicanism who affirmed that the future of dialogue between the two will now encounter new difficulties, “in part because of the evident lack of unity within the Church of England itself.” It added: “The present difficulties of dialogue between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, however, must not discourage Christians [by which of course they mean Papists and Anglicans!] from praying to God and acting for full unity.”¹⁹

Pray they might to their false gods, but as things stand now it is not ecumenism, the “unity movement”, that is bearing fruit, it is the implosion within Anglicanism itself. But again, as far as Rome is concerned, whatever gets the job done is fine with her. Either way, she wins.

It may very well be that only a minority of Anglicans actually “cross the floor” to Rome, at least at this time. The majority may continue to flounder on, becoming increasingly liberal, moving further and further away from traditional Anglican moorings. If this happens, as appears very likely at this juncture, Rome's agents will continue to undermine the entire institution from within, like termites in a wooden house, and ultimately it will become so confused doctrinally, so rudderless, so utterly lacking in any kind of real unity, that it will just disintegrate. Perhaps we are still many years away from that day. But Rome is very patient. She will wait. For she is confident that that day will surely come eventually.

And what will happen to those Anglican conservatives who do not want (as yet!) to join Rome, but who are still very opposed to what has happened? There are only two options open to them. Some may eventually break away and start a new version of Anglicanism. Certainly there are many who are calling for such a schism, and it may yet occur. Over 1300 Anglican “clergy” in Britain, including 11 serving bishops, wrote to the archbishops of Canterbury and York to say that they would consider defecting from the Anglican institution if women were consecrated as bishops. They said that they would only accept women bishops if they have a legal right to separate havens within the Anglican “Church”, offering opponents of women bishops a network of parishes where they could worship under the leadership of exclusively male priests.²⁰

Others, however, have decided that they will try to “reform” the Anglican institution from within. We have to admire the lone protester who stood up when U.S. sodomite bishop, Gene Robinson, was giving a sermon at an Anglican “church” in London in July, and denounced him as a heretic, repeatedly calling on the effeminate bishop to repent. Robinson's supporters began to clap to drown out the protester's voice. He was then escorted out of the building.²¹ We have to admire his bravery, but his bold stand will achieve nothing, for the *system itself* is rotten to the core, and *cannot be reformed from within*. And this

is what those calling for reformation, while remaining within the system, fail to grasp:

Over 1100 Anglican conservatives from around the world, including 300 bishops, met in Jerusalem in June (it was called the Global Anglican Future Conference), just a short while before the Lambeth Conference meeting, and declared the formation of a new global Anglican communion for “faithful” Anglicans living in liberal provinces – a “church within a church” is how it has been described, the “Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans”. They were prompted to start this initiative because of the failure of the Anglican archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, to discipline United States bishops who took part in the consecration of the sodomite bishop of New Hampshire, Gene Robinson. Their aim is to attempt to halt the slide of the Anglican institution towards western secular values, and to reform it from within. Indeed many spoke of the Jerusalem meeting as heralding a “new reformation”. The “Jerusalem Declaration” which was issued stated: “We reject the authority of those churches and leaders who have denied the orthodox faith in word or deed. We pray for them and call on them to repent and return to the Lord.”²² And: “We acknowledge God’s creation of humankind as male and female and the unchangeable standard of Christian marriage between one man and one woman as the proper place for sexual intimacy and the basis of the family. We repent of our failures to maintain this standard and call for a renewed commitment to lifelong fidelity in marriage and abstinence for those who are not married.”

²³ The plan is for this new body to have its own bishops, priests, theological colleges, and eventually its own structure – but all constructed entirely within the legal constraints of existing Anglican institutions.²⁴ The movement’s members come mainly from Anglican “churches” in Africa, Asia, Australia and South America, but also include disgruntled Anglicans from England, Canada and the USA.

However, the entire plan is doomed to failure. *One simply cannot reform false religion.* Reformation from within has been attempted through the centuries by all kinds of men within all kinds of religious institutions, and it has never, ever worked. The would-be reformers either get sucked back into the system, or they end up leaving.

So: a) *conservative* Anglicans, Anglo-Catholic in doctrine and practice, will “cross the floor” to Rome; b) *ecumenical* Anglicans who do not wish to leave their “church” will continue to promote ecumenicity with Rome, hoping for eventual “union”; and c) *liberal* Anglicans will continue to push for a “church” which takes a leftist, radical stance on doctrine and practice. The point is this: *not one of these three strands within this “inclusive broad church” is biblical.* And all three are destroying the Anglican institution. It is falling apart in its present form. What exactly will emerge from all this with the passing of time is anyone’s guess at this stage. Utter confusion and uncertainty reigns within the institution. A “broad church” can never satisfy all its adherents. A religious institution which stands for everything cannot last, for it really stands for nothing. One thing is for certain: whatever happens, Romanism benefits. The Great Whore on the seven hills is the only true winner.

Anglicans need to hear the true Gospel of Jesus Christ! They are deluded. Like the Roman Catholic people, they belong to a religious institution which falsely calls itself a Christian church. They are floundering because they are not founded upon the Word of God, the Bible. Their priests and priestesses are blind leaders of the blind. Those who hear the voice of Christ in His Word, and who feel the pricks of conscience, and come under conviction of sin, must forsake this false religious harlot, and turn to Christ for salvation!

August 2008

[Shaun Willcock](#) is a minister of the Gospel, and lives in South Africa. He runs Bible Based Ministries. For other news articles (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, pamphlets, etc., please visit the [Bible Based Ministries website](#), or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries’ electronic mailing list, to receive all future articles, please send your details.

Bible Based Ministries

info@biblebasedministries.co.uk

www.biblebasedministries.co.uk

Providing teaching from the Word of God, and a biblical exposure of the Papal system and all that is associated with it

Contending for the Faith Ministries

(Distributor for Bible Based Ministries)

42055 Crestland Drive

Lancaster, CA 93536

USA

This news article may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full

ENDNOTES:

- 1.For further teaching, listen to *The Sin of Sodomy*, a set of four CDs by Shaun Willcock, available from Contending for the Faith Ministries.
- 2.For further teaching, listen to *The Church of God*, a set of eight CDs by Shaun Willcock; and *Women in the Church*, by Shaun Willcock (available as a cassette tape only), all of which are available from Contending for the Faith Ministries.
- 3.*The Witness*, July 14, 2008, "Tutu: Move Together on Gays".
- 4.*The Witness*, July 14, 2008, "Tutu: Move Together on Gays".
- 5.*The Witness*, July 17, 2008, "Splits on Women and Gays Dominate Lambeth Agenda".
- 6.*Anglican Bishop Asks Pope for Magnanimity*, July 9, 2008. Zenit.org.
- 7.*Baptismal Regeneration*, by C.H. Spurgeon, pg.315. Pilgrim Publications, Pasadena, Texas, 1975.
- 8.*The Seceders*, by J.H. Philpot, the Banner of Truth, London.
- 9.*The Sunday Times*, July 6, 2008, "Anglican Church Faces Split Over Gays".
- 10.*The Sunday Times*, July 6, 2008, "Anglican Church Faces Split Over Gays".
- 11.*Trappings of Popery*, by Shaun Willcock, pgs.26-31. Bible Based Ministries, 2007. Also *Anglicanism: a Corrupt, Worldly, Popish System*, by J.C. Philpot (pamphlet). Published by Contending for the Faith Ministries in association with Bible Based Ministries.
- 12.See "*Holy War*" *Against South Africa*, by Shaun Willcock. Cromwell Publishers, London, 2003. Available from Contending for the Faith Ministries.
- 13.*The Bible Based Ministries Magazine*, Issue No. 98, 2003.
- 14.*Anglican Yes to Women Bishops an "Obstacle"*, July 8, 2008. Zenit.org.
- 15.*Anglican Bishop Asks Pope for Magnanimity*, July 9, 2008. Zenit.org.
- 16.*Satan's Seat*, by Shaun Willcock, pgs.54-56. Bible Based Ministries, 1995. Also *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, by Walter Walsh. Chas. J. Thynne, London, 1898. And *Jesuit Plots from Elizabethan to Modern times*, by Albert Close. The Protestant Truth Society, London.
- 17.*Jesuit Secret Agents*, by Shaun Willcock (pamphlet). Bible Based Ministries.
- 18.*Anglican Yes to Women Bishops an "Obstacle"*, July 8, 2008. Zenit.org.
- 19.*Anglican Yes to Women Bishops an "Obstacle"*, July 8, 2008. Zenit.org.
- 20.*The Sunday Times*, July 6, 2008, "Anglican Church Faces Split Over Gays".
- 21.*The Witness*, July 14, 2008, "Tutu: Move Together on Gays".
- 22.*The Sunday Times*, July 6, 2008, "Anglican Church Faces Split Over Gays".
- 23.*The Witness*, July 1, 2008, "Anti-Gay Christians Sever Church Ties".
- 24.*The Sunday Times*, 29 June 2008, "Anglicans Announce "Church Within a Church".