

TSARISM OR RECONSTRUCTION

IN THE

CHURCH?!

AN OPEN LETTER

Explaining the Writer's Views on the Constitution
of the Old Catholic Church, (now Liberal Catholic)

By

T. H. MARTYN

Until recently General Secretary of the Australian Section T. S.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE

AMERICAN BRANCH

Krotona

Hollywood, Los Angeles, California

1919

A QUESTION

Krotona, Hollywood,
Los Angeles, Calif.
July 12, 1919.

Mr. T. H. Martyn,
c/o Waldorf Astoria,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Martyn:

Many conflicting rumors and unreliable pieces of information are being circulated regarding the Liberal Catholic Church movement and its Constitution and Rules. In view of your close association with Mr. Leadbeater, I write to ask you for a statement of such facts as have come to your attention that have a bearing on the important points in this connection.

As I understand it you are in favour of a Church movement along liberal lines, such as the Old or Liberal Catholic Church purports to be, but that you are decidedly opposed to the present form of its Constitution. If this is the case, would you mind telling me what are the points of your proposals?

I hesitate to take your valuable time with my enquiries, but feel at this time while the Constitution and form of the Church is in the making, it is essential that as much light as possible be thrown on the various points, in order that the most useful form of organization may be given to the world.

(Signed) Very sincerely yours,
CRAIG P. GARMAN.

AN ANSWER

Waldorf Hotel,
New York,
July 31, 1919.

Dear Mr. Garman:

Your letter of July 12 reached me some days ago. I am afraid your questions require a long answer, for there are so many things I do not like about the Old Catholic Church Constitution (now Liberal Catholic), I will try to show how it should be remodeled as you request, but a word or two of introduction seems necessary.

The Old Catholic Church established on the Continent 1871, seems to have extended to Great Britain some years ago, but made little progress there. The head of it was one Bishop Mathew. Mr. Wedgwood and two friends secured consecration at the hands of a second Bishop of the order named Willoughby. Bishop Mathew who consecrated Willoughby denies the formality of the proceedings and declares the consecration of Mr. Wedgwood and his friends to be invalid in turn, but I take no interest in this dispute and know little about it, as for the T. S. it can afford I think to take the generous view in any case.

Somehow or other Mr. Wedgwood seems to have believed himself and his two friends to be the only surviving bishops left in the O. C. Church of Great Britain early in 1916. Willoughby joined the Roman Catholics and Mathew was I fancy reported to have done so. Perhaps that is how a mistake arose, but the latter is still going strong so one gathers from letters to the press, is still head of the O. C. C. in Great Britain, and is now an Archbishop.

In spite of this fact Mr. Wedgwood and his friends drew up a Constitution, printed it, and adopted it on April 20th, 1916, calling it the Constitution of the Old Catholic Church in Great Britain, I take it that a Constitution of that division of the O. C. C. movement already existed. If it did not this one could not be valid without the authority of the real head, Bishop Mathew, naturally.

I have seldom in my life felt so utterly surprised as I felt when I first perused Mr. Wedgwood's Constitution. At the suggestion of Mr. Leadbeater in July 1917 the author agreed to alter it in essential particulars but he has not done so, and in its present form I regard it as unnecessarily reactionary and dangerous. Here is a summary of its provisions:

1. The head (Mr. Wedgwood) is self appointed.
2. The head is appointed for life.
3. All Bishops, Priests, Deacons and members who join later must obey the head.
4. The church regards the Pope as the Primate of Christendom.
5. The Bishops are to be regarded as claiming obedience in spiritual things (as spiritual things are not defined it is for the Bishops to say what they are.)
6. The church is controlled for all time by a hierarchy (at present Mr. Wedgwood and his two Bishop friends form the apex of it.)
7. The clergy and any religious orders that may in future be formed are under the obligation of "canonical obedience" to the head (Mr. Wedgwood.) "Canonical" obedience is not defined in the Constitution so it will always mean any sort of obedience the head may require.
8. *No priest or layman may inaugurate a new mission, nor may any layman lecture in connection with the church without the approval in writing of the head.
*NOTE: 1. Already the "Liberal Catholic Quarterly" has been discontinued: 2. and the pamphlet, "Occultism of the Mass and O. C. C. in Great Britain," has been withdrawn from circulation at the request of Bishop Wedgwood.
9. Any Bishop or priest "may be dismissed, degraded, or deposed for incapacity, etc., or for other reasons which may seem to the Episcopal Synod sufficient, any ecclesiastic so sentenced is bound to submit and without question to the judgment as soon as it shall be conveyed to him."
10. The clergy must not forget that "*they are set apart from the world*, they should at the same time preserve a manner that is natural and simple."

It is difficult for the normal student of history, and of human nature to read this summary without a gasp, but perhaps there are some still who in the presence of priests are not normal. Centuries of pretension and effrontery on the part of Roman ecclesiastics have hypnotized their ancestors, and they have not themselves awakened to the fact that it is illusion. Even to-day new made priests ordained by Mr. Wedgwood under this invalid Constitution are using the eternal weapon of priestcraft, *threat*. How soon they get broken in! A Reverend gentleman tells his critics here, in America, so I am informed:

If you oppose the Liberal Catholic Church you oppose the Great White Lodge and it will be bad, very bad for your health.

In Australia one already hears the same sort of thing. Modesty in the way of making claims to be the mouthpiece of God was never a weakness of any church old or new so I suppose we must expect that sort of thing in any case, and perhaps should not blame the movement itself, for the mentally unbalanced frequently believe themselves to be the Christ Himself. You can hear in Sydney that the beginning of this church (Constitution and all) was all part of an inspired plan, that the founders were practically infallible agents of Spiritual Elders, and much of that sort of thing, but it usually comes so far as my experience goes, from the class that hopes rather than knows. Whatever the source of such claims may be they require justification, in this case that is sadly wanting. A tree must be known by its fruits so the World Teacher Himself is reported to have asserted.

Fruits! Yes this scraggy old tree of *Ecclesiastic Authority* which Mr. Wedgwood makes us a present of is well known by its fruits, no need to let it grow to try it out, its fruit has been judged also and found very bitter by its victims, the people. If you will read an article which I wrote for the Theosophist under the title of "The World Teacher and Democracy," you will find in detail the facts on which I support this statement. (I have a copy here and will enclose it as the article may not appear for some time yet. Please take care of the copy, it is the only one I have.)

This Article will suggest incidentally the lines on which, from my viewpoint, any new church will have to be constituted if it is to meet the need of the world on the one hand and that of the World Teacher on the other. Please do not suppose that I am presumptuous as to speak for Him, all that I mean is that we read His will in His works and in His words, and in the article I merely set these out. I confine myself to facts as you will notice, if the facts are wrong or the deductions made from them, then those who are wiser will I trust point out the mistakes.

First, then, the new church must be democratized. Autocracy except in the Roman Catholic Church has been turned out neck and crop by the Fifth Sub-race, after having been thoroughly tested. This race wants and is going to have democracy, in other words it insists on the right to select its own leaders and managers. It is quite true that it is only experimenting at present, and that its democratic efforts so far are immature and imperfect, but it insists on maintaining them, and will improve them. Especially will it improve them when the mischievous plotting of hierarchies like those lately disposed of by the war are finally ended. There is more to be done in that direction yet of course, but any proposed new ones may expect a more than warm reception. Now a new church to make any appeal must recognize this the spirit of the age today, and most surely of tomorrow, for I take it the Fifth Sub-race will never go back to old forms at all, but I wont enlarge on that. I want the church promoters to study the *beginning* of this era, (and also the ending of it), to notice the environment which the Great Lodge prepared for the World Teacher when He came before. That would seem to be their primary duty. Then they might also make a study of His work and words when He established Christianity. They will find much to help them, among other things that His work was then and presumably is intended again to be for democracy.

Mr. Wedgwood would do good service if he would make clear if or why professional priests are required at all. I do not mean priests that are paid for their services, it may be necessary to remunerate in some cases, I mean priests who are to regard themselves as a class apart, as "set apart from the world" to use Mr. Wedgwood's own words. We have had a lot of experience of this sort of priest, and to be quite candid I may say on behalf of a great number of people that they will never be willingly tolerated again. Why cannot the work of the new church be conducted by volunteer laymen, not set apart from the world but ordained in the prescribed manner. If we may anticipate the reply from Mr. Wedgwood that he does regard those who take orders as set apart by God, then let him state his reasons clearly.

Madame Blavatsky ("Isis Unveiled") is emphatic in denying that they are. Mrs. Besant in "*Esoteric Christianity*" traces the Christian Sacraments (all of them) to the Mysteries of Paganism. She by no means lowers their value on that account, on the contrary (Chap. xii, p. 325) she says:

They were established by Occultists, by men who knew the invisible worlds; and the materials used, the words spoken, the signs made, were all deliberately chosen and arranged with a view to bringing about certain results.

Turning back a page or two we read :

The second characteristic property of a Sacrament belongs to the facts of the invisible worlds, and is studied by occult science. The person who officiates in the Sacrament should possess this knowledge, as much, though not all of the operative power of the Sacrament depends on the knowledge of the officiator.

Pursuing this subject in the same chapter Mrs. Besant states as the essentials of a Sacrament:

1. The use of Mantras or “Word of Power.”
2. Certain Signs and Gestures of “The Sign of Power.”
3. Materials which can be magnetized.

Not one word about an agent qualified by apostolic succession! Rather as quoted above, the value of the sacrament “depends on the knowledge of the officiator.”

We can now turn to the writing of Mr. Leadbeater on this subject. Mr. Leadbeater time after time has found solution for difficult problems, and perhaps will add to what has already been stated on this confusing subject. In *The Hidden Side of Things*, Vol. 1 (Chapter on Occult Investigation of the Mass, etc.) the author refers to a great reservoir of force “constantly being filled by the Spiritual Hierarchy in order that its contents may be utilized by members of the Adept Hierarchy and Their pupils for the evolution of mankind” and continues,

The arrangement made by Christ with regard to His religion was that a kind of special compartment of that reservoir should be reserved for its use, and that a certain set of officials should be empowered by the use of a certain set of ceremonies, certain words and signs of power, to draw upon it for the special benefit of their people. The scheme adopted for passing on the power is what is called ordination, and thus we see at once the real meaning of the doctrine of the apostolic succession.

Then follows the result of watching the celebration of the Mass in Roman Catholic Churches in Sicily where neither priest nor people were highly developed:

Yet the quite ordinary celebration of the Mass was a magnificent display of the application of the occult force . . . its chief effect was produced upon the causal bodies of the inhabitants.

There was a second effect, explains the investigator, but that was only called into being by the strong feeling of devotion on the part of an individual. Various functions of different churches were subsequently observed, and the writer continues:

I found that at every celebration the same results were produced, and the two forces which I have tried to describe were always in evidence—the first apparently without any appreciable variation, but the display of the second depending on the number of really devotional people who formed part of the congregation.

Mr. Leadbeater then proceeded to make further investigations as to how far this outflowing of force was affected by the character, the knowledge, or the intention of the priest, and he writes :

I may sum up briefly the results of the examination of a large number of cases in the form of two or three axioms, which will no doubt at first sight seem surprising to many of my readers.

First, only those priests who have been lawfully ordained and have the apostolic succession, can produce the effect at all. Other men not being part of this definite organization, cannot perform this feat, no matter how devoted or good or saintly they may be. Secondly neither the character of the priest, nor his knowledge nor ignorance as to what he is really doing, affects the result in any way whatever . . . Here is a plan whose arrangement is to some extent mechanical; it is ordained that a certain act when duly performed shall be the recognized method of bringing down the force, and this can be done with comparatively little training by any one on whom the power is conferred.

The clergy of the Church of England (Low Church as well as High Church) were found to possess this power, while ministers of dissenting sects did not. They produced other effects, however, but did not draw on this particular reservoir.

It may not be impossible to find a common meeting place for the different authorities quoted here. Madame Blavatsky repudiated the professional priest and all his ways, or rather his claims and may have been thinking of him as a man claiming to be “set apart from the world”, etc. She denied that any apostolic succession made a man any better or any different in character, and especially denies the claims made on behalf of priests. In “*Esoteric Christianity*” Mrs. Besant states that the sacraments were used long before the time of Christ, so perhaps there may be other ways of acquiring the particular knack requisite to the officiator. Mr. Leadbeater is absolutely definite and insists that ordination as used in the English and Roman Catholic Churches is necessary to enable the celebrant to get the magical effects which he describes. It is instructive to note however, other important deductions from what Mr. Leadbeater writes:

1. Neither the character of the priest, nor his knowledge nor ignorance as to what he is really doing affects the results in any way whatever. The celebrant is merely an automatic part of the mechanism.
2. The celebrant needs comparatively little training.
3. The Low Church clergyman has the power just the same as the Roman Catholic priest.
4. The character of the celebrant does not affect the result in any way whatever, nor his title.

It may be remembered that Low Church Anglican Clergymen object to being called priests, and reject the title of “Father.” We see then the power can be passed on to men of modesty, as effectively as to those who affect to be “set apart from the world” as Fathers in God, and holy men with privileges over their fellows. Also the same ordination is effective with men of low moral characters as thousands of priests have been.

With Mr. Leadbeater’s results in mind we may picture Mr. Wedgwood as starting out to secure the advantages of apostolic succession for a new church which he no doubt hoped would give to people all that other churches could offer as well as the advantages of Theosophical truth, and freedom of thought. Whether a new church was necessary or even desirable may well remain a matter of opinion. Mr. Leadbeater’s investigations had already prompted workers in the T. S. to take all they could of our splendid message to the churches. We were, I think, getting on very well too, and if we could get Theosophy into the already thoroughly organized institutions of Christendom, what need for a new church without any of the mellowed conveniences of the old one?

However, Mr. Wedgwood decided on a new church. He secured the Apostolic succession, fell in love with or was already an admirer of Romanism and its system of ecclesiastical authority, and not knowing much about history I take it, took a lot of trouble to copy its mistakes. It is here I join issue with the new church.

I make no quarrel with its sacraments, realize fully the need of the people of all countries for religious help in their lives. Freely I admit that ceremonial attracts a large number of people, (making the reservation that it may and does repel another quite large class) and I fully appreciate the good intentions of Mr. Wedgwood in his preliminary work. His method I have to condemn, and as said the fact that he ignores all the lessons of history and experience. I should have no right to interfere in anyway however, perhaps not to express an opinion, which I am aware is of no more value than that of a thousand other people, had not the new church come to the Theosophical Society for a blessing and a start. Mr. Wedgwood depends entirely on the T. S. for a start and being part of the T. S. I ask why not consider the interests of the T. S., and also the interests of posterity, for which the T. S. works.

I suppose it is hardly worth while at this stage considering the question of whether the new church is needed or not. It is here. The next thing is to make the best of it. Its constitution at present is not only unacceptable but it is invalid, and a new one must be drawn up. I feel that the T. S. should certainly through its President, or Council, insist that the new constitution must have the approval of the Society before the latter can undertake to support the church.

This new constitution might assume agreement on the following heads:

1. The principle that Christianity was intended for democracy.
2. That the result of Mr. Leadbeater's investigations be adopted.
3. That "ecclesiastical authority" be abandoned.

I have written on the first and third of these suggestions in "The World Teacher and Democracy" (the article a copy of which I forward you.) That leaves Mr. Leadbeater's investigations, the salient points of which to repeat, are, that ordination is essential, that its effects are mechanical, that the person ordained needs little training, that he need not acclaim himself as a priest outside the performance of his church duties.

If we get so far in agreement as this the following proposals for a new constitution suggest themselves:

1. It would be better to invite the members of the church itself to elect their leaders, to nominate a head either directly or through a committee, and to appoint committees to manage its affairs.
2. To make all appointments for limited terms.
3. Strike out "canonical obedience" altogether, let the loyalty of everybody be required *to the maintenance of the Constitution*. No objection to those ordained adding a pledge of service to humanity.
4. As we are assuming that the performance of Masses is of benefit to the world, impose on those ordained the duty of performing this ceremony at certain intervals either in public or private.
5. Provide for the formation of new congregations in as many places as possible, by ordaining the nominee or nominees of any body of people that wishes to have a branch church. The more celebrants there are the better for the spiritual progress of the world.
6. Those admitted to Orders should be advised to "preserve a manner that is natural and simple" but not advised that they "*are set apart from the world.*"
It seems agreed that ordination does not make bad men good nor good men better than they were before. On the other hand a quite good layman may be spoilt by regarding himself as "set apart" from his fellows and the suggestion too is shockingly anti-christian.
7. I suggest that for the time being the opportunity be offered to laymen to fill all the offices of the church. At present there are plenty of volunteers, and Mr. Wedgwood as well as almost all of the others interested is a volunteer layman.
8. Avoid restrictions on the freedom of those ordained. Let them be bound by the Constitution, and let that provide for dismissal for breaches. Don't put this power over them in the hands of the head or his nominees.
9. Let the acceptance of the Pope be dropped. On April 20, 1916, we were at war with Germany. The Pope was reasonably suspected of using his secret forces against the interests of the Allies and in favour of what we have been led to believe are the agents of the dark forces. Ecclesiastical authority as exercised by the papacy has always been secretly employed in looking after the interests of the "profession" rather than those of the people. Will Mr. Wedgwood tell us why the Pope is to be prayed for but not the King or President as provided for in the churches of the majority of the English and Allied countries?

The sort of Constitution suggested here will reverse the policy of that of April, 1916. It will trust the people in preference to trusting a self-appointed secret hierarchy: It will vest all power in the church as a whole rather than in the professional portion of it.

Many members of the Theosophical Society are more or less hypnotized by that word *hierarchy*. When it is mentioned they immediately think of the glorious body of Elder Brothers which so many of us honour and revere. The Great White Lodge is frequently referred to in our literature as a Hierarchy. Well "hierarchy" is only a word of course, but as applied to these Elder Brothers what does it indicate? Does it imply autocracy or democracy for instance?

Please do not answer quickly. Think! We have a few facts to help us.

- A. A message from some of these Great Ones was once conveyed to members of the T. S., it ran in effect thus: “Believe nothing *because* We say it.” In other words “You grow by judging for yourselves, not by blind dependence on directions from your elders, and it is not Our way to demand blind obedience.”
- B. It is on record that years ago when the T. S. was first founded there was difference of opinion among members of the Great Lodge itself as to the desirability of starting at that particular time. It was a matter of judgment with uncertain elements to be considered. Now what happened ? Did the Great Head of the third department (to which this activity belonged) issue orders and decide the matter arbitrarily? Not at all. Those Masters Who were prepared to shoulder the responsibility just went ahead—and succeeded. (To this spirit contrast the muzzling clauses of Mr. Wedgwood, forbidding even *laymen* who join the church to lecture about the church without his written authority.)
- C. Again we have been taught to believe that each member of the Great Brotherhood (note the word Brotherhood is applied to The Great White Lodge, perhaps more frequently, than Hierarchy) just looks around to see what part of the great Plan he can help to carry out, and makes that his work. No orders! No asking for directions. No “canonical” or other obedience is demanded!

Well why not follow the Great lead really dropping once for all this hierarchical menace that produced the dark ages? Autocracy ever breeds tyrants and tyrants make slaves. “All ye are brethren” speaks the Christ to His followers (Math. 23). Why not make the new church a Brotherhood, get back to the Christian Constitution of the year 100 when the influence of the Great Founder was still potent. Why not trust His plan again and rely upon His ability to again guide a movement born in liberty, based on freedom, cemented with mutual confidence and trust. How different such an ideal from this soul freezing Constitution under review, which seizes power and authority off hand. Mr. Wedgwood and his priests are a better type of men than their successors will be. What will happen when some plotting Jesuit secures the chief office? Let us act for the future, as well as for today.

If the Ecclesiastical Authority method is insisted on it will be found that the Theosophical Society *cannot* work hand in hand with the new Church. The T. S. does trust its members, it is democratic. Its affairs are managed in the light of day. Mr. Wedgwood’s church is an autocracy, its affairs are settled in secrecy. The T. S. has built its temple in the cause of human brotherhood *without distinctions*, a great experiment of course, and only half worked out, but we are going to make a full success of it if we can.

The interests of this church autocracy will soon clash with those of the Theosophical Society. They have already seriously clashed in Australia, and if rumor be true in at least one other country. The T. S. claims to have no official connection with the L. C. Church, but it must do more than weakly proclaim this half-truth if it is to revive the confidence of its own members. A problem already faces us in connection with prominent officers of the T. S. who have become priests under this Constitution. As priests they must obey the head of their church as well as intermediary bishops if they are of lower grade. As T. S. officers therefore they are not free where clash of interest occurs. Apart from this point the prominence given to Roman titles and dress, their intrusion in the T. S. and their partial if not entire acceptance by the T. S. officials, has caused much distrust as to the statements that there is no official connection.

If the church were not a secret autocracy but a daylight organization, and if discredited titles and distinctive attire were not the sine-qua-non of ordination, these difficulties would drop away. As it is, it will be found necessary to take precautions to keep the two movements separate and distinct. The onus of this is with the T. S. officers at present. My own experience as General Secretary in Australia leads me to say that the church likes the shelter of the T. S. and has no intention of facing a cold and unsympathetic world alone.

We cannot afford to get involved with retrograde principles of government. The day we do, our great

ideals perish. We may merge into a church, it would be quite easy to merge into Mr. Wedgwood's church, but that would end the T. S. and its ideals. Which is to be changed then, the democracy of the T. S. or the autocracy of the church?

To return to the church. Is it to be a universal church? At present it makes no pretense to be more than one more sect. Its creeds, its dogmas, its mechanical working all are to be dictated by an autocratic head to dependents vowed to obedience before hand. Perhaps you will challenge this statement on reading it especially when you remember that a Statement of Principles was published with the Constitution under review which says that church members are permitted "the widest measure of liberty in the interpretation of the scriptures, the creeds, and the liturgy." That sounds fine but the same paragraph continues that the church

recognizes a deposit of faith . . . (Jude 3), Preserved . . . in the ark of the Church Catholic . . . This divine revelation . . . runs in the two concurrent streams of Tradition and Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture, in its integrity, represents the mind of the early Church, but the deposit was at first handed down orally (2 Timothy ii, 2; 2 Thessalonians ii, 15), and this method of perpetuating the apostolic tradition persisted till comparatively late in the *disciplina arcani*. Consequently Old Catholics do not look to the Bible as the sole rule of faith.

It appears then that the new church makes an article of faith of tradition preserved, it is claimed, in the ark of the Church Catholic. Have members the privilege of freedom of thought with regard to this tradition? It would appear that their liberty to interpret is confined to Scriptures, Creeds and Liturgy, while the head of their church is the repository of the privilege of interpreting *tradition*. Here is a fine opening for authoritative declarations, doctrinal decisions and even papal claims—later on of course,—for who is to interpret this evasive tradition but the head?

But to return to my question, is this to be a universal church, and if so in what sense? Are people of other religions eligible to join it without foregoing their own faiths? Can they partake of its sacraments? Is the privilege of partaking of its sacraments to be restricted in any way, if so in what way? No attempt seems to be made to answer these practical questions, but there is a real opening for a church that would be comparatively universal. Such would require to admit to membership all who accepted its constitution, and the constitution in turn would be of the broadest nature. It might then provide for grades.

There remains the matter of priestly titles. Mr. Wedgwood seems to accept the authenticity of the New Testament which he quotes freely on the subject of tradition (Statement of Principles). I wonder how he regards the following words of the Great Founder of Christianity, he overlooked them when composing his constitution:

They (the priests) bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne and lay them on men's shoulders, but all their works they do to be seen of men; they make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments . . . and love to be called of men Rabbi, Rabbi. But he ye not called Rabbi, for one is your Master even Christ; *and all ye are brethren*, And call no man your father upon earth for one is your Father, which is in heaven . . . whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

Tens of thousands of Christian people today imagine that this sort of sentiment is essentially Christian in spirit, evidently there is some mistake, for many of the gentlemen whom Mr. Wedgwood has ordained have broken this Christian rule almost before they could visit a tailor to get the borders of their garments enlarged. The title of "Father" is a particularly objectionable one to turn loose on the T. S. for many of our members are inclined to think that Christ should be followed rather than Mr. Wedgwood. It has been made manifest to all observers that the taking of a man and the turning of him into a priest in the course of a few minutes, does not change his human nature, and if it sets him apart from the world (as Mr. Wedgwood tells him it does) or not, it does not cure him of vanity if he has it in his system.

If before he had a weakness for the glitter of a distinctive title or a distinctive dress, it will remain with

him after ordination.

Happily some have not and I think I could name a bishop and more than one priest who heartily dislike being placed in the disagreeable position they find themselves, after having offered themselves to this work from motives of duty. Well with the new Constitution shall we still have these absurd old anti-christian titles in our reformed (!) church? I wonder if Mr. Wedgwood would announce publicly that the use of titles was optional? That would enable us to divide the sheep from the goats to some extent, would it not? There is little sense of humor in a church naturally, if there were, the suggestion of the ludicrous might be mentioned, also there is a suggestion of quackery about this sudden manufacture of Fathers and Bishops, but if Christ Himself is ignored I am not sanguine about common sense or the interests of the movement generally getting much hearing on this subject. It may be of course that the people who are attracted to this priesthood are of a temperament that lives more contentedly in limelight, and amid the fragrance of some external distinctiveness. The trouble is that to encourage this weakness is anti-christian. On the other hand one recognizes that if the titles are cut out the interest of some of the promoters may wane.

Unfortunately this greedy adoption of titles by men known far better and more widely as altruistic workers for the T. S. than as priests has done a lot of harm in the T. S. as with the public. Today there is a sense of weariness with these outside things and a growing belief that our cause will be best served by a revival of Theosophical propaganda.

In conclusion I will try briefly to indicate the sort of Constitution that would be acceptable to those who believe as I do. The church aims at becoming a sort of world-movement, I take it, and requires a parent Constitution under which and subject to the provisions of which different countries could provide Constitutions for themselves.

1. Name.
2. Location of Headquarters (which need not be permanently fixed.)
3. Objects. (A suggestion), "This church is established:
 - a. To provide means for the enjoyment of Christian fellowship, by members of the Christian community.
 - b. To ensure the effective performance of the Christian Sacraments.
 - c. To make available to people of Christian Communities a church in which unrestricted freedom of thought in matters of belief, in the interpretation of Scriptures, Creeds, Liturgy and Tradition is maintained."

(A suggestion.)

Principles, acceptance of which is expected on part of adherents.

1. Belief in God as the Supreme Architect and Preserver of the Universe.
2. Belief in the Spiritual Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God.
3. Belief in the ever living Christ, Founder of Christianity and recognized Head of all Christians throughout the world.
4. The Church tentatively adopts the scriptures, creeds, liturgies and traditions common to Christianity as a basis of enquiry, permitting its members the widest measure of liberty in their interpretation.

RULES

1. Administration. Provide that the Bishops of the church (or whatever grade corresponds to the senior office) have charge of and arrange for use in the churches, such Sacraments and Ceremonial as they deem best.
2. Appoint a managing body from among members of the church; priests and lay people, mostly the latter. Duties, all business matters.
3. Provide for the election of a head by the Executive body provided for in clause 2. Such head to be chosen from one of the bishops. Term of office to be one, two or three years. Note the election of head

might be effected by the body of Bishops if more convenient, or perhaps by both bodies combined would be better.

4. Particularise the duties of the committees and of the managing body, the duties of the head would be to administer under the constitution, to preside over bishops and executive. The constitution of the T. S. would suggest a useful basis for the promotion of National divisions.

Little more than this would be necessary, the proclaimed objects of the constitution would ensure freedom, and the allegiance would be to the constitution, not to individuals. Provision would be made for dealing with recalcitrant members who disregarded the constitution, by the managing committee.

FINAL CONCLUSION

The matter of titles and so on must be settled soon, and the decisions go into a new constitution. They will make or mar it. At the outset Mr. Wedgwood had three alternatives to choose from in regard to titles. The adoption of the Low Church way of using them sparingly. The adoption of some nomenclature that would comply with Christ's words, or the adoption of the loud and florid pretensions of the Roman division of the church. He chose the last, and an epidemic of "Fathers" has broken out in the body of the T. S. What on earth the T. S. will do to cure itself I don't know, but the first thing to ask perhaps is what will Mr. Wedgwood do now?

So, hurriedly, and perhaps without sufficient care I have answered your questions; you understand of course that this expresses my personal opinions; do not let them weigh with you, but think the points out for yourself and think them out in the presence of the Master as it were so that the personal colouring may be eliminated as far as possible. In every thing I have done in connection with this new church I have tried to do that. In one respect I think I am in a minority. History has always had a fascination for me, today with most people history attracts little attention, and even the Reformation, its great work for afflicted humanity, and its great need is almost forgotten by this generation. The lessons and the facts of the thousand years when a church and its ecclesiastics dominated human liberty and debased civilization are barely known to the busy children of this generation. For the sake of my own little ones and for the sake of humanity my conscience makes it necessary for me to decry any attempt to revive the bad old system.

I have no feeling against individuals, whether priests, bishops or popes, but it would be for me criminal to ignore what I know and let the priest snatch power again if I can prevent it. It is my duty I know to give reasons rather than to state opinions and that makes my letter long, but I rely upon the reasons.

As to Mr. Wedgwood personally and the new priests, I have the highest regard for all, that only makes my position more difficult, but pretty well everything I say here has already been said or written to Mr. Wedgwood himself, so to him there is nothing new in it.

You are welcome to make any use you like of this letter and of the article.

With all good wishes,

Yours very sincerely,
T. H. MARTYN.