

April 28, 1837

My dear Gladstone,

Many thanks for your last letter
to which I wish to send a few words of remark,
I will not say reply -

As to what I said of yourself, if in any
thing I went beyond the reality, I am sure you
will ~~use~~ use it, I judge, in the way you speak of.

And now as to the main subject of your
letter, there are some obvious points of agreement,
which I will first note, and then add the
points, in which I don't feel able to agree, giving
my reasons - All of which I beg you to understand
is not didactic, but by way of enquiry - espe-
cially as it shades off every way into legal, &
Constitutional matter, in all: you ought to know
better than myself.

The grant to the Presbyt. is not a new anomaly
& I see nothing as yet to keep you from a
full part in Part^a a Government.
I believe God has wrought thro' the Presbyt.ⁿ
body.

I think grants of money maybe made to Presby^{ter} by Parl^t.

The King is of course the fountain of legislation. — But I feel that no recognition by the State can make a body to be a Church — It may make it an Establishment, even the Socinian, but not a Church, tho' orthodox, being schismatical. The extension of Presbyterianism is as effectually the destruction of the Apostolical Church of Scotland — as the spread of Popery in Ireland &c —

No a posteriori arguments drawn from results can make a body to be a Church, wh: was not so by original constitution. I pass over the whole question of the doctrines of the Presbyterian body. Altho' I sh^d have much to say, believing them deeply pledged to false principles, and hostile to the Apostolical, & Catholic system.

It is in the fulfilling of the doctrine & that give the English Ch: her claims, but Apostolical designation, & succession.

The King is the fountain of legislation — but of ecclesiastical authority only in virtue of being in Communion with the Ch: and what he c^d not himself have out of its communion, he cannot delegate to individuals, or a body ^{not} being members of the Church.

Now these are the disjointed remarks, which occur to me in the Chief parts of your letter. I think, I can best state my meaning dogmatically, without meeting any objections - & beg you to sift everything very jealously, for I feel always diffident when I venture on Law &c -

My hypothesis was, "If Parliament be a mere secular body then you may &c -

Now I maintain that Parliament has become a mixed body, and therefore incompetent by right to legislate on any but secular questions. The following propositions are the grounds of my opinion, & I will state them, so that you may judge me by making off what you admit, and bidding me correct, a subject what you object to.

First. The Church is a Corporate body: governed by its own Spiritual Officers in Sp^l things; & administered, as to all Ecclesiastical, or general affairs, by the whole body in some sort.

For instance the Church before Constantine.

2^d. Constantine's Eccl Power was obtained, not by his Imperial authority, but by becoming a member of Christ's Church.

Civil Powers not in communion had no authority in the admin^t of the Church. They

neither had nor can have without overthrowing the distinction between the Church, & the unchristian or the excommunicate.

If it be said excommunication only excludes "a Communicative Rationis of Eucharistia" - it must be answered ^{be answered} ~~be answered~~ - Crowned Schismatics cannot shelter themselves under the exception.

Now this axiom "that Ecclesiastical Power is enjoyed by no one whether King or Caesar except only by communion with the Church, is capable of proof both from the General Councils of the whole Church, & of the Anglican in Particular.

[Two questions I wholly pass over at present:

1. How Eccl^l affairs were, & ought to be admin?

2. How the tithes, lands &c of the Church are held.]

3. The King of England, & the whole Civil power were in Communion: with the Church till the Reformation. The period from Henry VIII. to Eliz. was so anomalous, & fluctuating that, no one will venture to draw precedent from it.

4. The 3. Eliz.th gave the first seeming sanction to a schismatic's sitting in Part. The

act of Supremacy being turned to Commons only - the
peers being hereditary Com. rolls. After R C Com-
mons took it, and Pendants set in the town house.
Now here was the first evil precedent:

The first result was the overthrow of Church, &
Kingdom.

5. 25 Charles II. The Act, & Cap: Act.

30. — — — The declaration of ^{1st} Trausub^{er}
Hambialm^{er} de. imposed on Land as well
as commons. So that this anomalous state
lasted only from 5 Eliz. to 30 Ch: ~~with~~
the Parliament after the Rebellⁿ the de-
dicted

6. The Rev: 1688 confirmed the then
state of the Civil, & Ecc^l Constitution -
and this was perhaps the nearest approxi-
mation to a Catholic condition since
Hen 9. VIII. but I think the whole has
been lost by the vain, & painful cry of Protes-
tant ascendancy - I can believe the wise
men of that day conceived the hope of
working on the principle of identity in Church
& State to the ultimate abolition of
Schism. It was defeated, I don't enquire how -
but I believe one of the main faults to be

1688

the terms made by the Scotch Presby: ^m - which obtained the 1st Recognition of the body - (I grant that the case was very difficult, by reason of the non-juring Scotch Church).

From that time we have been undoing all that was done 1688.

1. Admissⁿ of Presbyteries to Parli. 1712-13.
2. Repeal of Test & Corp: ⁿ
3. R. C. Relief.

4. In their proportion Church & State have ceased to be identical.

And in that same proportion ought the Ecclesiastical affairs of the Church to have been reserved to her own members

For no man without the Communion of the Church ought to have, nor can have either by Patent of Nobility or Popular Voice, without an open breach of Right any vote, or power in the administration of the Church. The King bestows it (as by Commisⁿ) only in virtue of being a ^{Royal} Communicant: and none are capable of exercising or even of receiving it save only as qualified by the privileges of the Church. E.g. A Roman C, a

a Presbyterian King wd have no Prerogative over the
Eccel: affairs of the Ch: nor can the Crown at this day
make either a R. C. a Presbyterian ^{Eccel:} or ^{any} compromise ex-
cept by an open breach of right, amounting to oppres-
sion of conscience.

8. Parliament is a mixed body, and so far from
being able to admit your conclusion that, it is a
rightful mode of expressing a mixed result in
Eccel: affairs, I feel that ~~parliament~~ ^{mixedness} or as I
wd say "fufecture of identity with the Ch:" brings
with it a fufecture of its Eccel: privileges.

You draw a fair distinction between aid, & in-
terference. And is not the Church the only
body unaided, ^{at home at least} and alone inturped with?

Grants are made to the R.C.s, & Presbyt:
but no inturference. The Church is inturped
with even to the stalls &c, but no grants like

~~I have this morning seen the Baines' system about 1st fruits & 10th!!!!~~

Tithes, glebes &c. do not stand by votes of Parlia-
ment, but by the common laws of all Property-

Church property is a figment - is it not? Is not
every Rectory a corporation sole, & every Chapter a
Corporation aggregate? But is there any further
Corporateness than between the Bishops of Bedford, &
Newcastle - or the Goldsmiths, & Fishmongers Com-
pany?

And now what is the meaning of the "Union of Ch: & St:
or the "Ch: Established". Is it the King's nomination of
Bishops? the lay patronage? the proposition of property by
Common Law? The Parliamentary Rules, binding
on none but her own members, who need no laws
and on nobody else? I protest I do not understand
the meaning except it be that a mixed Par-
liament has power (x as I feel without right) to
interfere without aiding.

How distinct is the principle of Establishment
from such an union of Ch: & State the Presbyt:
in Scotland, a R Cath^o in New South Wales
will prove.

And now I must hasten to an end begging
you to write me also noting the unproved, &
unprovable points. Before I finish I would
add a question, what adversary of the English Ch:
could consistently oppose the removal of Ecol: func-
tions from a mixed Parlt. to a Commission
or Synod of her own members? Could the RC?
The Presbyt:?. The Voluntaries? The Independents?
The anti-Ch: & - State unionists? The liberty of
conscience, & grievance Southern? (Every argument
ad captum & demum ^{id est} ^{ad hominem} ^{id est} ^{ad hominem}) And shall her own

children pray for the perpetuation of the high principles
of being troubled, threatened, and brought into bondage
by a mixed body of Roman Catholic Schisma-
tics, & Protestant sectarians of every conceivable
kind. Shall we come, & put our ear to the door
post the "broed thro" with the awl of a per-
petual scintilla?

But I can go no further now. than only
to say that, I see not only no reason why you
shd not embrace the full effus of God's provi-
dence to you of power & office, but every reason
why you ought; and that in sharing the mixed
legislation of the Govt you shd have the
deliverance of Christi's Church, and the aim
of approximating every other anomalous body
to the same, at once, & always in view.

You answered your own question abt the
oikonomia - did you not? by adding that, it is
a rival body, or a defunct Church, teaching
its own forms, & perverting up all others.

And now at last, I will add no more than

that I am my dear Gladstone,
Ever affectly yours
H. E. Manning.

April 28. 1837.
Friday Night.

Apr. 28

H. S. Manning

W. E. Gleestone Esq

M. P.

Carlton Gardens
London

1837

RECEIVED
MAY 1 1837

RECEIVED
MAY 1 1837

RECEIVED
MAY 1 1837

April 28 1837
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th inst. in relation to the proposed meeting of the friends of the cause of the colored people in the city of London. I am glad to hear that you are so warmly interested in the cause, and I have no doubt that your efforts will be successful. I have the pleasure to inform you that the meeting will be held on the 1st of May at 8 o'clock in the evening at the rooms of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, No. 10, Broad Street, London. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
H. S. Manning