

OUR IDENTITY WITH THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL;

AS DESCRIBED IN THE

“CLIFTON CHRONICLE” LETTERS.

BY

PHILO-ISRAEL.

THIRD THOUSAND.

LONDON :

W. H. GUEST, 29, PATERNOSTER ROW.

BRISTOL :

I. E. CHILLCOTT, 26, CLARE STREET.

1877.

Entered at Stationers' Hall.

A. RUSSELL, PRINTER, 30, MOORFIELDS, LIVERPOOL.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following Letters, addressed to a local newspaper, had their origin in this wise:—It was felt that our various magazines and journals on the subject of our Identity seldom or never reach the general public. They have no access to the houses of the mass of our fellow-citizens in such towns as Bristol and Clifton. It struck me, therefore, that an effort ought to be made to reach these classes through the secular newspapers. With diffidence accordingly, I addressed myself to the Editor of *The Clifton Chronicle*, a journal which enjoys a pretty large circulation in this vicinity, and asked him if he would publish a few letters I wished to send him on our interesting subject? I anticipated refusal; but, to my surprise and great delight, I found the worthy Editor willing to accede to my request for reasons which I need not here detail. The only stipulations he made were “that the letters should be short—to the point; and that the ‘preaching’ element should be wanting.” I gladly acceded; and the result was the series of letters now placed in a collected form before the public with the consent of the Editor to whom they were originally addressed. I believe they put the facts and arguments of our case, as far as they relate to the Scriptural view of the matter, in a clear—perhaps striking—aspect, calculated to arrest the thoughtful mind; and *that* I anticipate is their sole merit. That the Redeemer of “His people Israel” will use these letters largely, to persuade His still “blind” ones of their glorious origin, and enable them to “see” “the rock whence they were hewn and the hole of the pit whence they were digged,” to “look unto Abraham their Father, and unto Sarah that bare them,” (Isa. li. 1-2) and thus be convinced of their true Hebrew descent, is the earnest prayer and hope of the writer,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

CLIFTON, December, 1876.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Introduction	3
Letter No. 1.—Queen and Empress	5
" 2.—The Colonization of Palestine	6
" 3.—The Secret of England's Greatness ; and the Gates ...	7
" 4.—The Universal Creditor	8
Letter from " Laicus-Hibernicus "	9
" 5.—The Happy Family Party	10
Letter from " Inquirer "	11
" 6.—The Fatally Destructive Race	11
" Philo-Israel " replies to " Inquirer "	12
" 7.—The Unconquerable Nation	13
" 8.—The Encirclers of the Earth	14
Letter from " Anglo-Saxon "	15
" 9.—The Universal Rulers	16
" Philo-Israel " replies to " Anglo-Saxon "	17
" 10.—The Multiplying Race speaking the Universal Language	18
" 11.—The Ever-continuing Monarchy	19
" 12.—The Emancipators of the Slave	20
" 13.—The Isolated Nation	21
Letter from " Anglo-Saxon "	22
" 14.—The Asylum for Foreign Refugee	22
" Philo-Israel " replies to " Anglo-Saxon "	23
" 15.—The Scattered People at Home in every Climate ...	24
" 16.—Retrospective and Explanatory	25
" 17.—Explanatory	26
" 18.—Further Explanatory	27
" 19.—The Possessors of the Sign	29
" 20.—The Decalogue	30
Letter from " Juvenis "	31
" 21.—The Christian Nation	32
" Philo-Israel " replies to " Juvenis "	33
" 22.—The Universal Benefactors	33
" Philo-Israel " Explains	35
" 23.—The Universal Missionaries	35
" 24.—The Testimony of the Book of Common Prayer ...	37
" 25.—Conclusion	38
" 26.—The Great Pyramid of Ghizeh	39

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CLIFTON CHRONICLE."

N.B.—Some communications from readers of these Letters appeared from time to time in the Clifton Journal. These will be found inserted in their proper place and order of appearance,—with the Author's replies,—since they seemed to raise points of interest and served to elucidate the great truth of Our Identity with Israel.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. I.—QUEEN AND EMPRESS.

SIR,—A letter has appeared in the *Man of Kent and Woolwich Garrison Chronicle* having reference to the new title Her Majesty has assumed, which I imagine must prove of interest to some of your readers. Its object is to introduce a modification of our glorious National Anthem, which the recent change has called for. I trust you will be able to find room for the annexed extract from the letter, which is all I wish to trouble you with. My friend, a solicitor in London, says:—"Now that our most gracious Queen has proclaimed herself Empress of India, a little alteration in our National Anthem will, I think, not be out of place ; and, if not too presumptuous, may I beg the insertion of the following. If written somewhat to meet the Anglo-Israel views, I think the matter and words may not be deemed altogether inappropriate even with the general public."

God save our gracious Queen,
Long live our noble Queen,

God save our Queen ;
Send her victorious,
Happy and glorious,
Long to reign over us,
God save our Queen.

May she, our Queen, long reign
O'er England's *wide domain*, (a)

With power and might :
Cause her alone to Thee
For aid and strength to flee ; (b)
Still this her motto be,
" God and my right ! " (c)

May her Imperial fame
Through India spread Thy name, (d)
Both far and wide ;

(a) "Thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east, to the north and to the south" (Gen. xxviii. 14). See also Gen. xxxv. 11 ; Isaiah xlix. 19, liv. 3, &c. "Victoria by the Grace of God of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Colonies and Dependencies in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australasia, Queen, Defender of the Faith," &c., &c. "On the British flag the sun never sets."

(b) Deut. ix. 5, &c., &c.

(c) "Dieu et mon Droit" covers a wider range than perhaps was ever imagined when first adopted, and certainly than is generally imagined now.

(d) "And it shall be to Me a name of praise and an honour before all the nations of the earth, which shall hear all the good that I do unto them" (Jer. xxxiii. 9), &c., &c.

And midst that teeming throng,
 May we, both loud and long,
 Proclaim true Israel's song—
 "Heaven's light our Guide." (c)

Empress of heathen States; (f)
 Mistress of hostile "gates," (g)
 Her flag is seen;
 England and colonies, (h)
 Unite, and rend the skies,
 Let this one shout arise,
 "God save our Queen."

So far my friend. A word from myself now in conclusion. Her Majesty, while Queen of England, is no doubt "Empress of Heathen States" as well as "Mistress of hostile gates." The events now taking place in the Levant, the collection there of twenty ironclads and unarmoured war-ships of Her Majesty, clearly indicate an approaching crisis in our national history, and, I would submit, point to the change approaching in the destiny of that great "Gate," of all the gates of the East, *La Porte Sublime*, the goal of Russian ambition, but which *The Times* and the voice of England declare equally, "*shall never become a Muscovite Port.*" Constantinople is the key or "Gate" of India, of the Levant, of Malta, Palestine, and of the Suez canal; and whether we, nationally, can allow such a position to fall into the hands of the Russian Empire, let British statesmen and the public declare.

Yours truly,

May, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

P.S.—An article in the *Evening Standard* of the 25th May, on "Russia in Central Asia," will repay perusal.

P.-I.

LETTER NO. 2.—THE COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE.

SIR,—There is a society now working in London, having for its object the colonization and occupation of Syria and Palestine, by British, German, and Jewish colonists. It is proposed, I believe, that they shall lease tracts of land from the Turkish authorities, bring them under cultivation, improve them, and thus fit them gradually for the greater and more glorious occupation of the "promised inheritance" by the two re-united Houses of "Israel" and "Judah" (the British races and the Jews), whose "return" to their land many among us believe to be imminent.

Your readers will know by the signature at the foot of this letter that the writer is one who looks forward ardently to that day. But he holds that the occupation of God's own land is not to be brought about by the means now proposed by the society in question.

The following extracts from the *Record* newspaper of a recent date plainly prove that the period has not arrived for the return of "the Tribes" to their own land.

(c) Some of your readers may not be aware that these words form the motto of Her Majesty's latest Order—"The Star of India." And thus sang Israel of old, "In the day-time also he led them with a cloud, and all the night through with a light of fire."

(f) "Ask of Me and I shall give (thee) the heathen for thine inheritance" (Psalm ii. 8; xviii. 43; xlvii. 3; cv. 43, 44; cxi. 6; Isaiah xlix. 23), &c., &c.

(g) "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (Gen. xxii. 17). "Let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them" (Gen. xxiv. 60). England possesses the following amongst others of her enemies' "gates"—Gibraltar, Malta, Aden, the Island of Perim, Peshawur, Singapore, Malacca, Penang, Sarawak, Hong Kong, Cape Coast Castle, Heligoland, &c., &c.

(h) "The uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Psalm ii. 8). "A nation and company of nations shall be of thee" (Gen. xxxv. 11), &c.

To those who are contemplating emigration to Syria, I would most earnestly say "The time has not yet come. Wait !"

The following is the extract from a letter of the 14th inst., I allude to, received from a native Christian gentleman at Cairo. It shows that considerable alarm exists amongst the Christians of Syria :—

"We Christians are very anxious to learn what course the English will take respecting the present alarming state of affairs in our country. There is a great spirit of excitement among the Moslem against the Christian population. The Moslems go about the city and use violent and threatening language against the Christians, and we are fearing there is going to be a declaration of war between the Sultan and Christian Governments. We do not know what will become of the Eastern Christians, unless protected by European powers ; but we trust God will find us a way of deliverance out of our present dangers."

Another letter from a native Syrian Christian says :—

"The fearful catastrophe in Salonica has created a great excitement in the whole of Syria among the Moslems, especially at Damascus, Beyrout, Hama, Tripoli, and other places. The Moslems are openly threatening the Christians with a renewal of the former massacres, and we Christians are anxiously looking for protection from our English friends and fellow-Christians in other countries of Europe."

Let intending emigrants recollect that the land which the Lord Jehovah "careth for" ; on which "the eyes of the Lord" are always fixed "from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year" (Deut. xi. 12) ; which he says "is Mine," and shall "not be sold for ever" (Levit. xxv, 23), has yet to be violently wrested from its present Moslem possessors.

The Turkish empire, in dissolution, will be no safe abode for innocent British emigrants, men, women, and children. And finally, let us recollect, that God's word assures us that terrific organic changes are to take place in the very configuration of the surface of the country, to fit it for its future selected inhabitants. "The earthquake" is to rend it (Zech. xiv, 4), the surface of large tracts of the country is to be raised (Zech. xiv, 10), the waters of the Mediterranean are to flow into the Dead Sea, and thence probably into the Gulf of Akaba, as plainly indicated in Exek. xlvii, 8—11 ; and not till these changes have occurred can we conceive it safe that the grand returning procession of the two united nations of "Israel" and "Judah" shall be accomplished.

Better, I say, to await GOD's good time, when, as He has promised, "the House of Judah" (the Jews) shall walk to "the House of Israel" (the British) "and they shall come TOGETHER, out of the land of the NORTH, to the land that I have given to their fathers for an inheritance" (*i. e.*, to Palestine), (Jerem. iii, 18.)

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

Clifton, June, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO 3.—THE SECRET OF ENGLAND'S GREATNESS ; AND THE GATES.

SIR,—How are we to account for the position we British occupy in the world? Given two insignificant islands in the western seas, peopled ages ago by hordes of nomades, who, Sharon Turner and those learned in ethnic science tell us, were *Asiatics*—Keltae (Chaldee?), Scots, Teutons, Saxons, Danes, Angles, Jutes, and Normans—these converging tribes settling here finally amalgamated ; and what do we see now? An imperial race, holding one-fourth of the terrestrial superficies of the globe ; administering an empire grander than any which has yet appeared upon the earth ; to which the Persian, the Babylonian, the Assyrian, the Egyptian, the Greek, and the Roman were mere dwarfs and pigmies, and which, so far from showing

symptoms of decay, is exerting an influence to-day, and exercising a power now, which surely can belong only to the very "*chief of nations*."

There is a peculiarity in our national condition which is seldom thought of. Not only have the British an enormous colonial as well as an immense heathen empire owning allegiance to our Queen, but we have, besides, all the more important positions in various portions of the earth, which historians and strategists call the "Keys," but GOD'S Word terms the "Gates," of the world.

For instance—we dominate the Red Sea, and are, no doubt, the arbiters of that ocean highway; because in the north we hold a commanding influence in the SUEZ canal, supported by the first-class fortress Malta; in the south, the island of PERIM gives us the very lock of the "door," which has a double bar and key in Aden and Socotra, both in the close vicinity.

British India we acquired by our capture and hold of those "keys" of the position, which we early obtained, viz., Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta. Down the straits of the Malayan peninsula, Penang, Singapore, and Malacca are points of influence we call "keys" of that passage, which secure to us the ruling influence, and the right to open or shut this great ocean roadway. Then Rangoon, Peshawur, Lebuan, Hong-Kong, Sydney, New Zealand, Cape Town, Natal, Cape-Coast Castle, St. Helena, the Falklands, Gibraltar, and those other strategic "places of arms" which serve to give the holders military power and dominating influence over surrounding races are the heritage of the British nation. And think you, Sir, that the nations who thus see *us* seated in their positions of strength, in their own Fatherlands, love us for our grasping, encroaching, "pushing" propensities? Surely not: they "hate" us, and in their hearts are our "enemies" still! They wish us away, and would gladly be rid of us—if they could!

Why, we ask again, is all this majesty, this power, dominion, and influence given to *our* "favoured race?" and why are *we* thus the key- (or gate-) holders, *par excellence*, of the nations of the world? What is this secret? We answer—it is because GOD has promised to one race only, of all the nations of the earth, that *they*, and *they* alone, shall fulfil this very destiny. He has said, speaking to Abraham and to his Hebrew descendants (but to NONE ELSE), "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his *enemies*." "Let thy seed possess the gate of those that *hate* them."—(Gen. xxii. 17; xxiv. 60). That same race, living among the Gentiles, is likened to a "LION" among "the beasts of the forest," and world-wide power and influence are ascribed to them in the words, "If he go through, he both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver." (Micah v. 8.)

Surely the prophecy and the fulfilment here agree exactly! The British and the lost Hebrews being identical, the secret is explained! They, in virtue of their race, have the "gate" of those that "hate" them (*being "enemies"*), and, as the "Chief of Nations," they influence the destinies of other nations! In short, the "British LION" is master of the situation; "Britannia rules the waves;" and mark, Sir, in this consists the glory and grandeur of the whole thing—for which we, nationally, ought to be so thankful—she shall do so for EVER! (Isa. lx. 11; li. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 26—28.)

I am, yours truly,

Clifton, June, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER No. 4.—THE UNIVERSAL CREDITOR.

SIR,—Among all the nations of the world there seems to be one especially marked out to be the "Money-lender." We have heard, sometimes—have we not?—of the tendency of *the Jew* to play this part. That race has, time out of mind, been in bad odour on this very account.

But we English have not, when our own needs pressed, despised the help our Jewish-Hebrew millionaires have given us! Lately, when the Suez Canal shares were bought and paid for, the *Jewish* Premier negotiated the temporary loan, and the *Jewish* bankers—Messrs. Rothschild—found the £4,000,000 sterling that were “wanted” at the two days’ notice.

The Jews, however, are not a “nation.” They have no established government, fixed polity, or settled habitation. They are distinctly a “scattered people,” “few in number”—five to seven millions throughout the earth, and barely 52,000, all told, in Great Britain!

The *national* “money-lenders” we shall find (if we reflect) are—The BRITISH! Let any one who doubts this fact take up an issue of *The Times* or *Standard*, any day, and examine the “Stock and Share Lists.” He will find that not only is London “the counting-house” of the world, but that about five-and-twenty of the fifty-six civilized nations of the earth are indebted to the British! Their stocks are quoted regularly in *our* money markets; and the greater portion of the cash they have wanted has come out of *British* pockets!

The *Westminster Review* of January last gives us the actual facts. “Foreign countries,” it is said, “during the last thirty years, have added something like *three thousand millions* to their debts;” and “there is no question that *we* (British) *have been the great lenders*.”

Now the curious fact connected with this matter is, that when our own Government has needed money, British millionaires, merchants, and subjects have advanced it, but never the alien: whereas the foreigner, when he has been forced to borrow (and which of them has not?) has always had his wants supplied largely by emptying John Bull’s money bags; being sure of finding *there* a perennial supply, and a creditor constantly ready (hitherto) to lend!

How is this phenomenon to be accounted for? “Why,” say the learned, “the British have an enormous commerce, which brings wealth; and out of the surplus profits they are able to lend money to all comers.” But how, we ask, came these islanders to get this world-wide trade? How is it that it yields such enormous returns? Whence the “ready mind” to lend? The commerce of France, of Germany, of America, is extensive, the resultant wealth of each considerable. Why do not *these* nations figure as “money-lenders” to ALL mankind?

I beg, Sir, to hazard a reply. God’s Word foretold this remarkable rôle, *now played by the British races alone*, as Israel’s portion, “If they would hearken (nationally) to the voice of the Lord their God.” “The Lord shall open unto THEE his good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless all the work of thine hand: and thou shalt LEND UNTO MANY NATIONS, AND THOU SHALT NOT BORROW.”—(Deut. xxviii. 12; xv. 6.)

The immense wealth of this Hebrew people is also distinctly predicted in Deut. xxviii. 1—14; Isaiah lx. 11-16. The national debt of this Israelitish Power—Britain—is merely her own children’s help to the parent’s need! Its amount is trifling, compared with the nation’s capital and credit.

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

Clifton, June, 1876.

SIR,—Permit me to add my word to that of “Philo” and “Anglo-Israel.” I fancy that he may have passed over a document which goes far to support his views, although not much quoted in the present day. I allude to the preface of the English Bible. What the personal views of the translators were I do not learn; nor can I recall the names of the writer (or writers) of the preface. It is at least suggestive.

1. It describes England as “*Sion*,” and “the most high and mighty

Prince James" (the same as Jacob, but modified by transit through the Spanish) in his appearance as of the *sun* in his strength. It matters not for our purpose that Queen Elizabeth had previously been called a *star*, but ere the first paragraph concludes allusion is happily made to the King's hopeful *seed*.

And within forty years ago, when the service for the accession of our present Queen was in preparation, some in authority [Archbishop Howley, of Canterbury (?), and Bishop Porteus, of London (?)] may be supposed to have held the views now propounded in your paper. It was just about that time that the gifted Sharon Turner first broached his very original ideas on the subject. For those Anglo-Israelites who took part in the service this morning must have been struck with one special petition in the prayer succeeding the fourth prayer for the Queen. It is as follows:—"That our posterity may see her children's children and peace upon *Israel*."

I commend these extracts to your "A.-I." correspondents; and as the subject becomes more widely taken up, doubtless, further light will be thrown on it.

I remain, your obedient Servant,

28th June, 1876.

LAICUS-HIBERNICUS.

LETTER No 5.—THE HAPPY FAMILY PARTY.

SIR,—Do your readers recollect a clever cartoon in *Judy*, published on the 5th January last, called the "New Year's Family Party"? The story was this:—"John Bull" has a little dinner for his "family party" and around his festive board at the new-year gathering are assembled the following near relations—1st, Australia, looking blithe and handsome; 2nd, British Columbia, sturdy and strong; 3rd, Caffraria; 4th, Natal; 5th, New Zealand, dark and tattooed; 6th, Canada, pointing to her necklace ornament, the "British Standard." The 7th chair is vacant, but offered to "Brother Jonathan," a tall and thin American, who disdaining the invitation, walks off, or makes as though he would, thinking of the "Centenary of Independence." "John Bull," however, offers him hearty hospitality, proffers him a tankard of "foaming ale," and greets him with the honest expression of good will in the words, "Jonathan, you *may* as well take your place at this table." What *Judy* made fun of is surely, Sir, likely some day to be a glorious fact.

Have your readers noticed that since the civil war in America the feeling of our kinsmen to us "Britishers" has been far less bitter than it used to be? We have seen it somewhere stated that ere long it will be proper that the British nation should offer the United States "federation," "and thus re-unite with the parent stock a branch of the Anglo-Saxon race, which ought never to have been allowed to become separated."

One with us in kindred, in manners, laws, customs, traditions, language, literature, and faith, it has required but one point of union more to make the ties which bind us lasting: we have wanted a common monetary system, a "common unit of money and accounts" between the two great countries, giving us a commercial confraternity which *must* tend, sooner or later, to fuse the two races of the stock into the one grand Anglo-Saxon brotherhood they are surely destined to exhibit.

A telegram from Philadelphia, dated June 7th, published in *The Times* of the 8th, proclaims that this *desideratum* has been all but accomplished! The Senate has passed the resolution "authorising negotiations for a common unit of money and accounts between the United States and Great Britain." The bill will doubtless pass the House of Representatives, and be adopted, we trust, by ourselves. Then will be accomplished what the Editor of *The Times*, on the 21st January, 1876, declared will be an immense benefit to the whole Anglo-Saxon race. "The field of this international currency is not,"

he truly said, "a narrow one. It opens to us no less a prospect than the establishment of a common monetary system for all English-speaking peoples, *who by the end of the century will probably rule, or people, the greater part of the earth's surface, and monopolize even a greater share of its commerce.*"

These are remarkable words to emanate from the "leading journal," but they are not more remarkable than those the same writer used, speaking of the "giant colonies" of Great Britain, on the 1st May, 1875. He then said that these constituted the "grandest federation of states the world has ever witnessed;" a "vast united empire" at the ends of the world, with the "old country" acting as the "central link."

Let the reader add to this vast "federation" the United States, already one with us in friendly bonds, and soon to be also in the commercial ties which a "common unit of money and accounts" will certainly create, and we may easily see that there is thus realized for us the prediction of God Almighty to "our forefathers Abraham, Isaac, and Israel," "a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee" (Gen. xvii. 6., xxvi. 3., xxxv. 11). The fact is true of the British to-day! We are a nation and a company of nations. No one can deny it! Must we not, then, be of the Hebrew or Israelitish stock?

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

Clifton, June, 1876.

SIR.—I have read with much interest, and, I may add, a certain amount of conviction, the series of letters which are appearing in your paper from time to time under the signature of "Philo-Israel." There is, however, a real, or at least apparent, anomaly in this writer's letter, entitled, "The Universal Creditor," which appeared in your last issue, and to which I draw attention more for the sake of eliciting an explanation than provoking a controversy.

In the latter part of his letter "Philo-Israel" says that in the experience of the British a prophecy contained in Deut. xxviii. 12 and xv. 6, has been fulfilled, viz., that they (the British) should lend unto many nations, and should *not borrow*. How then is this to be reconciled with the statement at the commencement of the letter that "when the Suez canal shares were bought and paid for, the *Jewish* Premier negotiated the temporary loan, and the *Jewish* bankers—Messrs. Rothschild—found the £4,000,000 sterling that were 'wanted' at the two days' notice"?

In a former letter "Philo-Israel" says that Britannia rules the waves, and "shall do so for ever," whereas I read in the Psalms (Psalm xv. 5) that "he that putteth *not* out his money to usury . . . shall never be moved." See also Deut. xxviii. 19, 20. The speculations which have until recently taken place by Englishmen on 'Change' in Turkish bonds do not seem to bear out "Philo-Israel's" conclusions.

Yours truly,

AN INQUIRER.

June 22, 1876.

LETTER NO. 6.—THE FATALLY DESTRUCTIVE RACE.

SIR,—Have your readers ever reflected that there is one race of men now extant on the earth whose bare presence in certain quarters, where they desire to locate themselves, is the death-knell of the aborigines? and that *that* race is the British?

Let me point out to you some instances of this curious anomaly, to which we give too little thought.

Our race, the Anglo-Saxons, have, during the last 250 years, taken pos-

session of, and colonised, the whole continent of North America, from the Arctic Circle in the north to the Tropics in the south, from the Pacific in the west to the Atlantic in the east. This vast continent was the home of the Red Indian when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth, Mass., in A.D. 1620. The aborigines then roaming "fancy free" throughout the great domain of their fathers are now rapidly "dying out," and by the last accounts were barely 300,000 in number! Intemperance, sterility among females, and impatience of settled habits, are causing their disappearance when brought face to face with the vigorous and "pushing" Anglo-Saxon. (Deut. xxxiii. 17).

Australia and Tasmania were both peopled originally by distinct races of savages, very few in number, and destined soon to vanish.

Those of Sydney "died out" in 1846. In 1803 the aborigines of Tasmania were 3,000, all told. In 1864 the last survivor of that hapless race was present at an entertainment in Hobart Town; and since then *he* has gone, leaving no trace of the native Tasmanian on the earth! The blight of our fatal presence has been on the "stationary savagedom" of the land, and the "Blacks" have gone.

In New Zealand a really vigorous nation of *Red* men have been brought in contact with our people. What has been the result? The Maories, in 1858, were 56,000 in all, and of these but 3,000 resided in the southern island. *They* have rapidly passed away, and by this time have probably "died out" altogether. In the north island the native races, decimated by disease, war, drunkenness, infanticide, and sterility among the women, are destined, we are told by local observers, to early disappearance before the same "pushing," overwhelming British, whose mere contact has been so fatal to the aborigines of other unhappy lands where they have set their hearts on settling as *colonists*.

In very recent times what has been the result of our occupation, as a British colony, of the Fiji Islands? It is a dark and dreadful story; but one reflecting, happily, no blame on us as a nation!

No sooner had we "annexed" them, and assumed, *at their own request*, the protectorate of their territory, as one of Great Britain's possessions, than an outburst of measles and typhoid fever, among the natives, carried off whole tribes—decimated entire communities—struck off fully one-third of an already sparse population, causing 40,000 deaths during the four months' plague!

Can any of your readers account for the singular fatality attaching to the colonising efforts of what is really a noble people—one which, on the whole, has kindly cared for the aborigines, and fairly striven, *generally*, to act towards them *in loco parentis*?

Allow me, Sir, again, to offer a solution of this new mystery. This nation, being Israel, as a result of her singular fecundity, and of the "straitness" of her home, has been forced to seek out many outlets for her enormous, multitudinous progeny. She has been "scattered to the ends of the earth," and "planted" there in colonies. And GOD has foretold, as the fate of the races she is "to push to the ends of the earth," that "though I make a FULL END of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee; but I will correct thee in measure, and I will not leave thee altogether unpunished" (Jer. xxx. 10, 11; xlvj. 27, 28).

The subject, and the reason for this wondrous fatality attaching to our colonizing operations, deserves the attention of the thoughtful inquirer.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

Clifton, June, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

PHILO-ISRAEL'S REPLY TO "AN INQUIRER."

My object is not controversy. But a courteous question requires a candid reply. I beg to submit that Deut. xxviii. 12, and xv. 6, predict that while

Israel shall "lend to many nations," she *nationally* "shall not borrow" *from them*. Deut. xv. 6 shows *that* by the context. The prediction goes on, "Thou shalt reign over many nations, *but they shall not reign over thee*." The loan raised for the Suez Canal shares was one of a merely temporary character, and *was not* raised from alien foreign nations. It was lent to meet a sudden emergency, by bankers of a kindred *Hebrew* stock, naturalised subjects of the British crown.

There was no Old Testament prohibition to the loan of Hebrew money on interest to the alien, but only to "*the poor of thy people*" on *usury* (Exod. xxii. 25; Levit. xxv. 35—38; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20). These passages, and also our Lord's words, Matt. xxv. 27, requiring money to be increased by interest, under certain circumstances, by Israel, surely explain Psal. xv. 5 to "An Inquirer's" satisfaction. Deut. xxviii. 19, 20, I would point out to him, relate, with the whole chapter from verse 15 to the end, to the condition of *the house of Judah* (the Jews) at this very time.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 7.—THE UNCONQUERABLE NATION.

SIR,—Great Britain assuredly occupies a most singular position, as the *one* European power of the first class which has never suffered the indignity of hostile invasion by the alien,—certainly since A.D. 1066! It has been foremost in almost every great conflict for the last eight hundred years, but has rarely (and that when good reason can be assigned for the facts) been really worsted by the foreigner.

We have heard and read of Battles of Dorking, and of the ease with which British soil could, any day, be overrun by Continental armies, if, only, "British naval supremacy were at an end!" *That* is, of course, the point! How came our race to obtain this supremacy, and why? But I would draw attention to the fact, that over and over again in our history we have completely placed ourselves beyond the influence of this so-called over-riding advantage, and have thrown ourselves on foreign soil, and offered battle, too, to the foreigner, where *every* advantage has been his own! Let Crecy, Poitiers, Agincourt, Blenheim, Ramilies, Oudenarde, Malplaquet, the Peninsular campaigns, Albuera, Quatre Bras, Waterloo, the Indian mutinies, the Crimean, the Abyssinian, and Ashantee battles, all testify with what result! The Duke of Wellington was the hero of a hundred fights, and "every fight he fought he won;" and never, in the field, did he lose a single cannon!

Then, in regard to our native land: can any of us recollect the time, or recall from history the date, when foreign fleets and hostile squadrons have blockaded our many ports, enabled the foreign foes of Britain to insult her by invasion, landed an army to effect the conquest of the soil, or humiliated a race whose boast is that, under God's protecting blessing, they never have, on this, their own ground, signed a treaty of peace, purchasing the clemency of the alien conqueror, or submitted to terms dictated by the victorious invader of their home? Can this be asserted by France? Have we not ourselves, within this century, twice overrun that land from end to end? and in the late war the German armies did the same! Were Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, or Russia free from the iron grasp of the great Napoleon's military power? and did not each of them submit for a time to humiliation and indignity unutterable, which that ruthless conqueror imposed on *them*; as he purposed to do on us, had not the providence of God been our refuge and our shield! What has caused the happy immunity of our race and land from these chastisements to which we see *all* our foreign alien neighbours have been subjected! "The sea," say some, "has been our defence." Nay! it has afforded foreign lands no protection when *we* have

had a mind to issue forth and attack *them* on their own soil! "British supremacy at sea accounts for it," say others. Nay! In 1805 an accidental (?) storm was all that prevented Napoleon's successful landing on the shores of Albion! Our military authorities and the author of our "Battle of Dorking" tell us that nothing will be easier, in these days of steam, than the successful invasion of our Fatherland—"given certain opportunities which a chance (?) storm, or an accidental absence of a British channel squadron, may any day supply." What then, Sir, makes us British so confident—so safe in this our island home, our land of "unwalled villages" and towns? I must offer what I submit is a reasonable solution.

This nation, being Israel, is under God's own immediate protection. He has assured us, as a nation, that He is "our God." "I will strengthen thee," He says, "yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. . . . They that strive with thee shall perish. . . . They that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought" (Isaiah xli. 8—12).

He has also appointed for "His people Israel" A PLACE (Great Britain) "that they may dwell in *a place of their own*, and *move no more*; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime, and as since the time that I commanded judges to be over MY PEOPLE Israel" (2 Sam. vii. 10, 11).

This, Sir, it seems to me, is the security we British rest upon in our island home to-day. It occurs to me, too, we want no better!

Yours truly,

Clifton, July, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

ERRATUM.

In my last letter I said that the survivor of the hapless race of Tasmanian aborigines had "died out" after 1864. I should have stated that the last MAN of the race had gone! *A woman*, has, it seems, survived till now! The *Bristol Times and Mirror* of the 6th July reports, as the most recent news, that "Lalla Rookh, the last Tasmanian aboriginal, had died at the age of 73, of paralysis; her last days had been smoothed by a grant of £80 a year by the Government to the matron who looked after her."

This confirms two of my statements :—1st, that the blacks of Tasmania have GONE, "died out" to the last man and woman; 2nd, that the British have *generally* acted paternally and with consideration for these hapless races. Alas! I cannot state that they have always done so. But Deut. xxxiii. 17 shews that Israel's destiny was to "push the people together to the ends of the earth."

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER No. 8.—THE "ENCIRCLERS" OF THE EARTH.

SIR,—During the late German invasion of France we saw that General Von Moltke's tactics, when a preponderance of numbers justified it, always consisted in the effort to "surround his enemy." At Woërrth, at Sedan, and at Paris, we saw how successful these manœuvres were. With nations, as with armies, if there be a decided preponderance in numbers and population, power, no doubt, and influence, both result from the acquisition of positions which geographically "surround the enemy." Has it ever occurred to you, Sir, and to your readers, that there is one nation now extant on the globe, which is in precisely this tactically commanding position with reference to all the rest of the earth? The colonies and possessions of this one race—the Anglo-Saxons—actually encircle the rest of mankind! The territories of this portion of the human family—the British and the American nations—"belt the world."

The colonial empire of the British consists of fifty-six separate governments, and curiously enough, if any one will take the trouble to trace them on an atlas, he will find that they are so placed as to form two distinct circles,

roughly drawn, one in each hemisphere, literally enclosing in their mighty fold the whole of the other nationalities of the earth.

Taking the eastern hemisphere, we trace the circle thus :—Starting with the British Islands in the north-west, we pass in review, Heligoland, Gibraltar, Malta, Gambia, the West Coast African settlements, St. Helena, the Cape of Good Hope and South African colonies, Mombassa, the Mauritius, the Seychelles, Perim, Aden, Socotra, British India, Ceylon, Burmah, the Straits settlements, Labuan, Sarawak in Borneo, Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, the Fijis, Hong Kong, the Chinese ports, and West Canada ; thus completing the great *eastern* circle.

In the western hemisphere, the same remarkable outer circle of possessions belonging to the Anglo-Saxons, is again manifest. Commencing with the Hudson's Bay territories, we have, passing westward, the stretch of the Dominion of Canada, British Columbia, the Fiji islands, New Zealand, Ushuwia in Terra del Fuego, the Falkland islands, British Guiana, Trinidad, the West India islands, which belong to Great Britain, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's island, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, with the possessions of the United States, (all Anglo-Saxon) completing the great circle of the *western* hemisphere.

Is it not strange that the outlying fringe of the whole earth should thus constitute the habitat of the British races, and that east and west alike the circle which encompasses the whole earth should be the heritage of this one people ?

What can be the cause of this singular arrangement ? I think, Sir, GOD'S Word gives the sufficient answer. The Anglo-Saxons, including the British, are Israel. To that people GOD has given the "coasts," "the sides," "the ends," "the uttermost parts" of the earth ; and "when the most High divided to the nations their inheritance—when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the BOUNDS of the people (*i.e.* of the Gentile nations) *according to the number of the children of Israel*. For the Lord's portion is HIS PEOPLE, Jacob is the lot (cord, belt, girdle, or outside circle) of His inheritance"—(Deut. xxxii. 7, 9).

This, and other passages, seem to give us the reason for the arrangement. Israel was destined to be the "encircler" of the Gentile nations of the earth. The British, as Israelites, have literally fulfilled that destiny which their GOD announced as appertaining to them 3320 years ago.

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

Clifton, July, 1876.

SIR,—In common with "An Inquirer" I have read with interest the letters which have lately appeared in your journal under the signature of "Philo-Israel." While I admire the earnest enthusiasm of the writer, and the ingenuity he displays in support of the theory for which he contends, I cannot help thinking that occasionally (unintentionally, no doubt) he allows his zeal to outrun his discretion. Take for example, the statement in the letter in the *Chronicle* of to-day, that "Great Britain assuredly occupies a most singular position, as the *one* European power of the first class which has never suffered the indignity of hostile invasion by the alien—certainly since A.D. 1066." Surely "Philo-Israel" has forgotten that in the reign of Charles II. the Dutch fleet under De Ruyter sailed up the Thames, and burned the ships of war which lay at Chatham. "Soon the capital," says Macaulay, in his *History of England* (vol. i. p. 192), "began to feel the miseries of a blockade." Food was scarcely to be procured. Tilbury Fort, the place where Elizabeth had, with manly spirit, hurled foul scorn at Parma and Spain, was insulted by the invaders. The roar of foreign guns was heard for the first and last time by the citizens of London. In the Council it was seriously proposed that, if the enemy advanced, the Tower should be abandoned. . . . It seemed likely that the Government would have to deal at once with an invasion and an

insurrection." This extreme danger was, however, averted by the ignominious peace of Breda, but the nation, says Macaulay, "was in a mood scarcely less fierce and sullen than in the days of shipmoney."

I call attention to these facts because I feel sure "Philo-Israel" has no desire to raise any false issues or to argue from inaccurate data, and remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,

Clifton, July, 1876.

ANGLO-SAXON.

LETTER NO. 9.—THE UNIVERSAL RULERS.

SIR,—We islanders seldom, in our selfish isolation, ponder on the singular destiny which has made us "rulers over many nations" in various quarters of the world, "west, east, north, and south" (Gen. xxviii. 14). And yet so it is! Let me for a moment point out the details: they are worth considering.

Take India first—that vast empire of which our Queen is "Empress." In that wondrous land the following *nations* acknowledge her sway:—

1. The Bengalees	36	millions in number.
2. The Telugus	14	" "
3. The Tamils	16	" "
4. The Malayalim	3	" "
5. The Canarese	8	" "
6. The Mahrattas	13	" "
7. The Oriya Races	5	" "
8. The Santhals, &c.....	5	" "
9. The Guzarathis.....	6	" "
10. The Sindis	1	" "
11. The Sikhs and Punjabis ...	12	" "
12. The Hindusthanis	80	" "
13. The Burmese.....	3	" "
14. The Assamese	3	" "
15. The Cingalese	2	" "
16. The Hill Races.....	1	" "

Total..... 208 millions of souls.

In addition to these, *Frenchmen* in masses are British subjects in Canada, *Germans* and *Dutch* in the South African settlements; *Caffres*, *Hottentots*, and other *African nations* in the same localities and on the Gold Coast; *Chinese* in Hong Kong and Singapore; *Malays* in the Straits settlements and Borneo; *Red Indians* in Canada; *Tasmanian* and *Australian aborigines* (where they have not already "died out") in those lands; *Spaniards* in Gibraltar; *Italians* and *Levantine*s in Malta; *Parsees*, *Arabians*, and *Africans* in Aden; *Jews* in Britain and India; and various other nationalities in St. Helena, the Falkland Islands, in the Arctic regions, and the other possessions of the British in literally the four quarters of the globe!

Speaking roughly, it is calculated that Her Majesty has over 300 millions of heathen and Mahomedan subjects, with, say, 45 millions of Christians, over whom she *rules*, distributed in the British Islands as the seat of empire; "planted" in the west originally (here and in Canada); "spread," next, "to the east," in India, China, and Asia generally; "to the north," in the Hudson Bay territories and the Arctic circle; and "to the south," in the island continent of Australia, in Tasmania, New Zealand, the Fiji Islands, the South African settlements, and in the Falklands (Gen. xxviii. 14).

This race, then, is "dispersed" throughout the world; is everywhere an "imperial" ruling people; and, with its flag, claims and exercises all but universal domination over not one, but "*many nations*" of the earth.

Now change the scene. Is it in any man's power to point to the spot, *the whole world over*, where this same wondrous race has settled down as *subjects*

of any other nationality whatsoever, and become the subordinate, not the ruling power, in that locality? Let the reader try to discover such a place, and describe to the readers of the *Clifton Chronicle* the naturalized British community, now ruled over by an alien nation! We vouch for it, he will fail! None such exists!

One wishes to fortify one's position, even if a strong one; and I am no exception to this rule. On the subject of our race being "the unconquerable and ruling one," let your readers hear what *The Times* said in its late leader of the 10th of July:—"We (the British) *alone among the nations of the world* do not know what it is to feel that our kinsmen are the unwilling subjects of the foreigner. France, Holland, Denmark, Italy, even Germany, know this; and French, Dutch, Danes, Italians, and Germans may more easily understand the feelings of the Emperors of Austria and of Russia than we, without corresponding experience to teach us sympathy. *There is no Englishman in any part of the world kept subject to a foreign power.*" Thus speaks *The Times*, no mean or ill-informed authority in such a matter, as every one must allow!

Again I ask, Sir, *Why* is this? How comes our destiny to have been thus shaped for us? The simple answer, I believe, is that in the counsels of the Almighty, He set apart ONE nation, "His people Israel," for this particular rôle in the grand drama which has been enacting in the history of the world. He promised his blessing to that special race—"If thou carefully hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy GOD, to observe to do all these commandments which I command thee this day. For the LORD thy GOD blesseth thee, as He promised thee: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow; and thou shalt reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over thee" (Deut. xv. 6; see also Deut. xxviii. 13; Psalm ii. 8). The British being Israel, I submit, is the fact which accounts for this apparent mystery, and also for the nation's wondrous exaltation and prosperity since its Reformation in the sixteenth century.

Yours truly,

Clifton, July, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

PHILO-ISRAEL REPLIES TO "ANGLO-SAXON."

Long official life has taught me to weigh words. What I wrote in my 7th letter is accurately true, *teste* "Anglo-Saxon." De Ruyter's insult offered to our one "gate" (London), in A.D. 1667 (3rd June), was *not* the blockade of our many ports," nor "the invasion" of our soil by "the landing of an army to effect its conquest." GOD'S Word never promised us immunity from *threat* of invasion, or from the insult for a few hours of a single "GATE." He said, "Thy gates shall be open continually: they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the WEALTH of the Gentiles." The immunity promised, therefore, was from "effectual blockade" of the *national ports as a whole*. We must recollect the circumstances of A.D. 1667, and Charles the Second's disgraceful reign. A Romanist and pitiful sensualist, that unworthy monarch brought down on our nation God's four sore judgments, His righteous chastisements of "His erring people Israel." These were—1st, the shameful sale of the "GATE" Dunkirk by the King, in A.D. 1664; 2nd, the Great Plague of London, A.D. 1665; 3rd, the Great Fire of London, A.D. 1666; 4th, the *threat* of invasion, and blockade of London on the 3rd to 12th June, 1667: but, by GOD'S direct interference, the consummation of *neither* invasion nor "effectual blockade" in the national legal sense of even one single port of Great Britain for a "day or night."

Macaulay's account of these events *was* in my mind when I wrote my 7th letter. His words, I submit, prove the really merciful character of the judgments inflicted on, and the truth of His promises to, His people, by the GOD of Israel, from A.D. 1664 to 1667.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 10.—THE MULTIPLYING RACE SPEAKING THE UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE.

SIR,—There is one, and only one nation known to modern research, which possesses the remarkable characteristic—thereby separating it from all other races on the globe—that *its population doubles itself in exceedingly short periods of time*. Its increase is so rapid that the fact has, over and over again, caused its statesmen the gravest anxiety. For, while its people multiply faster than those of any other state, its territorial home-limits are so wonderfully circumscribed, that were it not for the providential acquisition of colonies and continents in various parts of the earth, enabling the masses to throw off their superabounding millions from time to time, the *habitat* of this race would long since have become a charnel-house. The people multiplying in a manner almost marvellous, would either have died of starvation, or devoured each other! The nation I allude to, Sir, is, as you may guess, the British race, settled in these favoured but very diminutive islands of ours, in the western seas.

Mr. W. E. Axon, M.R.S.L., in an able paper on “The Language of the Future,” published in the *Quarterly Journal of Science* for July, 1873, goes very fully into this subject. He gives us the periods in which various populations double themselves in given times, and the following is the result of his researches. He finds that

The Germans, taking the mean of the North and South, double once in 100 years.

The French once in 140 years (the French themselves say once in 334 years).

The Russians once in 100 years.

The Swedes once in 92 years.

The Spanish once in 112 years.

The Italians once in 135 years.

The Turks (who are DYING OUT) once in 555 years.

But that the British, in these islands, double their numbers once in 55 years, and the same race in New England and in the British dependencies once in 25 years; or taking the whole race, once (as a mean) in 41 years.

He found as a further result of these calculations, that in the year A.D. 2000, Italian, French, Russian, German, and Spanish (the latter in Europe and South America) would be the languages of 505 millions of the human race; but, that “English” must become the vernacular of 179 millions in Europe, and of 1,558 millions of Anglo-Saxons, in that “grand confederation of states,” regarding which I wrote some time ago (see “The Happy Family Party,”) in your columns. That is, that whereas 505 millions would speak various languages, *not English*, that would be the world-wide universal tongue of the almost infinite, incalculable multitude, “no man can number,” of *over seventeen hundred millions of the human family, all of the same stock—the Anglo-Saxons*. These, I beg to state, are the ideas of a man of science, not writing at all in view to support the “Israelitish origin of the British.” He is ignorant of *that theory in toto*. Can your readers, Sir, at all account for this wondrous future awaiting our “favoured race”?

Again, allow me to bring forward an explanation, which, I submit, fully clears up the mystery as nothing else does. The British races being Israel, faithfully respond to God’s own words regarding them. He stated the Hebrews should be “like the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore for multitude” (Gen. xxii. 17; xxxii. 12). Balaam said, “who can count the dust of Jacob, and number the fourth part of Israel?” (Numbers xxiii. 10). Moses promised them the blessing of “increase” (Deut. xxviii. 4, 11; xxxiii. 17; Gen. xlviii. 19). Isaiah sung of it (chap. x. 22). Hosea predicted it (chap. i. 10). Jeremiah spoke of it (chap. xxxi. 8). Ezekiel prophesied it (chap. xxxvii. 10). The other minor prophets adverted to it,

and St. Paul distinctly declared that it should come to pass (Romans ix. 27).

Being Israel, I say, Sir, we have this peculiar "identification," to which no other nation can pretend—that "being as the dust of the earth for multitude," we British have "spread abroad to the west" (first), "and to the east" (next), "and to the north, and to the south" (Gen. xxviii. 14). This being our God's own arrangement for His people, I submit that we, as Israel, answer perfectly and undoubtedly to the divine description.

Yours truly,

July, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

NOTE.—Singularity enough, *The Times* newspaper has come again to my aid since the above was written, as it so often has done before, while this subject has occupied my thoughts. In the leader of the 15th July, the editor remarks "That the most increasing people in the world are found in the United Kingdom—in France, the least." That "this is not half the tale"—that "so increasing at home are we, that we are filling continents, fringing oceans, and making the whole world our home." That "overflowing our old boundaries, we are peopling the GLOBE" (see Gen. xlix. 22). The reader should refer to this article, and study it. It could not be more *apropos* to my subject had it been penned, Sir, by PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. II.—THE EVER-CONTINUING MONARCHY.

SIR,—It would be a matter of great national importance to us all (would it not?) if we could be assured, beyond all doubt, that the glorious constitution under which we live, the limited monarchy, the civil and religious freedom we enjoy under the shadow of the throne, shall be ours FOR EVER? I wish to point out to you that, while other nationalities have had, in fact, no political stability, we ourselves, since A.D. 827, when Egbert became *de facto* "King of England," always have been under a monarchy.

An apparent exception in the seventeenth century cannot be conceded; for the seven years' *interregnum* (A.D. 1653 to 1660) during which Cromwell administered the "Commonwealth" so vigorously, was never, I take it, nationally recognised by the laws, by the Parliament, or by the people of England, and may be properly set against the 1042 years during which the land has flourished under the *bonâ fide* rule of KINGS. In the lands of "alien" races it has not been so, as we can see. France and Spain has been the scene of constant revolutions. One is to-day, and both were lately, under republican institutions. Russia, Germany, and Austria are ruled by emperors, kaisers, czars, but not by kings, as once some at least of them were. Since the Conquest the throne of these islands has ever been occupied by monarchs whose KINGLY title, whether by lineal descent or by the collateral branches, has been perfectly legal and direct. Her Majesty's ancestry traces back, through James I. of England, to Kenneth II., King of the Scots and Picts (A.D. 787); to Fergus I., the first King of the Scots (A.D. 530), and to Eochaid II. of Ulster (*cir.* B.C. 580). Our throne to-day, therefore, looks back 2456 years, and finds that its occupant dates back her pedigree to about the era of the Babylonish captivity of the house of Judah, and that the "kingdom" itself has, for more than 1,000 years, been an existing fact, as the established ruling polity of these realms!

We lately saw, when it was feared the time-honoured title of "queen" or "king" might be exchanged for the more high-sounding but tinsel one of "empress," how the nation properly rebelled against the very idea, and would have none of it! That was the national instinct refusing to abide under any but the "kingly" power; refusing *all* change here whether to the democratic republicanism of the time of Cromwell, or to the "diadem of the empress," as wholly unworthy of its glorious past!

Why is all this? Why should our race in particular, when others have been enamoured of change, be so faithful to the *monarchy* of England? The republican form of government works right well in the United States! France thrives under it! The Swiss consider it the best form of political existence! *Why* do we British cling to the "kings" and "queens" of England, as the only possible rulers of this our land?

I would suggest to your readers, Sir, that the reason is the old one! This nation is "God's own people, Israel,"; the lost ten tribes of that ancient race "cast out," 26 centuries ago, for their idolatries, from "home and fatherland." To David, God swore that "there should not fail him a man in His sight to sit on the throne of *Israel*." He promised him that his house, throne, and kingdom should be established for ever. He arranged that a dynasty of "rulers" of David's house should bear rule perpetually over the seed of "Israel." We see thus that this nation, being Israel (and the Jews having NO KING), we are tied up to a monarchical form of government; to a race, in short, of kings, in perpetuity, of David's line!

I submit, therefore, that the great *desideratum* I originally started with is nationally ours already! and that our political existence, under a monarchy of God's own choice, is secured to us, as His glorious gift and blessing, FOR EVER.

I beg the reader to consult, as bearing on the point, the following passages:—2 Samuel vii. 12-29; 1 Kings viii. 25; Psalms lxxxix. 3, 4, 36; Isaiah xlix. 23; Jeremiah xxxiii. 19-26; Ezekiel xxxvii. 22-25.

Yours truly,

Clifton, August, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 12.—THE EMANCIPATORS OF THE SLAVE.

SIR,—I suppose there is no one who will at this time of day venture to deny that the chief actors in the grand effort to put down the abominations of the Slave Trade the wide world over have been the British.

Slave owners and slave dealers themselves, at one period of their history, the time arrived when public opinion, and public execration too, against the practice, was aroused; and William Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson, and other heroes, whose names will be familiar with your readers, had the satisfaction on the 25th March, 1807, to see a law for the *entire abolition of the traffic in slaves* passed with the unanimous consent of both Houses of the British Parliament, and become the law of this land of freedom! For that great and glorious boon to the oppressed Negro this nation cheerfully paid down the sum of *twenty millions sterling*! From that period to this the constant effort of the British has been to put down this most iniquitous system. They maintain in deadly climates, at cost of much life and treasure, a powerful squadron of ships of war off the East and West coasts of Africa, in view, as much as in them lies, to stamp out this accursed trade. British diplomacy toils to persuade other less enlightened nations to take their views of the enormity of the traffic in human flesh and blood; and the nation has viewed with satisfaction the termination of African slavery in the Southern States of the American Union, as well as some efforts to abolish it in the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, in quite recent days. So utterly opposed is the genius of our race *now* to this abominable trade in human beings that, by law, the deck of a British man-of-war, in whatever part of the world it may happen to be, is counted as British ground, and the chains of the slave fall off his limbs, and he becomes a freeman the instant he sets foot on the deck of such a ship, or lands upon what is British soil! Quite recently, we have seen how jealously the nation has regarded the very smallest infringe-

ment of this most sacred law, and compelled the Government of the day virtually to cancel—by a Royal Commission—the two Slave Circulars issued to naval officers in command of H.M.'s ships-of-war, because they *seemed* to abrogate that great principle for which our forefathers made such sacrifices, viz., that “traffic in slaves is an abomination, unknown to British legislation.”

Can our readers point to any other nationality which, being really in earnest in this matter of “Negro emancipation and abolition of the trade in slaves,” has submitted to sacrifices like ours, pecuniary or otherwise—maintaining, too, for long series of years, expensive machinery for the suppression of the horrid crime? They cannot! for we *know* the thing is not true of any but the British!

We ask again—*Why* is this so? *Why* have the inhabitants of these Islands of the West been gifted to do such deeds of philanthropy, and persistently to continue in the seemingly hopeless effort to destroy this traffic for now these seventy years? We answer confidently that it is because *they*, and they alone, are of that race to whom GOD gave this very commission! Speaking to “His people,” “the House of Jacob,” that is, to The Ten tribes of Israel, GOD Almighty, in pointing out to them their national sins, told them His will in reference to this very question of the slave. “Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the band of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed GO FREE, and that YE BREAK EVERY YOKE?” (Isaiah lviii. 6). This is GOD’S command to His people Israel; and the British being that people, are, in their at present imperfect manner, obeying the precept, and carrying out the command! No other nation than our own (being Israel) has the commission or the burning desire to perform GOD’S behest. And, Sir, be sure the time is close at hand, as I hope ere long to show, that our identity being publicly acknowledged, here and abroad, the command given to US “to *break* EVERY YOKE,” and “to let the oppressed GO FREE,” shall be obeyed by our race, and by every other now guilty of contravening GOD’S command, in a manner which will leave us nothing to desire.

Yours truly,

Clifton, August, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER No. 13.—THE ISOLATED NATION.

SIR,—We have often been led to notice—have we not?—the position of isolation which this country and nation occupy with reference to the other great powers of Europe. It is matter of notoriety and observation from many stand-points. In the first place, as islanders we are geographically cut off from the continental nations; and this fact has, doubtless, rendered us to a great extent a separated, peculiar, isolated race. In some Continental cities, in their “*English quarters*,” the British “*dwell alone*,” as we all know. In the matter of language it is the same. Severed from the European nations, the bulk of our people refuse to learn the vernaculars of their neighbours, and proverbially disdain to acquire them. If they try to speak them they fail, as a rule, most disastrously. Our Protestantism—so different from that of our (ostensibly) nearest of kin, the German races—is another barrier. Ours is a faith which, founded on spiritual religion, appears, doubtless, to a politically protesting nation as strange and unaccountable. It serves to sever us materially from the Teutonic, while the Latin nations cannot disguise their wonder and contempt at the religious habits and Sabbath-keeping, church-going ways, to which a respectable minority of our people certainly do incline. A German work lately described London for its dulness as “quite a died-out city” *on Sunday*. The *hauteur* of the English character, its coldness, reserve, and distance, act always as repellants to Continental visitors who come to see us in our home; and most of them, as we know, return to their fatherlands with strange and wondrous tales of the inexplicable, uncouth, cold, and frigid

John-Bullism of our national temperament, which they can neither understand nor afford to treat with contemptuous indifference. Our national customs, habits, amusements, tastes, prejudices—all these are enigmas to the Continentals as a mass, and serve, each to a certain extent, to strengthen the impression that we British are a wonderful, incomprehensible nation, wholly diverse from the Continental mould, and whom it would be safe to put quite out of consideration, *were it not for "la belle marine"!*

The explanation of all this of course lies quite on the surface. We are islanders, to begin with. We are a rough, somewhat rude if not violent, solid, steady, wealthy, religious race. We have long been in the (foolish) habit of considering ourselves *far* better than our neighbours, and of bearing ourselves towards the rest of the world accordingly, as if *they* were beneath contempt. All these favourable, and some adverse, traits have rendered us what we are—*an isolated people!* But is that all? *Why* are we so? Why, Sir, being Israel, how could we be otherwise? God's word says of that race, "I have SEPARATED you from other people. . . I the Lord have SEVERED you from other people, that ye should be MINE" (Levit. xx. 24-26). "Thou didst SEPARATE them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance" (1 Kings, viii. 53). "The people," said Balaam, speaking of Israel, "shall dwell ALONE" (Numbers xxiii. 9); which surely is only another expression for the state of things we have been considering, and describes accurately the *isolation* of the British at this day among the nations of Europe. Their kinsmen, the Jews, also exactly respond to the description: they, too, "*dwell alone.*"

I am reminded, Sir, by quoting the prophecy of Balaam, of one of the objections raised by many to my line of thought. "For," they say, 'that passage states that 'the people shall *not* be reckoned among the nations,' whereas the British *are* so reckoned and have ever been.' I reply—of whom was the prophet speaking? Why, of *Israel*, of course! And pray, I ask, is Israel "reckoned up" among the nations! Ask any schoolboy to "reckon up" the modern nations, and will "*Israel*" be one of them? Of course not. The Jews are "Israelites," but not "a nation"; and the lost ten tribes, though somewhere existing *as* a nation (Jer. xxxi. 36), are not yet publicly or nationally known—though they soon will be—by their God-given, "prevailing," glorious name "ISRAEL." "The people" (that is "ISRAEL," the ten-tribed nation) do indeed, Sir, "*dwell alone,*" and are "not," as Balaam prophesied, yet "reckoned up among the nations."

I am, Sir, yours truly

Clifton, August, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

SIR,—Your indefatigable correspondent, "Philo-Israel," will pardon me if I again refer to one of his statements and question its accuracy. Speaking of the passing of the Act for the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, he says in his letter of this week's *Chronicle*, "For that great and glorious boon to the oppressed Negro this nation cheerfully paid down the sum of *twenty millions sterling!*" This is not exactly the fact. The twenty millions sterling were not paid for the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, but for the abolition of slavery itself in the British dominions in 1834; and this was the sum at which the human chattels of British slaveowners were appraised.

I am, Sir, &c.,

Clifton, August, 1876.

ANGLO-SAXON.

LETTER NO. 14.—THE ASYLUM FOR THE FOREIGN REFUGEE.

SIR,—Most of your readers recollect, I suppose, a capital squib lately published by the author of "Ginx's Baby," called "The Blot on the Queen's Head." In that clever little work the British empire is described under the

figure of "an inn." The author said, *inter alia*, this inn "was a refuge for all sorts of people. There were sumptuous rooms for monarchs, or roving princes and princesses, or shahs, or sultans, or cadis, or republican presidents, or emperors of any colour, from Russia to Hayti. There were plainer rooms for poor patriots, if they happened to want to hide from their countrymen or creditors for a few days. There were even garrets, where peripatetic revolutionists, running away from the police of Germany, Russia, France, or Spain, or other places of *that* sort, could find appropriate beds and greasy food." These words describe in a fairly accurate manner the kind of refuge Great Britain extends to the European political refugee. If an emperor is in trouble and forced to abdicate, where does he turn in his distress but to *perfid*e Albion? The great Napoleon, on the 3rd July, 1815, surrendered himself to the captain of H.M.S. Bellerophon; and claimed the hospitality of England! His nephew, more fortunate than he, not only claimed, but twice received it, and found his grave in this refuge for the unfortunate. His widow and son are now England's honoured guests. King Louis Philippe, in his misfortunes, could turn to no better asylum than the friendly shores of Britain; where (denied by France) Don Carlos lately, and a long list before him of foreign potentates and princes, in the dark days of revolution and disturbance, have found a ready welcome. And so it is with those persecuted for their faith in foreign lands. Are the Jesuits expelled from some state in Europe? They hasten to the land of freedom, where, so long as they outwardly conform to the laws of their hosts, no questions are asked; and they can plot, and work, and undermine, in order—if they can—to uproot the Protestantism of the people whose asylum gives them safety. Are the Jews placed under penal laws in Austria, Rome, or Spain? They flock to England, where they are sure now of kind and generous treatment. Are revolutionary Communists and Red Republicans in Paris hunted down, and their lives in peril there? They flee to London, where they can always lie *perdus*, and issue forth again when the storm of persecution has been allayed.

But let the reader mark that Great Britain is the *only* land in Europe that offers this sure and safe asylum to which all distressed ones gravitate. French potentates and ruffians in distress don't crowd to Germany, Italy, or Spain! Crowned heads, when uncrowned, don't seek a grave in Norway, Russia, Belgium, or Portugal! They *all* hasten to the only spot where they know there is civil and religious liberty, where law is honoured and respected, where an asylum claimed is always granted, and a refuge from trouble is absolutely certain.

We ask again, *Why* should this be? Why is *this* country the only land in Europe where the stranger is made welcome, and the safety and asylum sought is always found? I answer, Sir, because this nation, being Israel, they are under the Divine command given *only* to that race—"If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex (*i.e.* oppress) him. The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for YE were strangers in the land of Egypt. I am Jehovah, *your* GOD" (Lev. xix. 33, 34). "One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you" (Exod. xii. 49).

Britain, therefore, Sir, is an asylum for the foreign refugee (in a manner not followed anywhere else); for we treat him here, and I submit *HERE ONLY*, like "one born in the land"—as GOD directed ISRAEL to do (Numbers ix. 14).

I am, Sir, yours truly,

Clifton, August, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

NOTE.—I beg to thank "Anglo-Saxon" for his valuable correction of my statements in regard to the twenty millions paid by the British, not for the abolition of the slave trade, in 1807, but for the abolition of slavery itself in the British dominions, in 1834." I do not think what I wrote was really inaccurate; but the correction strengthens my position. In 1807, the British abolished the slave trade *by law*. In

1834, they proved their earnestness and sincerity in the matter by taxing themselves and their posterity to the tune of twenty millions sterling, to sweep away the foul thing itself throughout their wide dominions for EVER.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 15.—THE SCATTERED PEOPLE AT HOME IN EVERY CLIMATE.

SIR,—If you look round you, you will find as a somewhat singular fact that there are two apparently ethnically diverse people who are *one* in this respect, that they are practically ubiquitous. I mean the Jews and British. Go where you will, the sons of Judah, or the Jews, are to be found. In the United Kingdom, on the Continent of Europe, in Russia, in Asia, in Africa, in India, in China, in the United States, even in Polynesia, this “scattered” race are always to the fore. Depressed, down-trodden, persecuted, a “bye-word,” without settled government, tolerated, a “trembling, faint-hearted” people, “without might,” and “few in number,” just as GOD’S Word said they should be; yet the Jews are everywhere, clinging nobly always to their ancient faith, looking for and “expecting” that change in their condition for the better which, be sure, Sir, is close at hand.

But besides the Jews, the British also, I have said, are “everywhere.” And so they are! Her Majesty’s dominions, we know, “belt the world.” Her 56 governments and colonial possessions are so placed that on her empire the sun never sets! The roll of the morning drum in her military stations and cantonments round the globe never ceases for a moment! In Europe, Great Britain is the chief of nations. In the East, she is decidedly the chief of the Asiatic Powers, the grand representative of “the kings—those from the rising sun.” In America, her race fills a vast continent, extending from the Arctic snows to the Tropics. Australia she has made entirely her home! Tasmania, New Zealand, the Fijis, and ere long (who can doubt it?) the islands of Australasia, own, and will own, her sovereignty. China feels her power, and no portion of that extended sea-board but bends to her influence and recognises her “meteor flag.” Africa is largely owned by her; and the exploration of that land, undertaken by brave British hearts and hands, will lead, we believe, to “British protectorate” over the greater portion of that continent, which is the home of Ham!

Then again, what port the wide world over is *not* visited by our ships? Where is there a prospect of opening up a trade but British ships are first in that field, and the “Union Jack” is ready to protect it? What Continental city, what quarter of the earth has not a large resident, but *not* “naturalised” British population? Where do *not* our missionaries go, and plant the standard of the Gospel? Arctic snows do not repulse them! India’s burning plains do not appal them! West, east, north, and south, British merchants, British mariners, British missionaries, British men, and British women too, brave all climates, resist all vicissitudes, and successfully plant colonies where every other nationality always has, and always does, most completely fail.

And *why*, we ask, is this? Why to this island race is there granted this power of universal conquest, this ability to defy all climates? Again I say, because that ability and power is the heritage and blessing given by GOD’S Word to Israel only, and reflected and possessed to-day by Israel herself, the British races! GOD’S Word says to Jacob and his posterity, the Hebrews, “*Thy seed shall spread abroad (break forth) to the WEST, and to the EAST, and to the NORTH, and to the SOUTH*” (Gen. xxviii. 14). “*They shall feed*”—speaking of His people Israel—“*in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all HIGH PLACES. They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the HEAT nor SUN smite them; for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them;*

even by the springs of water shall He lead *them*" (Isa. xlix. 9, 10). So that from the isles of our home in the West, in the cool and balmy shades of the temperate zone, to our burning, equatorial, and tropical possessions in Ceylon, India, Africa, and North Australia, GOD is with US as a race, has mercy on US, and leads US, as he does no other people or nation known to modern civilisation and research. Of us, British—being Israel—GOD has said, "Thou art my servant ; I have chosen *thee*, and not cast *thee* away. . . I will not forget *thee*" (Isa. xli. 9 ; xlix. 15). Prospects such as these, Sir, are surely of extreme national moment to us just now, and very cheering.

I am, yours truly,

Clifton, September, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER No. 16.—RETROSPECTIVE AND EXPLANATORY.

SIR,—It is time I should pause (this being my 16th letter), and, taking a retrospect of the ground we have traversed, explain what may seem to want explanation.

In my previous Letters, I have pointed out the wonderful position our nation takes as a leading power in the earth, and the only explanation I could see of our various characteristics which could satisfy a reasonable mind was, I said in each case, the fact that, being Israel, we do no more than fulfil the prophetic Scriptural descriptions of that people, in these, the last days of the world. I showed that from small beginnings we British have become an "imperial" race, holding a fourth portion of the habitable globe in sovereign dominion, and a fifth part of its inhabitants as our subjects ; that the "gates" or keys of our *enemies'* countries are in our possession, in spite of their strong aversion to our presence in their fatherlands. These, I stated, were all Israel's characteristics, as promised to that nation by their GOD.

I then alluded to the wondrous wealth of our people, that, "lending to many nations we borrow from none" ; and this we found was the special mark of favour GOD designed to show to "Israel," if they repented, and hearkened to His voice (Deut. xxviii. ; xv. 6).

I pointed out, in the next place, that we islanders had now developed into a "nation and a company of nations," united in manners, customs, laws, traditions, language, literature, commerce, faith ; with the hope shortly, too, of a "commercial confraternity" with the great Anglo-Saxon nation in the American Union, which distinctly indicates the fulfilment of Jehovah's promise to Jacob, in Gen. xxxv. 11, already made partially good to *us* in our circumstances of to-day.

The curious fact that our colonial settlements always are attended with the destruction of the aborigines occupied our thoughts ; and this misfortune, we found, was also predicted of "Israel," in its dispersed condition, by Jeremiah, in chapters xxx. 10, 11 ; xlv. 27, 28.

The "multitudinous" character of the British races, with the probable universal use of our Anglo-Saxon speech, we next saw were distinctly marks of GOD's people "Israel," possessed by us, and us alone, of all the nations of the earth.

Our monarchy, we remarked, had lasted for a thousand years ; and we drew the comforting assurance that in the future, too, it would be "*everlasting*," as GOD said Israel's should.

The British, we pointed out, were the "universal rulers," but "never in any part of the world were kept subject to a foreign power." This observation, made recently by *The Times* newspaper, of *our* people, we found was but the echo of GOD's promise to Israel, that while she "ruled over *many* nations, *they* should not rule over *her*" (Deut. xv. 6).

Ours, we noted, too, was the glorious rôle of "slave emancipation," as Jehovah said Israel's should be (Isaiah lviii. 6).

We observed next that we British were ever in a position of "isolation" on the continent of Europe, among the Gentile nations of the world. And what, I asked, was that but the strict fulfilment of Balaam's words, that "the people (*i. e.*, Israel) shall dwell ALONE"? (Numbers xxiii. 9).

England, I then showed, was the proper asylum of the "foreign refugee," as GOD said "His chosen people" should let their land become; for "ye were," said He, "strangers in the land of Egypt" (Lev. xix. 33, 34).

And lastly, I placed before your readers facts showing we British are a "scattered people," yet "at home in every climate"; that, unlike the Jews, ours is the position of command, of power, and of dominion, in all zones; and that our colonial possessions actually "surround the earth." These indications, I showed, were just the marks GOD Almighty put upon "His people Israel," and that he pointed to them in His Word as those by which we, in the latter days, may learn to recognise them in their "lost" estate.

All these characteristics, however, are merely material, earthly, temporal. Is this "the end all, and the be all here" of all our labours? Do we find "Israel" in the British only for *this*? Clearly not! Far higher aims and objects, I say, the LORD our GOD had in choosing, in losing, and now in finding "His people" the ten tribes of Israel! The end I put before myself in future is to trace to you, Sir, and to your readers, the *spiritual blessings* we nationally have, and may expect, from our "identity" with the lost house.

With a few words of additional explanation next week, I hope to enter on my new and more pleasant task in the issue of your journal a fortnight hence, if you, Mr. Editor, will permit.

Yours truly,

Clifton, September, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 17.—EXPLANATORY.

SIR,—I think I ought to explain who "the Israelites" are we seek to identify with the British, and why we want to find them *now*. These Israelites are not "the Jews," who, I admit, are "Israelites" too. But they *are* those ten, out of the twelve tribes, sprung from the patriarch Jacob, who, between the years B.C. 740 and 678, were carried away "captive" from Palestine into the land of Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 23). There is no evidence these "captives" ever returned back to their own land at all. Canon Rawlinson thinks and says they did. But he has not proved the point. Nor can he! Jewish historians, ancient and modern, flatly deny it! We hear of them as a separate race in Josephus's days (Antiq. xi. 5, sec. 2). St. Peter wrote to these "dispersed" ones. St. James so designates them also, in his 1st chapter 1st verse. St. Paul's Epistle to the *Galatians* was actually addressed to these very "wanderers." What, then, became of them? They were surely not absorbed among the heathen and thus "lost"? Certainly not! For GOD Almighty made with Abraham, in Genesis xvii. 7, an "everlasting" and unconditional covenant, which included the whole twelve tribes, and must be of force to-day, to preserve them all in being, as GOD is true!

Does history give us any—the very slightest—clue as to where these "lost" people are? None! Does the Bible? Historically none! Do the Jews know anything of them? Nothing! What, then, has happened to them? These ten tribes were nationally sent among the Gentile nations, under GOD's own directing hand, and there retained, "disguised" and "lost," until the "veil" shall be taken from them in the "latter days." But how "lost"? 1st, by banishment for 26 centuries from home; 2nd, by loss of their true name of "Israel"; 3rd, by loss of their vernacular, *Hebrew*; and 4th, by

loss of their national religion, the Mosaic Law. Thus "disguised," they have been made "outcasts," and sent "wanderers among the nations" (Isa. xi. 12; Hosea ix. 17).

But this wretched fate was not to last for ever! No sooner were the ten tribes "outcasted" and "outlawed" than mercy from their GOD followed them! He promised that He would be to *them* "as a little sanctuary" in "the countries where they shall come" (Ezek. xi. 16); that He would be to *them* "as though He had *not* cast them off" (Zech. x. 6); that they were "not to fear, for He was with them; nor be dismayed, for He was their GOD" (Isa. xli. 10). He brought them to "the islands of the west," in "the north country," and there He let these poor nomades "renew their strength" (Isa. lix. 19; xli. 1). *There* He gave them all those grand material distinctions and worldly blessings which we so long have been passing in review. But "there is more to follow!" and things, too,—precious things,—which "accompany salvation."

But what need is there *now* to find this people, and what benefit to Great Britain can accrue if we find them here? By finding Israel, we terminate the curses now bearing so heavily on the Jews! We put in operation causes leading to events which will terminate in their restoration to their land (Jer. iii. 18; Hosea i. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 16, 22). By finding Israel, we bring to an end the horrid occupation of the "Holy Land" by the desolating power of the Turk. We restore the "Holy People" to the "inheritance," and thus do what GOD says He purposes to effect, "with *His* whole heart and *His* whole soul" (Jer. xxxii. 41). We bring near the day when "many peoples" and "strong nations" shall "come" to the Lord; and the "earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Zech. viii. 22; Isa. xi. 9). By finding "Israel," we introduce our people, the British, into times when unexampled prosperity, national exemption from war, from sighing, and from sorrow, shall be theirs! when national enjoyment of GOD's blessing, and outpoured Spirit, and "righteousness," all shall be bestowed on them; when they representatively shall "RETURN" to their own land, *with the Jews*, as GOD's "redeemed," "with everlasting joy on their heads"; when, obtaining gladness and joy, "sorrow and mourning shall flee away" (Jer. iii. 12; Isa. xxvi. 20, 21; li. 11). These, Sir, are the reasons which influence me and many thousands now of my fellow-countrymen in searching and looking for GOD's "lost" ones; and sure I am that if I, and you, Sir, too, succeed in finding them in these islands, we shall confer a boon and a blessing on our nation, which, eternal in its duration, is priceless in its value, and will result in the public acknowledgment of the British by the whole of mankind, as well as by their covenant GOD, that they are indeed the grand, "prevailing" nation "ISRAEL," GOD's chosen people, His heritage, His inheritance, His servants, His elect; while He is, in a peculiar sense, such as He is to no other race, *THEIR* GOD.

Yours truly,

Clifton, September, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 18.—FURTHER EXPLANATORY.

SIR,—In addressing you again this week, I feel I ought to acknowledge your kindness in permitting me thus to draw attention to a subject of public interest, but one which hitherto the secular journalist has not been forward to entertain as worthy of much consideration. It is in truth of vast national importance, as I have stated, and hope to show yet more clearly before this series of letters is closed; and I beg to thank you, Sir, for the invaluable opportunity you are giving me of bringing the matter before a large audience, whom I could never hope otherwise to reach.

I think it is due to your readers that, before I continue my contemplated

further discussion of our subject, I should place one consideration before them, of some importance, on which I am anxious there should be no mistake. I am aware there runs through the whole of my letters a vein of (shall I say?) national self-complacency, of national glorification, national self-assertion, which seems to imply that the British are a nation favoured by their GOD, a people placed in all respects on the pinnacle of temporal grandeur and prosperity on account of some inherent excellence, some goodness, some moral greatness, as compared with their Gentile neighbours, which has recommended them to GOD Almighty's kindness and care, while it has doomed the "alien" to a far different and subordinate position. Let me utterly, once and for ever, renounce this idea! I firmly hold to the belief that of all nations this one, of which we form a part, is incomparably, in GOD's eyes, *the very worst!* Recipients of the most exalted favours, we have made base returns to Him! Favoured as I have shown we are, we are utterly ungrateful, stubborn, stiff-necked, headstrong, as regards His will. With His Word open to us, and Reformation light to guide us, we are, *like our Israelitish ancestors*, prone to idolatry, ever lapsing into it! Knowing that He hates excess, our national vice is drunkenness! Aware that purity is what he desires, the "social evil" is rampant everywhere in our midst! Taught that righteousness is what he loves, and that every false way is "His abomination," we are constantly proving that fraud, falsehood, and every unjust and inequitable transaction is familiar to many of our traders and merchants, who thus bring disgrace and dishonour upon our national escutcheon!

Why, then, we ask, has all this prosperity, this glory, this national benefit and blessing been ours? Why has GOD Almighty regarded the British nation, *even if Israel*, more than the Germans, the French, the Danes, the Italians, the Swiss, or the Russians? We answer, that if we look for excellence in the recipients of the Divine mercy as *the cause* of all His favour, we shall look in vain! The history of "His people Israel," nay, of every believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, should teach Christian students better than *that!* To "Israel" of old, Moses said, "Not for thy righteousness or for the uprightness of thine heart dost thou go to possess the land. . . . The Lord thy GOD giveth thee not this good land to possess it for *thy* righteousness, *for thou art a stiff-necked people.* . . . From the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt until ye came unto this place *ye have been rebellious against the Lord* (Deut. ix. 6, 7). What, then, is the secret of these favours? The nation in its former condition being vile, and we being so too, why is GOD Almighty favourable to *us*? Why does He follow *us* with his loving kindness and tender mercy? I cannot do better, Sir, than repeat what Moses told *our* forefathers was the cause, and ask your readers to ponder the wondrous statement!—"Because he loved thy FATHERS, therefore He chose their seed after them. . . . The Lord thy GOD hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself above all people that are on the face of the earth. The Lord did not set His love upon *you* nor choose *you* because ye were more in number than any people, for ye were the fewest of all people. But *because the LORD loved you, and because He would KEEP the OATH which he had SWORN unto your fathers*, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen from the hand of Pharaoh, King of Egypt" (Deut. iv. 37; vii. 6, 7). This oath, then, to "our fathers," Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, is our safeguard, stay, and present support; and as it shall be ours nationally, Sir, *for ever*, I say our subject is one which is deserving of the earnest consideration of every Christian man and woman among us; and I rejoice to think these poor letters of mine are conducing to that effect already.

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

Clifton, September, 1876.

LETTER No. 19.—THE POSSESSORS OF THE "SIGN."

SIR,—In commencing my present letter I have to open an entirely new vein of research, and one which to some minds, my own I confess especially, will prove of greater interest than anything we have touched upon as yet.

If you look around you attentively, and have been anything of a traveller, you cannot fail to have observed, that of all the nations or races of the world, but three, and three alone, are true *nationally* observers of the 7th day of Sabbath rest, after a real godly manner. These three races and nations observe the day I repeat *nationally*, and by *law*. With them, the sacred, solemn observance of the day they have set apart for Sabbath rest is enjoined, and in the case of two of them penally enforced by statute, as well as by the law of the land. I mean, Sir, 1st, the British nation; 2nd, the United States of America; and 3rd, the "scattered people" we call the Jews.

Now look where else we will, we find a different state of things. In heathen lands—in Asia, Africa, China, and in the islands of idolatrous Polynesia, the Sabbath, or 7th day of rest, is unknown as a day of *national*, sacred, GODLY observance. In Christendom, what do we see? Except in this our "favoured land," the observance of GOD'S day of rest is nationally a form, devoid of life; an "observance" which the majority of the Continental nations nationally disregard or utterly contemn. Which of the Continental, which of the Gentile nations of the earth, can be held *nationally* to keep GOD'S holy day? The German nation, which nearest approaches our own in language, character, and the Protestantism of her faith, does *not* hallow the Sabbath! Its most godly men, and the nation at large, fail to see their obligation to keep it entirely sacred. The purely Latin nations, the French, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Italians, openly desecrate it.

The Germans, as a race, when visiting our shores complain bitterly of the dulness of England's Sunday. A German author, as we lately said, described London on the Sabbath as "quite dead." The best theatres, the best concerts, the best dances, always take place on Sundays in Germany. In a great many German as well as Scandinavian towns, the shops are open till one o'clock, p.m., and really godly men, present at the services of their churches in the morning, consider they are lawfully and properly employed in attending to their own business and secular concerns during the remainder of the day. Such is the condition, generally speaking, of the majority of the nations which constitute what we term "Christendom." Now how are we to account for this wonderful distinction? Why should two Christian nations, the Americans and ourselves, widely separated by the ocean (but kinsmen still), *nationally* and by law, respect the 1st day of the week as "the Lord's day"? Why should a "scattered people," known everywhere as "Jews" and "Hebrews," equally nationally and by *their* law, hold fast to the same solemn observance of the 7th day of rest as "Jehovah's Sabbath" and His precious gift to them? and why should the national observance of one day in seven thus be the peculiarity of these *three* races, but be utterly unknown in the same marked and sacred sense to the *whole* of the outside world? I submit, Sir, it is because these three races constituting the thirteen tribes of Israel—I name that number advisedly—have with *them* that "sign," by which GOD himself declared that He would be known to *them*, and they to Him, "throughout their generations." He himself said, speaking of the day of rest, "it is a SIGN between me and the children of Israel for EVER" (Exodus xxxi. 17); "It is a SIGN between me and you THROUGHOUT your generations" (Exodus xxxi. 13); "They shall be a SIGN between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God" (Ezek. xx. 20). "Ye SHALL keep my Sabbaths" (Lev. xxvi. 2). The Sabbath, thus, is an obligation laid by their Maker himself on the tribes of Israel, through all time, by which they may be recognized; and, quite independently of their volition, is perpetually binding on *them*.

Such, I submit, is the true explanation of this curious fact. But let me not

be misunderstood. A portion of this wondrous race was destined for a time to fall into idolatry, and become as heathen GENTILES themselves (Hosea i. 2—9; iv. 16, 17; ix. 17). And during this period of their estrangement from their GOD their Sabbath “sign” it was predicted should be, and was accordingly, withheld. My authority for that statement is Hosea ii. 11. But Israel, converted and “reformed,” is restored to Jehovah’s favour. She is again nationally “GOD’s people”; “sons of the living GOD”; and with her “sonship” restored she has also her “SIGN” replaced, whereby *we* may recognize her national existence; and *she* may know that Israel’s Jehovah is still *her* “covenant GOD” (Hosea i. 10; xi. 9; xiv. 4).

Yours truly,

Clifton, October, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO 20.—THE DECALOGUE.

SIR,—I begin, as usual, by asking a question. Have your readers ever observed that whereas the continental nations think little or nothing of “the Decalogue,” or the law of the Ten Commandments, delivered on Mount Sinai, they are, to the British especially, and to the Anglo-Saxon race in general, including our brethren in the United States, of vital importance, the foundation of their laws, the object of their teaching to the young, and the carefully exhibited covenant of their GOD, written upon the “posts” of their high places, to be seen and read of all men, in the state churches of their land? In heathen countries, of course, the Ten Commandments are entirely unknown and disregarded. Among the Latin nations of continental Christendom the Decalogue is utterly dishonoured. The Roman Catholic Church, which for the most part has the paramount influence in these lands, dares not rehearse the Ten Laws of Almighty GOD to *their* people or exhibit them to *their* eyes, for reasons which the reader can doubtless supply from his own knowledge and experience. In place of GOD’s ten true commandments, that Church in those so-called Christian countries produces and teaches, generally, a garbled list, in which the second and fourth are omitted or altered, and the tenth is amplified to make up the ten! Among the Protestant, Teutonic, and Scandinavian churches and nations of Europe, the ten commandments are not rehearsed in their public formularies; nor as a matter of early training are they (we believe) taught “diligently” to the children in the State and Sunday Schools. Among ourselves, as we all know, the Protestant State Church, which *ecclesiastically* represents this nation, Sabbath by Sabbath, makes use of the “covenant of Jehovah.” The whole of the ten laws are rehearsed without note or comment, in the hearing of the church, every Sunday, in a language “understood by the people.” To make sure that they shall not then escape the notice of the careless, and to carry out the Horatian maxim—

“Segnius irritant animos, demissa per aures,
Quam quae sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus, et quae,
Ipse sibi tradit, *spectator*,”

the Church has taken care to have the Tables of the Ten Commandments painted or engraved either in the chancels or in some conspicuous part of most of the parochial churches of our land, where congregations may *see* and easily peruse them. They are “diligently” taught too, in the schools, to the children. Bishop Cosins says, that “the Jews’ Decalogue was not used in any Liturgy, old or new, before that of the 5th of Edward VI., in 1552.” Shepherd, vicar of Pattiswick, quoted by Mant in 1820, declares that “the Ten Commandments were not appointed to be read even in the first English Liturgy of 1549. *They made no part of any ancient Liturgy*, nor are they read in the Communion Office of any reformed churches *except our own*; and

in ours they were first inserted at the review of Edward's Liturgy, in 1552." Even the Papal Organ at Rome, the *Osservatore Romano*, lately stated that "English Christianity is based to day on the Ten Commandments, Jehovah's Decalogue, and that the laws of GOD are the laws of the English Constitution."

It results, therefore, that since the National Reformation and repentance, in the 16th century, this nation, as represented by its Protestant State Church, has been a respecter of GOD'S "covenant," and that, in fact, it is the only nation or race (for we include our Anglo-Saxon brethren in America in our remarks) which *nationally* observes it.

We ask again, why is this? To that question, as to all others hitherto, we must respond as before. It is because, being Israel the Anglo-Saxons have not only the SIGN of the Sabbath, but also the second SIGN—the Decalogue—to distinguish them from all the other (*i. e.*, Gentile) races of the earth. "He (Jehovah) wrote upon the tables the words of the COVENANT, the Ten Commandments" (Exodus xxxiv. 28). "Write thou these words" (the Ten Commandments) was the injunction to Moses, "for after the tenor of these words have I made a covenant with thee and WITH ISRAEL" (Exod. xxxiv. 27). "Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and" shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt bind them for a SIGN upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes; and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house and on thy GATES" (Deut. vi. 7, 8, 9).

Being Israel, Sir, I submit, we British, *since our Reformation*, do these very things, which the continental and heathen, or Gentile nations of the earth, *not being Israel*, are not constrained, nor even willing to carry out as part and parcel of their national condition and daily walk.

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

Clifton, October, 1876.

SIR,—In his last letter your indefatigable correspondent, "Philo-Israel," introduced what appeared to me, at least, to be a new development of his belief concerning the "lost ten tribes." He then, for the first time, I think, claimed the Americans to be Jews as well as the English, and said these two nations, with the people whom we now call Jews, constituted the "thirteen" tribes of Israel. But some of his letters that seek to identify the English nation with the Jews will, I venture to think, come in his way in claiming the Americans also as Israelites. For instance, one of his arguments in favour of our being Jews was that we were the *only* nation that had had a monarchy for more than a thousand years, and that such a perpetual monarchy had been promised to the Israelites by God. If such an argument be of any value, then the reverse will hold good as concerning the Americans, and it would be quite reasonable to say that they *cannot* be Israelites, because for the last 100 years they have lived under a Republican form of government. "Philo-Israel" also claims us to be Jews because we are an "isolated nation"—"islanders"; because we are the "asylum for the foreign refugee," &c.; all of which things were promised to the Israelites by God. But then, by parallel argument, the Americans *cannot* be Jews because none of these things are theirs; because they are *not* an isolated nation, *not* islanders; and their land is certainly *not* a home for foreign refugees, except, perhaps, the soundrels of all countries.

Seeking a little information on this subject,

I am, Sir, yours truly,

JUVENIS.

LETTER 21.—THE CHRISTIAN NATION.

SIR,—I feel I am now on dangerous ground, and that in what I am to say it will be needful, if “zealous,” to be “discreet.” I submit, however, for your readers’ consideration, whether, if the whole world be searched, any nation can be found which more exactly responds to the description of being *par excellence* “the Christian nation” than Great Britain? Where else are we to find one which better deserves the name? Among the heathen?—No one will assert that! Among the Mahomedan races?—Nay, they are, by religious profession—as we see in Turkey—the *enemies* of the cross and servants of Christ! Among the Roman Catholic and Latin nations of Europe?—Nay, their Christianity is based on false views of the scheme of redemption! Error is largely mixed with the truths they hold; and we, nationally, have withdrawn from Church communion with them—notably, at the reformation, as “Protestants” against “Popish error.” Shall we find a better type of Christianity among the Teutonic and Scandinavian nations, whose churches are, for the most part, Lutheran? Nay, these races hold not to the “Sabbath sign”; they respect not the “Decalogue.” The Protestantism of Germany is political, and truly “active living Christianity is all but dead in Germany as a national faith.” A *resumé* of the real state of affairs in the German Empire, as respects its Christianity, appeared in *The Times* of the 3rd December, 1875, and the result seemed to be that “the Protestant Church of Prussia is going down the stream with ever-diminishing buoyancy, form, and bulk, till it is like to sink altogether.” Reference to Roman Catholic organs of opinion (allowance being made for prejudice and hostility) show the same result. Only 81 per cent. of children in Brandenburg, we are told, are baptised, the balance being withheld by the parents! 58 per cent. of the marriages only come within the cognizance of the clergy. In Berlin things are even worse! And this is also the testimony of Jewish authorities:—*They* declare that Germany, as a nation, is “dead in the matter of real religious belief. Infidelity has eaten out the very heart of its Christianity!” Turn we now to Great Britain. Can there be any doubt that this is the chief Protestant and Christian Power in the earth? Surely, as Father Gavazzi said, “England’s Protestantism is the chief bulwark of the Reformation in Europe!” “It has been,” he justly adds, “the beacon of pure Gospel light to the world *for more than three centuries*!” This is the testimony of the foreigner, and appears to be impartial. Now take the evidence of an avowed enemy. What says the Papal organ, the *Osservatore Romano*?—“The English is a highly religious nation, and, as far as the Reformation permits, a *Christian nation*. . . . The whole nation, in a word, is religious and *Christian*. English legislation is nothing else than the faithful echo of that of Sinai, *received through Christianity*; the laws of GOD are the laws of the State—the one takes its force from the other.” This is high encomium of England’s Christianity; coming from such a source, its strict impartiality cannot be questioned. When we add that the Papal organ declares that “English customs are in perfect accord with the *spirit of Christianity*,” we have said enough to mark ours as pre-eminently *the* Christian nation, OUR ENEMIES being the judges.

Now why, we ask, should the British possess this marked character? We answer again, because, being Israel, GOD’S Word declares that she shall so be found! It is there written of Israel, *not Judah*, “Thou hast with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and *Joseph*” (Psalm lxxvii. 15); “He shall redeem Israel” (Psalm cxxx. 7, 8); “Fear not, I have redeemed thee” (Isaiah xliii. 1); “O Israel . . . return unto me; I have redeemed thee” (Isaiah xlv. 21, 22); “Israel shall be *saved in the Lord*” (Isaiah xlv. 17); “I will place salvation in Zion for Israel, my glory” (Isaiah xlv. 13); “The Lord *hath* comforted His people [Israel?], and *will* have mercy on His afflicted

[Judah?]" (Isaiah xlix. 13); "He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21).

These, and a vast body of other passages, all tend to prove that this *Hebrew* people are a "redeemed" and "saved" race—the "redemption" and "salvation" being Jehovah's work through Christ. They must, therefore, perforce, be a "Christian" nation who, not being as we know *Jews*, under Mosaic law, must be a race (not known as Israel by name) answering to the Divine description given us by the prophet Hosea (chap. i. 10)—namely, that "In the place where it was said unto them, Ye are *not my people*, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are *the sons of the living God*." These last words, Sir, I submit, are translated for us by St. John; in chap. i. 12 of his Gospel, and in chap. iii. 1 and 2 of his 1st Epistle; also by St. Paul, in Rom. viii. 19, Phil. ii. 15; and signify, nothing more nor less, than that the nation, the BRITISH, so described, being "true believers" in their Lord and Saviour, are "the righteous" and "the Christian" nation. That nation, in fact, which, when universally baptised with GOD'S Holy Spirit (Joel ii. 28)—as it will be—and consecrated by the promised "new covenant" blessing, purchased by the blood of the Son of God himself (Heb. viii. 10—12)—as it must be—will, indeed, constitute those "Trees of righteousness, the planting of the LORD, that *He* may be glorified," described in the passage (Isaiah lxi. 3) which was the subject of the recent Clifton Conference. (On that occasion the brethren dwelt—surely—*entirely on the spiritualizing and secondary*, not on the obviously primary, literal, and true meaning of the passage?).

Yours truly,

Clifton, October, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

PHILO-ISRAEL REPLIES TO "JUVENIS."

May I ask "Juvenis" to read my letters over again, *with care*? My object has been to draw the distinction between *Judah* (or the Jews) and the British, who are "Israelites;" between the "two tribes" and "the ten!" "Juvenis," in saying I have sought "to identify the English nation with the *Jews*," "to claim the Americans to be *Jews* as well as the English," has entirely missed THE point of the whole of my series of letters! This is very discouraging for a man whose endeavour has been to make things clear! Let me try to put the matter so that even "Juvenis" may see it!

This nation of ours is "ten-tribed *Israel*;" the *Jews* are "two-tribed *Israel*," or, "*the House of Judah*." Now, God provided that out of "ten-tribed *Israel*" should come a thirteenth tribe—"a people, and a great people"—separate from *Israel*, yet "of *Israel*." *That* tribe was Manasseh (Gen. xlviii. 19).

This Britain of ours—being "ten-tribed *Israel*;" "a people and a great people" the thirteenth tribe of Manasseh has, in fact, gone out from us, and become a "great" and separate "people," who though "of" *Israel* are *not* that people to whom the promises were given; are *not* that people to whom those glorious blessings are granted we have been so long considering. But Manasseh, we can see, is yet to be joined to "*Israel*" (the ten-tribed nation) and participate in all her future blessings (Ezek. xlviii. 5; Revel. vii. 6).

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 22.—THE UNIVERSAL BENEFACTORS.

SIR,—I think it may be safely said that John Bull is looked upon by the whole world as the alleviator of "every ill that human flesh is heir to." Wherever there is distress, national or individual, the appeal is made to English hearts and purses, and seldom is made in vain. A desolating fire

breaks out in Chicago, laying in ruins three-fourth of a noble city. British money is poured out in abundance, and a fund of noble dimensions is sent from England to help to restore the American town. In 1861 a famine occurred in the north-west of India. A single meeting held in London, in March, resulted in the remittance to Calcutta, by the Lord Mayor, of £107,585 before June, for the alleviation of that distress. A mutiny of terrible proportions breaks out in Her Majesty's Indian army and empire, devastating whole provinces, causing loss of life and property incalculable throughout the country. A Mansion House relief fund is again at work, and, between the 25th August, 1857, and February, 1858, no less a sum than £342,929 had been collected in the United Kingdom alone, and forwarded to the scene of conflict, to succour the distressed and compensate in some measure for the losses of the hapless survivors! Who does not recollect with pride the noble efforts made by our countrymen to assist the sufferers during the late Franco-Germah war? to succour the starving Parisians at the termination of the siege of Paris, when gaunt famine forced the citizens to submit and open their gates to their conquerors? Who can forget the large sums subscribed and sent to the sick and dying during the Persian famine; after the French inundations; while the Lancashire weavers' distress continued during the late American civil war; after the explosion on board H.M.S. Thunderer; and now to relieve the sufferers in Bulgaria? What accident ever occurs on our own coast, in our mines, or on our own railways, but instantly results in the opening of a subscription for the orphan and the widow, which generally is far in excess of the actual need, and leaves a handsome sum in reserve to be carried forward to the credit of the next great accident or catastrophe which befalls our people. Then as regards bodily suffering, is there a malady known, or afflicted member of the human body, for which an appropriate organization of relief and cure does not exist among us and *flourish*? Infancy, childhood, mature and old age, all are cared for in both sexes! The blind, the halt, the deaf, the dumb, the maimed, the incurable, the insane, the intemperate, the consumptive, the helpless, the stranger, the fallen, those in danger of falling, the outcast and friendless, have each their place in British hearts, and the appeal to help *their* sufferings is never heard here in vain! You, Sir, will understand I now am merely stating facts, not indulging in vain boasts! GOD forbid! He has *given* to our nation the means and the "ready mind" to do this gracious work; and British philanthropy and charity bear fruit accordingly at home as well as in foreign lands, in the colonial as well as in the heathen empires of the British Queen and Empress. And I, as an Englishman, and you too, I know, Sir, thank GOD for that.

But I cannot help inquiring how it all comes to pass. Why have *we* this nobility? Why are *our* hearts and hands so fashioned that we *always* respond to the cry of the oppressed, of the sick, and of the needy? Why is British gold ready to be lavishly poured out like water whenever wanted? My answer in the old one! This nation, being Israel, has Israel's character as GOD has portrayed it for us in His Holy Word! There He has Himself declared, "Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with FRUIT" (Isa. xxvii. 6). "This people have I formed for myself; they shall show forth MY praise" (Isa. xliii. 21). "The kingdom of GOD shall be taken from *you*"—the Lord was addressing the "Jews" or house of Judah—"and given to a NATION" (not a "scattered people," but a *nation*) "bringing forth the *fruits thereof*" (Matt. xxi. 43). Where, I ask, is the "fruitful nation" but in that other family of the Hebrews, who, being *not Jews*, are of "Ephraim," the "fruitful" one, as the very name implies? (Genesis xli. 52). And what is GOD's people "Ephraim" but "Israel," the ten-tribed nation? (Isa. vii. 8. 9; Hosea xi. 1—3; xiv; Jer. vii. 15). We being Israel, I repeat, the whole thing becomes plain. *We* respond, as *none else do*, to Israel's allotted, God-appointed functions! Benevolence, philanthropy, world-wide charity, are our national characteristics! These are the "fruits of GOD's kingdom" for which He looks, and which, for the Saviour's merits, He accepts of US. Sir,

let us humbly recognise our origin, and act out that character which Omnipotence has assigned to this our "favoured" race, "His people Israel"! For while "Judah is His sanctuary," where "God was manifest in the flesh," we must never forget at the *same* time that "ISRAEL was HIS DOMINION," that race by which He subjugates the world, and prepares it, by moral government, finally to receive the SON OF GOD who came by Judah (Psalm lxxvi. 1; cxiv. 2; Isaiah xi. 9).

Clifton, October, 1876.

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

PHILO-ISRAEL EXPLAINS.

I have been asked what authority I rely upon for the statement in my recent letter on "The Decalogue" that the Church of Rome teaches generally a garbled list of the ten commandments, "omitting or altering the 2nd and 4th, and amplifying the 10th to make up the ten." I reply that a Roman Catholic tract, by the Rev. J. Furniss, C.S.S.R., published in London by Thomas Richardson and Son, also in Dublin and Derby, "*Permissu Superiorum*," and bearing the "*Imprimatur*," of "*Paulus Cullen, Archiepiscopus Dublinensis*" (now before me), bears out my statement regarding the 2nd and 10th "commandments of God" to the very letter (see page 5). Also that a catechism issued under the authority of the Pontiff at Rome, drawn up by Cardinal Bellarmine, and published in 1839, fully corroborates me regarding the 4th commandment. The words of that commandment are given there as "*Recordati de sanctificare le feste*"—"Remember to keep holy the festivals" (not the Sabbath Day mark!). The same perversion may be found in a Roman Catholic catechism, translated from the Italian by the Rev. U. S. Agar, also published by Richardson and Son, *now on sale* in London. At pages 33 and 34, the 4th commandment is quoted (by the device of the omission of the 2nd) as the 3rd, "Remember thou keep holy the days appointed." I have some more accurate data to produce in proof of my positions if the above will not satisfy my questioner.

P.-I.

LETTER NO. 23.—THE UNIVERSAL MISSIONARIES.

SIR,—I suppose there can be no doubt that the British and Anglo-Saxon races, including our American brethren, are *par excellence* the missionaries to the heathen and benighted world. The beginning of this century of course witnessed the great outpouring of the missionary spirit on Christian nations in modern times. Something was done in this direction by our own Church as early as A.D. 1701; but in 1799 and 1800 the great Evangelical agencies which are now filling the earth with blessed "fruit" took their rise in this our own glorious home. From small beginnings, they have now attained a magnitude which attracts the attention of the philosopher, statesman, and journalist. They are producing effects also on foreign lands and races which distant Governments gratefully acknowledge and politicians recognise as really good. Let us see what are the results, *financially* considered, of a few of the leading religious and missionary agencies which have their homes in the British Islands. These we quote below are accurate in totals, and point to the great sacrifices British Christians are accustomed to make for the Protestant missionary cause. Five of the leading missionary societies in Great Britain alone reported their receipts during the last TWO years as follows:—

	1875.	1876.
Church Missionary Society	£175,835	... £195,116
Wesleyan Missionary Society	179,946	... 159,106
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts	134,826	... 125,294
London Missionary Society	103,553	... 114,853
Baptist Missionary Society	40,121	... 44,762
Totals.....	£634,281	... £639,131

The aggregate income of about 50 religious societies, including only the more important, was in 1876 £1,640,536, being an increase of £30,000 and more over that reported for the year previous! Calculating the results of last year's missionary reports, I found that the British and American races maintain about *twice* as many foreign Protestant missions as ALL the other Christian nations of the world put together; and that the expenditure on the work by the former, compared with that of *all* foreign nations *combined*, was as £1,519,000 is to £120,000, or in the ratio of over 12 to 1! The testimony of *The Times* newspaper to the value and importance of British missions to the heathen, as stated in a late issue, is most striking. The editor recognises their "national character." "Earls," he says, "bishops, clergymen, preachers, and tradesmen have been working at the same cause." The objects pursued by the societies are described as "benevolence pure" and "benevolence sectarian"—"efforts of all kinds, among our own countrymen, among special classes, and among the whole HUMAN FAMILY." Finally, *The Times* admits that there is "scarcely a region of the world to which the attention of *Englishmen* is not now directed, and in which they are not striving to DO SOME GOOD." This is very valuable and powerful testimony from a mere secular journalist! The strong approbation expressed by the Secretary of State for India in Council, in a State paper issued not long since (28th April, 1873), on the subject of the value of Christian missions in the vast empire of our Queen—now Empress—in Hindostan, is probably in most of our readers' recollection.

Such are the facts! No one can gainsay them! They are perfectly beyond cavil and denial! Now why, we ask, has GOD put such honour on our race, and on the Anglo-Saxon nations, as to make *them* thus the "messengers" of His blessed Gospel grace to the "*whole human family*"? I answer again, Sir, because this nation and this race, being Israel, they are but fulfilling that function which Jehovah Himself announced as theirs, to "*our* forefather Abraham," and again to Jacob, when He said to them, "In thee and in thy seed shall ALL the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 3; xxii. 18; xxviii. 14); a promise which includes both the Hebrew race (the seeds as of many), and Christ (the seed as of one), as St. Paul's words in Gal. iii. 16 lead us to conclude. GOD also said of Israel, "Men shall call you the ministers of our GOD" (Isa. lxi. 6). "Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit" (Isa. xxvii. 6). "GO YE" (a commission to *Israelites*) "therefore, and teach *all nations*" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). "Ye are My witnesses" (or Protestants)—addressed to Israel (Isa. xliii. 12; xlv. 8). To no Gentile nation did GOD Almighty ever entrust, as far as I can gather, the commission to preach the Gospel "*to all the families of the earth*." He gave the command to the Abrahamic race alone! That portion of it we usually recognise, viz., the Jews, are at present disqualified, for obvious reasons; and the Anglo-Saxons, but especially the British, most fully and completely discharge the noble function! Add this proof, Sir, to all that has gone before; and *can* you or your readers, as reasonable men, in the sight of GOD, withhold your belief longer to the conclusion that the Israelitish origin of this nation is TRUE, is PROVEN.

Yours truly,

Clifton, October, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

NOTE.—I think it proper to state that to Mr. E. W. Cox, of Cambridge Park, Clifton, I am indebted for the sentiment which concluded my last letter on "The Universal Benefactors." The passage quoted (Psa. cxiv. 2) contains a world of thought; the germ, in fact, of all that I have been placing before your readers for so long. "Israel" is indeed "GOD'S DOMINION," to prepare the world for "Judah."

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO 24.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

SIR,—We are so accustomed to “repeat” the beautiful petitions prescribed in the formularies of our State Church “*Book of Common Prayer*” that we do not give much heed to the references they contain, and to the allusions they make, to “GOD’s people Israel.” And yet the book is positively full of such! It is composed as if for the use, not of ostensibly *Gentile* Christians of the British race, but of “the lost sheep of the house of Israel,” converted by some wonderful process to Christ’s holy religion, and located in “these islands of the west”!

Let us notice a few particulars. In the order for morning and evening prayer, the sentences selected for introductory repetition are the utterances of the Hebrew prophets, of “the sweet Psalmist of Israel,” and of the Israelitish evangelists, addressed primarily to the Hebrews, and through them to the world at large. In the “*General Confession*,” the British Christian is taught to describe himself by the name GOD gave to “His own lost people,” as those who “have erred and strayed from His way like *lost sheep*” (Ezek. xxxiv. 6, 12, 16; Isa. liii. 6; Psalm cxix. 176; 1 Peter ii. 25). Those who have studied the Scriptures carefully know that the following designations are GOD’S own selected exclusive names for “The holy nation,” the twelve tribes of Israel. I mean such as “His people,” “My people,” “Thy people,” “My servant,” “Thy servant,” “Thy heritage,” “Thine inheritance,” “Thy chosen people,” “The sheep of thy pasture,” “Israel,” and the like. But these are the very names the compilers of our beautiful Church formularies selected and placed in the mouths of *British* Christians and believers for *national* use! The portions of the Prayer Book we allude to are these:—“He hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to *His people* being penitent.” “We therefore pray Thee help *Thy servants*.” “O Lord save *Thy people*, and bless *Thine heritage*.” O let *Israel*, bless the Lord.” “Bless ye the Lord GOD of *Israel*; for He hath visited and redeemed *His people*” (therefore a *Christian* nation). “To perform the oath that He sware to OUR forefather Abraham, that He would give US.” “To give knowledge of salvation to *His people*.” “Make *Thy chosen people* joyful.” “O Lord save *Thy people*, and bless *Thine heritage*.” “And bless *Thine inheritance*.” “Defend us *Thy humble servants*.” “He hath holpen *His servant Israel*, as he promised to *our* forefathers, Abraham and his seed, for ever.” “Spare us, good Lord, spare *Thy people*, whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy most precious blood,” (therefore again, ISRAEL, a *Christian* nation.). “O GOD, we have heard with our ears, and *our* fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old times before them.” (This is a quotation from Psalm xlv. 1; a Psalm addressed by “Jacob” to their God. “Our fathers” cannot be the Anglo-Saxon idolators, but *the Patriarchs of Israel*.) “Let there never be one wanting in her (the Queen’s) house, to succeed her in the Government of this United Kingdom, that *our* posterity may see her children’s children, and peace upon *Israel*. So that *we*, that are *Thy people*, and *sheep of Thy pasture*, shall give Thee thanks for ever,” &c. “That she (Victoria) may study to preserve *Thy people* committed to her charge, in wealth, peace, and godliness” (*i. e.*, of course, *the British people*). “And finally, O Lord, we beseech Thee mercifully to receive the prayers of *Thy people*, which call upon Thee” (*i. e.*, again, therefore, ISRAEL, *the British* people).

There are many other like passages in our “*Book of Common Prayer*” which the worshipper will doubtless recollect, all recalling the “copyright,” incommunicable names of “His people Israel,” the “Hebrew seed of Abraham,” applied indiscriminately there to *British* worshippers, in the State Church formularies prescribed for the *national* service of *their* GOD.

I ask again, the cause of this most curious and wonderful arrangement. Why are the British allowed to appropriate to themselves in their Prayer Book, GOD's names, given by Himself to "the tribes of Israel"? Does the Old Testament sanction such assumption by *Gentiles* of Israel's names? Clearly not! Does the New Testament? I humbly submit it is equally silent with the Old! How is it, then? Why, Sir, the old reason applies again here, and explains this mystery too. This nation, *being Israel*, our grand old Reformers, being God-taught men, in ignorance themselves of the "identity," caused *British* worshippers *nationally* to assume in Jehovah's own presence the names He gave to "His people Israël," and in that character to worship, to praise, and to pray to him; that character and such names being God-honoured, God-bestowed; the designations those solely applicable to His "prevailing" people "Israel," His heritage, His servants, His elect, His messengers, the tribes of His "holy," *i. e.*, of His "chosen, severed, separated, elected" ones, HIS SAINTS.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

Clifton, November, 1876.

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO 25—CONCLUSION.

SIR,—I conclude the series of twenty-five letters which your kindness has permitted me to publish in your columns, with the renewed expression of my sincere thanks for the opportunity you have given me of ventilating this really national subject. My sole object is my country's prosperity, and the real happiness here and hereafter of my fellow-countrymen and countrywomen. How is this attained, you ask, by what is here shown—namely, "the identity of our race with lost Israel"? What has gone before should throw *some* light on that inquiry! But the quarter of the coming glories has not yet been fully told! For, Sir, is it nothing to you and to me that our political existence as a nation, and our preservation as the very apple of GOD's eye, is nationally assured to us *for ever*? What! is it nothing that our Monarchy and our Constitution are both of GOD, are under His divine protection and His perpetual care? Is it nothing that to *us* is entrusted the precious Gospel, as the messengers of the glad tidings" to "all the families of the earth"? Nothing that GOD's word is vindicated by the restoration to us of his own selected, "prevailing name of ISRAEL? Is it matter of indifference that henceforth the truth of that word being established, the infidel is silenced, and the atheist put to shame for ever? Do we, I ask again, long for the outpouring of GOD's Holy Spirit on ourselves, our children, our relatives, our friends, our fellow-countrymen, on the British Empire at large? We shall have it! but it is contingent only on the discovery of "Israel," and the declaration of our identity! (Joel ii. 28.) And is that a matter of no real concern to us? Do we long that intemperance and drunkenness shall cease, ungodliness be banished, Sabbath breaking be unknown, and the British become "*the Righteous Nation*"? That is all assured us, too, as the result of the identity! (Isaiah xxvi. 2; lx. 21.) Do we long for the "*New Covenant*" when we British shall all know Him, from the least to the greatest"? The first step to take, of course, is to find "Lost Israel"; for to the house of "Israel" *only* is that promise made! (Jer. xxxi. 33; Heb. viii. 10.) And do we not alone of all the nations, pray for this very blessing, Sabbath by Sabbath, in our State Church prayer—"Lord, have mercy upon us, and write ALL these, THY laws in our (ISRAEL's) hearts, we beseech Thee"? Lastly, is it nothing to us that the Gentile nations of the earth should be brought to Christ—not in twos and threes, one here, another there, as now, but in masses—as "many people, as strong nations"? (Zech. viii. 22.) Yet we shall see this very thing; but only *after* Israel is found, for the promise takes effect after the grand "return" of Israel, with Judah, to the land—and the condition precedent, as all must see is to find "*lost Israel*," first!

In conclusion, I must indicate a few lines of thought for the reader's further private investigation, which I can do no more than barely mention. 1st, then British metrology is Israel's. The metric testimony borne by the oldest monument this world contains (the great pyramid of Egypt) to the "Israelitish origin of the British," is worthy of the reader's deepest study. The admirable work on that subject by the Astronomer Royal of Scotland, Professor Piazzi Smyth ("Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid"), should be in every library. 2nd,—The formularies of our State Church are framed as we have seen, on the supposition that the British are "Israel." But the Church has, in the Collect and Epistle prescribed for Pre-Advent Sunday (25th after Trinity,) recorded that the British are "*God's faithful people*," and points to the grand hope of *Israel* when "the return" "to their own land," from "the north country," shall gloriously take place. 3rd.—The nation is prone to idolatry. It is the besetting sin at this instant; and so was Israel's of yore (Hosea viii. 11). 4th.—This nation is "blind" as to its origin; and GOD said it should so fall out with Israel, (Isaiah xlii. 19, xliii. 8; Hosea. ii. 6; Romans xi. 25). 5th.—In public worship the national State Church has assigned, *not to the minister*, but to the British worshippers—"the eastward position." He prays "towards the land, the city, and the house chosen of the LORD," as Solomon in his petition covenanted that "the captive" people should always do (1 Kings viii. 44—48). And, lastly, they bear the very name the Scriptures assign to the house of Israel! "In Isaac" was the "seed" to be "called." And they are in truth, "the House of Isaac" (Amos vii. 9—16), the "Isaac=suna," or "sons of Isaac"—the "*Saxons*."

In the British, I finally submit, is clearly and grandly fulfilled, the closing scene of that most affecting and most beautiful of all our Lord's parables, "For this my son WAS DEAD, and is ALIVE AGAIN; he was LOST, and is FOUND" (Luke xv. 24—32).

Thanking you again, Sir, for editorial courtesies,

Clifton, Nov., 1876.

I am, yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

LETTER NO. 26.—THE GREAT PYRAMID OF GHIZEH.

DEAR SIR,—On Friday evening, the 15th inst., the Rev. C. W. Hickson, M.A., vicar of St. Bartholomew, delivered a most interesting and able lecture on "The Great Pyramid of Ghizeh in Egypt," at France's lecture room, Bristol, to a crowded audience. The lecturer explained the astronomical, metrological, chronological, and scientific, as well as Messianic symbolism of this wonderful structure; and showed how it had been ascertained beyond reasonable doubt, that the date of its erection was B.C. 2170. He established this by astronomical considerations as well as by facts connected with the building itself, into which the architect had monumentally imbedded the date in one portion of the construction. Mr. Hickson, in a lucid and careful manner, presented his hearers with the many sacred, scientific, and chronological problems which the pyramid solves, in its own mass; the following being among the most remarkable,—the quadrature of the circle (and this not once, but four or five times in the building); the sun's distance; the years of the orbit of the precession of the equinoxes; the duration of the solar year, accurately given to three places of decimals; the birth, death, and duration of the ministry of our Lord; the exact number of years of the Mosaic and Christian dispensations; the days of the week with record of the sacred character of the seventh. These and many other deeply important matters symbolized in the great pyramid were brought out in a masterly style by the lecturer and clearly explained. The interest of the lecture centered in the pyramid coffer, or lidless granite chest in the "King's Chamber," the cubical capacity of which was demonstrated to be practically identical with that of

the ark of the covenant, constructed under divine teaching by Moses at Sinai—and with the ancient British Chaldron—the unit of *lineal* measure being the “Pyramid Inch,” which is found by actually constructed standards in the “Ante-Chamber” and “Queen’s Chamber,” to differ from the British lineal inch by only half a hair’s breadth, or one thousandth part of the length of the latter. In other words, the pyramid inch is to the British inch in the ratio of 1’001 to 1. The lecturer justly pointed out that these and other extraordinary metrological analogies threw a strong light upon the question of the origin of the British races, and their identity with ISRAEL.

It will interest your readers to learn that Mr Hickson has within the last few days made the remarkable discovery that the ark of Noah, the dimensions of which in cubits are recorded in Genesis vi. 15, was probably of the capacity of exactly 100,000 pyramid coffers; 100,000 arks of the covenant; or 100,000 ancient British chaldrons.

We understand that Mr Hickson hopes to ascertain a mathematical relation between the dimensions of the “Stone of Destiny” (as the “Coronation Stone” in Westminster abbey is termed) and the mathematical function π (3’14159, &c.).

Allow me, Sir, to ask why such a building as the Great Pyramid of Egypt should be extant in these latter days, and what purpose it can answer? I reply that in Isaiah xix. 19, 20, God has declared that “In that day (*i.e.*, in our last days) there shall be an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the Land of Egypt, and a Matzaybhah,” or PYRAMID (see Dr. Margoliouth Hebr. Christ Witness, 1875, p. 541) “at the border thereof to Jehovah; and it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto Jehovah of Hosts in the Land of Egypt.” This testimony the building is now affording; proving thereby—1st, that God *is*; 2nd, that His prophetic word is literally true; 3rd, that the metrological testimony of the pyramid points to the identity of the lost tribes; and 4th, that it affirms the latter are found where pyramid metrology is firmly retained, viz., in these islands of the west, in the British races. And, Sir, the pyramid does more than this: it points to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of His people Israel, and through them of all the world! It tells us of the date of His birth, the duration of His ministry, of His death and resurrection, and of that dread moment (A.D. 1881, towards the autumn) when—not the end of the world will come, but—the day of grace past and gone, the great Gentile tribulation will commence (Joel ii. 30—32); the horror of the mighty and great earthquake will overwhelm the continental world *as by fire* (Rev. xvi. 18—21; 2 Peter iii.), and Israel preserved as by a miracle, caught up to a place of refuge and safety like Noah in his ark, will be kept in perfect peace, and restored with Judah to the land “which God hath given for an inheritance to their fathers.” This, Sir, and more, is the teaching of the Great Pyramid! It is a testimony adapted to the proud unbelieving intellect of the present day, which refuses to bend to the Word of God, *written*. It leaves man without excuse, for it tells him plainly of a Saviour, but warns him too of destruction, certain, awful, and suddenly impending, to those who wilfully reject the *freely offered* blessing of the blood-bought salvation, PURCHASED by the Great Redeemer, for His people Israel.

Yours truly,

PHILO-ISRAEL.

December, 1876.

FINIS.