THE RELIGIOUS WAR.

The Controversy Between Gladstone and Manning.

The Vatican Decrees and Civil Allegiance.

Does the Catholic Obey Queen or Pope?

The Archbishop Calls Upon Catholics to Rally to the Papacy.

"No Half-Hearted, Half-Fearful Assertions."

LORD SHAFTESBURY AND RELIGION

England Withdrawing from the Papal Court.

RELIGIOUS WARS IN THE OLDEN TIMES.

The Gordon Riots and the Emancipation Act.

The Course of Mr. Gladstone and Earl Russell in the Past.

The Gladstone Pamphlet.

LONDON, Nov. 7, 1874.

Yesterday was issued a work entitled, "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance: A Political Expostulation, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone."

This little volume will form an important landmark in the great ecclesiastical controversy now raging all over the world. It is one of the most effective examinations of the recent claims of the Papacy that have ever appeared, and, coming from the leader of the liberal party in England, it is destined to produce a profound influence on the opinion of the country and of Europe. It may, indeed, have results unexpected even by Mr. Gladstone himself. It is more than an expostulation with Catholics; it is an appeal to Protestants. If we were still discussing the question of Catholic emancipation it would be a powerful argument against the principle, and though Mr. Gladstone emphatically repudiates a retrograde policy on questions affecting the civil rights of the Catholics, his tractate will appear to the strong Protestant opinion of the country a call for a more active resistance to the aggressions of Rome.

NO INSULT INTENDED TO CATHOLICISM.

In his introductory chapter Mr. Gladstone states the occasion and scope of the work. His primary object is to vindicate the remarkable words which he used in his recent essay in the *Contemporary*. He denies that his language on that occasion was aggressive; coming from a layman who had spent most and the best years of his life in the observation and practice of politics, the words were defensive. It was not the abettors of the Papal chair that had a right to remonstrate with the world, but the world that had a right to remonstrate with His Holiness and his abettors. He repels the assertion that his language was an insult to Roman Catholics; and if he is told that he who animadverts upon the Papal chair and its advisers assails or insults Roman Catholics, he is not bound to accept a proposition which is not in accordance with reason.

The Rome of the middle ages (Mr. Gladstone goes on to say) claimed universal monarchy. The modern Church of Rome has abandoned nothing, retracted nothing. Is that all? Far from it. By condemning as will be seen those who, like Bishop Doyle, in 1826, charge the mediæval Popes with aggression, she unconditionally, even if covertly, maintains what the mediæval Popes maintained. But even this is not the worst. The worst by far is that, whereas in the national churches and communities of the middle ages there was a brisk, vigorous and constant opposition to these outrageous claims, an opposition which stoutly asserted its own orthodoxy, which always caused itself to be respected and which even sometimes gained the upper hand, now in this nineteenth century of ours, and while it is growing old, this same opposition has been put out of court and judicially extinguished within the Papal Church by the recent decrees of the Vatican. And it is impossible for persons accepting those decrees justly to complain when such documents are subjected in good faith to a strict examination as respects their compatibility with civil rights and the obedience of subjects.

MR. GLADSTONE'S PROPOSITIONS.

The propositions which Mr. Gladstone proceeds to vindicate are as follows:—

1. That Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith.
2. That she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.
3. That no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another.
4. That she (Rome) has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

Of the first and fourth of these propositions Mr. Gladstone says that they belong to the theological domain, and he disposes of them briefly. Roman Catholic controversialists used to boast of the unbroken and absolute identity of belief in that Church from the days of our Saviour, but now they asserted a living authority ever ready to open, adopt and shape cherubim doctrine according to the times. He goes on to say:—

If it is thought that the word "violence" was open to exception, I regret I cannot give it up. The justification of the ancient definitions of the Church, which have endured the storms of 1,500 years, was to be found in this, that they were not arbitrary or wilful, but that they wholly sprang from and related to theories rampant at the time, and regarded as menacing to Christian belief. Even the canons of the Council of Trent have, in the main, this amount apart from their matter of presumptive warrant. But the decrees of the present perilous Pontificate have been passed to favor and precipitate prevailing currents of opinion in the ecclesiastical world of Rome in the growth of what is often termed among Protestants Mariolatry, and the belief in Papal infallibility was notoriously advancing, but it seems not fast enough to satisfy the dominant party. To aim the deadly blows of 1854 and 1870 at the old historic, scientific and moderate school was surely an act of violence, and with this censure the proceeding of 1870 has actually been visited by the first living theologian now within the Roman communion—I mean Dr. John Henry Newman—who has used these significant words among others:—"Why should an aggressive and insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?"

CATHOLICISM AND MENTAL FREEDOM.

Mr. Gladstone proceeds to discuss the third proposition—that Rome has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused. He quotes in support of it a number of propositions condemned by the See of Rome, without citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed. Among these propositions are the following:—Those who maintain the liberty of the press (encyclical letter of Pope Gregory XVI., in 1831, and of Pope Pius IX., in 1864); or the liberty of conscience and of worship (encyclical of Pius IX., December 8, 1864); or the liberty of speech (syllabus of March 18, 1861; proposition seventy-nine, encyclical of Pope Pius of December, 1864); or who contend that Papal judgments and decrees may, without sin, be destroyed or differed from, unless they treat of the rules (dogmata) of faith or morals; or who assign to the State the power of defining the civil rights and province of the Church (syllabus of Pope Pius IX., March 8, 1861); or who hold that Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils have transgressed the limits of their power and usurped the rights of princes, or that the Church may not employ force; or that knowledge of things philosophical and civil may and should decline to be guided by divine and ecclesiastical authority; or that marriage is not in its essence a sacrament; or that marriage not sacramentally contracted has a binding force; or that the abolition of the temporal power of the Popedom would be highly advantageous to the Church; or that any other religion than the Roman religion may be established by a State; or that in "countries called Catholic" the free exercise of other religions may laudably be allowed; or that the Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with progressive liberalism and modern civilization.

CIVIL DUTY.

Mr. Gladstone also quotes words recently used by the Pope, claiming to be the Supreme Judge of the Christian Commonwealth, and entitled "in civil affairs to pass judgments on the acts of man." He does not think that it would be just to hold the members of the Romish Church responsible for recent innovations, but it is the duty of observers who hold them to be "false and arrogant" to entreat their Roman Catholic countrymen to replace themselves in the position of five and forty years ago.

Mr. Gladstone refers at some length to the controversy which preceded emancipation, and to the measures taken to learn from the highest Roman Catholic authorities of this country what was the exact situation of the members of that communion with respect to some of the better known exorbitancies of Papal assumption.

Answers in abundance, says Mr. Gladstone were obtained, tending to show that the doctrines of deposition and persecution of keeping no faith with heretics and of universal dominion were obsolete beyond revival; that every assurance could be given respecting them, except such as required the shame of a formal retractation: that they were in effect mere bugbears, unworthy to be taken into account by a nation which prided itself on being made up of practical men. But it was unquestionably felt that something more than the renunciation of these particular opinions was necessary in order to secure the full concession of civil rights to Roman Catholics. As to their individual loyalty, a State disposed to generous or candid interpretation had no reason to be uneasy. It was only with regard to requisitions which might be made on them from another quarter that apprehension could exist. It was reasonable that England should desire to know not only what the Pope might do for himself, but to what demands, by the constitution of their Church, they were liable, and how far it was possible that such demands could touch their civil duty.

THE POPE AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Gladstone adduces the testimony which was given on this point by various Roman Catholic authorities. He quotes Dr. Doyle, who said that the Catholics obeyed the Pope in matters of religious faith and ecclesiastical discipline; and that "our obedience to law and the allegiance which we owe the Sovereign are complete, and full, and perfect, and undivided, inasmuch as they extend to all political, legal and civil rights of the King or of his subjects. I think the allegiance due to the King and the allegiance due to the Pope are as distinct and as divided in their nature as any two things can possibly be." This was Dr. Doyle's statement; and he further declared that "neither the Pope nor any other ecclesiastical person has any right to interfere directly or indirectly with the civil government, nor to oppose in any manner the performance of the civil duties which are due to the King;" and in the same part the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland officially set forth "that it was not an article of the Catholic faith that the Pope was infallible."

Since that time (continues Mr. Gladstone) all these propositions have been reversed. The Pope's infallibility, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals, has been declared, with the assent of the bishops of the Roman Church, to be an article of faith binding on the conscience of every Christian. His claim to the obedience of his spiritual subjects has been declared in like manner without any practical limit or reserve, and his supremacy, without any reserve of civil rights, has been similarly affirmed to include everything which relates to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. And these doctrines we now know on the highest authority it is of necessity for salvation to believe.

SHOULD THE POPE CONTROL FAITH AND MORALS?

Mr. Gladstone points out that the difficulty will not be evaded by saying that it is only when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* that he is to be obeyed, for he himself is the only person who can unquestionably declare what is *ex cathedra* and what is not. He goes on to say:—

Again it may be sought to plead that the Pope is, after all, only operating by sanctions which unquestionably belong to the religious domain. He does not propose to invade the country, to seize Woolwich, or burn Portsmouth. He will only, at the worst, excommunicate opponents, as he has excommunicated Dr. Von Döllinger and others. Is this a good answer? After all, even in the Middle Ages, it was not by the direct action of fleets and armies of their own that popes contended with kings who were refractory. It was mainly by interdicts and by the refusal which they entailed when the bishops were not brave enough to refuse their publication of religious offices to the people. It was thus that England suffered under John, France under Philip Augustus, Leon under Alphonso the Noble, and every country in its turn. I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals. I submit that duty is a power which rises with us in the morning and goes to rest with us at night. It is coextensive with the action of our intelligence. It is the shadow which cleaves to us go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life. So, then, it is the supreme direction of us in respect to all duty which the Pontiff declares to belong to him, *sacro approbante concilio*, and this declaration he makes not as an opinion of the schools, but of countries. *Fidelibus credendam et tenendam.* A religious society which delivers volleys of spiritual censures in order to impede the performance of civil duties does all the mischief that is in its power to do, and brings into question in the face of the State its title to civil protection. Will it be said, finally, that the infallibility touches only matter of faith and morals? Will any of the Roman casuists kindly acquaint us what are the departments and functions of human life which do not and cannot fall within the domain of morals. If they will not tell us we must look elsewhere. Conduct and morals, we may suppose, are nearly coextensive. Three-fourths, then, of life are thus handed over; but who will guarantee as to the fourth? Certainly not St. Paul, who says:—"Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," and "Whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." No, such a distinction would be the device of a shallow policy unless, thereafter, Catholics of England can show that the Pope is unable to make any claim which can impair their civil allegiance, or that if any such claim is made it will be repelled and rejected.

Mr. Gladstone is led by just reasoning upon documentary evidence to the following conclusions:—

That the Pope, authorized by his Council, claims for himself the domain (A) of faith, (B) of morals, (C) of all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church; that he in like manner claims the power of determining limits of those domains; that he does not sever them by any acknowledged or intelligible line from the domains of civil duty and allegiance: that he, therefore, claims and claims from the month of July, 1870, onwards plenary authority from every convert and member of his Church that he shall "place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another, that other being himself."

"A DARING RAID."

Discussing the question whether these propositions being true are material, Mr. Gladstone dismisses the idea that "they have been disinterred, like hideous mummies picked out of Egyptian sarcophagi, in the interests of archæology." It must, he says, be for some political object of a very tangible kind that the risks of so daring a raid on the civil sphere have been deliberately run. Then comes the following pregnant passage:—

A daring raid it is; for it is most evident that the very assertion of principles which establish an exemption from allegiance, or which impair its completeness, goes in many other countries of Europe far more directly than with us to the creation of political strife and to dangers of the most material and tangible kind. The struggle now proceeding in Germany at once occurs to the mind as an instance. I am not competent to give any opinion upon the particulars of that struggle. The institutions of Germany and the relative estimate of State power and individual freedom are materially different from ours; but I must say as much as this:—First, it is not Prussia alone that is touched; elsewhere, too, the bone lies ready, though the contention may be delayed in other States. In Austria particularly there are recent laws in force raising much the same issues as the Falk laws have raised, but the Roman Court possesses in perfection one art, the art of waiting, and it is her wise maxim to fight but one enemy at a time. Secondly, if I have truly represented the claims promulgated from the Vatican it is difficult to deny that those claims and the power which has made them are primarily responsible for the pains and perils, whatever they may be, of the present conflict between German and Roman enactments; and that which was truly said of France may now also be said with not less truth of Germany. When Germany is disquieted Europe cannot be at rest. I should feel less anxiety on this subject had the Supreme Pontiff frankly recognized his altered position since the events of 1870, and in language as clear, if not as emphatic, as that in which he has proscribed modern civilization, given to Europe the assurance that he would be no party to the re-establishment, by blood and violence, of the temporal power of the Church. It is easy to conceive that his personal benevolence, no less than his feelings as an Italian, must have inclined him individually toward a course so humane, and, I should add, if I might do it without presumption, so prudent with what appears to an English eye a lavish prodigality. Successive Italian governments have made over the ecclesiastical powers and privileges of the monarchy not to the Church of the country, for the revival of the ancient popular and self-governing elements of its constitution, but to the Papal chair for the establishment of ecclesiastical despotism, and the suppression of the last vestiges of independence. This course, so difficult for a foreigner to appreciate, or even to justify, has been met not by reciprocal conciliation, but by a constant fire of denunciations and complaints. When the tone of these denunciations and complaints is compared with the language of the authorized and favored Papal organs, in the press and of the ultramontane party (now the sole legitimate party of the Latin Church) throughout Europe, it leads many to the painful and revolting conclusion that there is a fixed purpose among the secret inspirers of Roman policy to pursue by the road of force, upon the arrival of any favorable opportunity, their favorite project of re-erecting the terrestrial throne of the Popedom, even if it can only be re-erected on the ashes of the city and amid the whitening bones of the people. It is difficult to conceive or contemplate the effects of such an endeavor, but the existence at this day of the policy, even in bare idea, is itself a portentous evil. I do not hesitate to say that it is an incentive to general disturbance, a premium upon European wars. It is, in my opinion, not sanguine only, but almost ridiculous, to imagine that such a project could eventually succeed; but it is difficult to over-estimate the effect which it might produce in generating and exasperating strife. It might even to some extent disturb and paralyze the action of such governments as might interpose for no separate purpose of their own, but only with a view to the maintenance of rest or restoration of the general peace in the baleful power which is expressed by the phrase *Curia Romana*, and not at all adequately rendered in its historic force by the usual English equivalent, "Court of Rome." If the Court of Rome really entertains the scheme, it doubtless counts on the support in every country of an organized and devoted party, which, when it can command the scales of political power will promote interference, and when it is in a minority will work for securing neutrality. As the peace of Europe may be in jeopardy, and as the duties even of England as one (so to speak) of its constabulary authorities might come to be in question, it would be most interesting to know the mental attitude of our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen in England and Ireland with reference to the subject; and it seems to be one on which we are entitled to solicit information.

THE LIBERAL PARTY AND CATHOLIC RIGHTS.

The next point which Mr. Gladstone considers is—Were these propositions proper to be set forth by the present writer? He answers the question thus:—

For thirty years, and in a great variety of circumstances—in office as an independent member of Parliament, in majorities and in small minorities, and during the larger portion of the time as the representative of a great constituency, mainly clerical—I have, with others, labored to maintain and extend the civil rights of my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen. The liberal party of this country, with which I have been commonly associated, has suffered, and sometimes suffered heavily, in public favor and in influence from the belief that it was too ardent in the pursuit of that policy, while, at the same time, it has always been in the worst odor with the Court of Rome in consequence of its (I hope) unalterable attachment to Italian liberty and independence. I have sometimes been spokesman of that party in recommendations which have tended to foster in fact the imputation I have mentioned, though not to warrant it as matter of treason, but it has existed. Up to 1870 opinion in the Roman Church on all matters involving civil liberty, though partially and sometimes widely intimidated, was free where it was resolute. During the Middle Ages heresy was often extinguished in blood; but in every Cis-Alpine country a principle of liberty to a great extent held its own, and national life refused to be put down. Nay, more. This precious and inestimable gift had not infrequently for its champions a local prelacy and clergy. Thrice in history it seemed as if what we may call the constitutional party in the Church was about to triumph. First, at the epoch of the Council of Constance; second, when the French Episcopate was in conflict with Pope Innocent, and, third, when Clement XIV. levelled with the dust the deadliest foes that mental and moral liberty have ever known. But from July, 1870, this state of things has passed away, and the death warrant of that constitutional party has been signed and sealed and promulgated in form. Before that time arrived, although I had used expressions sufficiently indicative as to the tendency of things in the great Latin communion, yet I had for very many years felt it to be the first and paramount duty of the British Legislature, whatever some might say or do, to give to Ireland all that justice could demand in regard to matters of conscience and of civil equality, and thus to set herself right in the opinion of the civilized world. So far from seeing—what some believed they saw—a spirit of unworthy compliance in such a course, it appeared to me the only one which suited either the dignity or the duty of my country, while this debt remained unpaid, both before and after 1870. I did not think it my province to open formally a line of argument on a question of prospective rather than immediate moment which might have prejudiced the matter of duty lying nearest our hand and morally injured Great Britain not less than Ireland, churchmen and non-conformists no less than the adherents of the Papal communion, by slackening the disposition to pay the debt of justice. When Parliament had passed the Church act of 1869 and the Land act of 1870 there remained only under the great head of imperial equality one serious question to be dealt with—that of higher education. I consider that the liberal majority in the House of Commons and the government to which I had the honor and satisfaction to belong formally rendered payment in full of this portion of the debt by the Irish University bill of February, 1873. Some indeed think that it was a question into which this is manifestly no place to enter; but the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland thought fit to procure the rejection of that measure by the direct influence which they exercised over a certain number of Irish members of Parliament, and by the temptation which they thus offered—the bid in effect which (to use a homely phrase) they made to attract the support of the tory opposition—these efforts were crowned with a complete success. From that time forward I have felt that the situation was changed, and that important matters would have to be cleared up by suitable explanation. The debt to Ireland had been paid—a debt to the country at large had still to be disposed of, and this has come to be the duty of the hour. So long, indeed, as I continued to be Prime Minister I should not have considered a broad political discussion on a general question suitable. Neither I, nor, I am certain, my colleagues would have been disposed to run the risk of stirring popular passion by a vulgar appeal; but every difficulty arising from necessary limitations of an official position has now been removed.

Discussing our home policy for the future, Mr. Gladstone says that in regard to what the liberal policy has accomplished by word or deed in establishing the full civil equality of Roman Catholics he regrets nothing and recants nothing.

Archbishop Manning's Reply.

[From the London Times.]

Archbishop Manning, at a large meeting of Roman Catholic clergy, noblemen and lay assistants, assembled at his house on Thursday evening, delivered an inaugural address to the Roman Catholic Academia in reference to the future policy of the Catholic world. Thirteen years ago, he said, it was found necessary to extend the work of the association in England, and he was glad to say that they had done much to correct and educate the press of this country. In the present crisis, and looking to the coming great future struggle, they had a vast work before them. Looking to the hostility manifested on the Continent to the Sovereign Pontiff, he invited their special attention to the best means of asserting his infallibility and his right to spiritual and temporal power. One thing he would call their attention to, namely, that since his temporal power on the Continent had been denied him his spiritual power and influence over his subjects had greatly increased. Commenting upon the proposed system of international arbitration, discussed at the recent Conference at Geneva, he said there could be but one authorized arbitrator between the nations of the earth, and that one was the one who was not interested in the temporal affairs of one nation more than another, but was impartial to all, and that was the Sovereign Pontiff himself. Other questions which he invited their most serious consideration to were the infallibility of the Holy Father, his right to temporal as well as spiritual authority, and, amidst all the conflicting opinions of the world, the ultimate necessity of acknowledging civil allegiance to him as their only safety. Within the last twenty-four hours it had been intimated to him that the Catholic world was threatened with a controversy on the whole of the decrees of the Vatican Council. From this and other matters that had come to his knowledge he could see that they were on the very eve of one of the mightiest controversies the religious world has ever seen. Certainly nothing like the controversy on which they were about to enter had taken place during the last three hundred years, and they must be prepared. If they would only prepare themselves, he did not fear for the decrees of the Vatican Council or for the Vatican itself. But they must have no half-hearted measures. They must have no half-fearful, half-hearted assertion of the Sovereign Pontiff's claims. They must not fear to declare to England, and to the world, through the free press of England, the Sovereign Pontiff's claim to infallibility, his right to temporal power, and the duty of the nations of the earth to return to their allegiance to him. If they did this, if they proclaimed this with no uncertain sound, Protestants of England and Protestants throughout the world would hear them and be convinced. If, on the other hand, they minced matters, and spoke in half-fearful measures, Protestants would only turn away from them for their want of honesty. Protestants knew well what they meant and what the claims of the Catholic Church were, and therefore it would be best for the Church now to speak out, and he had no fear for the result.

Lord Shaftesbury's View.

In a recent address the Earl of Shaftesbury says:—

If he had the wealth of Glasgow, or the wealth of a few people in it, so far from fearing the progress of science, as many people did, he would spend no end of money to encourage it. He would urge upon these masters of wisdom that they did not plunge deep enough; they should go further and wider and higher. He wished a thousand times as many minds were engaged in scientific pursuits. A few eminent men held a monopoly, and they crushed the public with their crude and abundant fancies. But there was no greater folly than that committed by those who would maintain revealed truth by counter theories. The Bible has suffered far more from its friends than from its enemies. In their timidity they have deprecated inquiry, and so have appeared to distrust their own Zion. In their over zeal—as if the Bible could not take care of itself—they have proceeded to give explanations and interpretations which the language of Scripture would never justify, and then some clever scientific man laid hold of it, and in his criticisms has overthrown the faith of many by his just and his ridiculing observations. Had he the wealth of Glasgow he would say to Max Müller and his Orientalists:—"Here is the sum of £50,000; collect the facts you require. Send abroad your men. You say languages are dying out; send abroad and take the dying speech, the last confession of these dying tongues." He would send the same sum to Professor Tyndall and say to him:—"Accumulate your facts; I don't care about your theories, but turn your powerful intellect to the pursuit of facts." He firmly believed that if Glasgow or any wealthy city were to come down with such a means of advancing science they would see that in less than ten years that grand old book would be like the ark upon the top of Mount Ararat, surveying the subsiding of the waters and rejoicing in the restoration of life and joy.

Cardinal Cullen on Materialism.

[From the London Daily Telegraph.]

On November 6 Cardinal Cullen issued a pastoral recommending the Catholics of his diocese to subscribe largely to the Catholic University, and incidentally alluding to modern science and to Messrs. Moody and Sankey, the itinerant Evangelical preachers, now in Dublin. The Cardinal says:—"Great efforts are now being made to destroy Catholic education. The banner of infidelity is daringly unfurled in our own land, and the worst systems of pantheism and materialism, masked under the name of science, are recommended to us as the necessary consequence of the enlightenment of the age and the progress of the arts. To meet the wicked plans of the enemy it is necessary to have a good Catholic university, in which the higher branches of literature and science may be properly cultivated, and at the same time fertilized by the dews of heaven." The Cardinal says Catholics ought to pray for the conversion of those outside the pale of truth, who are now giving up their articles of religion and Book of Common Prayer, and becoming followers and admirers in religious matters of ignorant converted colliers, roaring minstrels, or speculative travellers, who can scarcely be expected to war successfully against the world, the flesh and the devil.

Mr. John Morley's View.

[From the London Daily News.]

Mr. John Morley, editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, last evening delivered an address at the Manchester Reform Club on the present condition of the education question. Speaking of clerical fellowship he said it was a breach of sound political principle and an incentive to religious hypocrisy. As to primary education, Mr. Morley insisted that the educational agitation must be begun again, and suggested, as necessary for the perfection of the system, the gradual abolition of grants for attendance, the enactment of compulsion and the establishment of free schools.

England and the Papal Court.

[From the Pall Mall Gazette.]

An informal intimation has been given to the public in a leading article in the *Times* that the anomalous representation of England at the Papal Court is at length to cease. The immediate cause of the withdrawal of the Secretary of Legation, who has stood toward the Pope in the character of an honorary and semi-official ambassador from the Court of St. James since the removal of Lord Odo Russel to Berlin, is, no doubt, the departure of the last remnant of the French protecting forces from the harbor of Civita Vecchia. Even before the temporal power was lost to the head of the Church there was difficulty in preserving formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican when Great Britain declined to receive a nuncio as the Pope's representative in return, and the awkwardness of the situation has increased ever since Cavour made his formal claim to Rome as the Italian capital in 1861. Since the Italian government took up its quarters there in the following year the English mission to the Pope has been what has been described as a "meaningless shadow."

GLADSTONE AND MANNING.

Prudentius Defines What the Church Considers Lawful and Unlawful.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

In your editorial article of last Sunday, on the Manning-Gladstone controversy, occur some passages to which all Catholics must take exception. Quoting the words of the Archbishop, "Civil obedience rests on natural law; revealed truth is the law of God," you pursue thus:—"Consequently the law of God teaches all men that they must, for the good of society, obey civil rulers in all things that are lawful." And you continue:—"The Archbishop thus admits in this reservation the same principle which was so much in vogue during our anti-slavery discussions, and which Seward spoke of as the higher law. Seward and the anti-slavery statesmen contended that a higher law—a law of conscience—compelled them to disobey the Fugitive Slave law decrees. Archbishop Manning advances the same principle when he reserves to his Church what laws are or are not binding upon the conscience of the Catholic citizen."

Pardon me, but the HERALD says too much, and draws too broad and too damaging an inference when he says that Archbishop Manning "reserves to his Church (to declare?) what laws are or are not binding upon the conscience of the Catholic citizen." The words of the Archbishop are:—"Society is founded on nature and subjects are bound in all things which are lawful to obey their rulers." Allow me to show you in what Catholic doctrine on this point, resembles the anti-slavery "higher law," and in what it differs.

The Catholic Church and her Pontiff are the custodians, witnesses and expounders of the entire revealed truth, written and unwritten. Now, revelation embraces the natural law promulgated anew under Moses, and forming the groundwork of domestic and civil society. It is with her a cardinal principle that she has no power to change or dispense with any one of the clearly known dispositions of the law of nature, any more than she can alter or dispense with like dispositions of the divine positive law. They both are the expression of the divine will, binding alike on the head of the Church and on every individual within her bosom. Any legislative enactment, no matter from what source proceeding, that violates the law of nature, founded in the eternal and essential fitness of things, is of itself null and void. Such is the law forbidding marriage between parents and their descendants down to the remotest generation. No law of Church or State can change the natural and essential "unfitness" existing here; no dispensation of any human authority can validate a union which nature reprobates. Such, again, would be a law tolerating or sanctioning promiscuous cohabitation. Such, under the new law revealed by Christ, would be a law legalizing polygamy and commanding the officers of State or all private citizens, under certain circumstances, to aid the polygamist in recovering his absconding concubine. Such, finally, would be a law making of man a mere chattel of his fellow man, denying him all social rights and compelling him to the habitual violation of his own innate moral sense.

These laws of the State are *ipso facto*, and anteriorly to any decision of the Supreme Court or ecclesiastical tribunal, null and of no effect. The law of nature, or the known positive law of God, which they violate, not only dispenses from obeying the legislator, but binds us not to obey him. When, therefore, you speak of the law of the State as opposed to the "higher law," either of nature or positive revelation, you induce a false notion in the minds of your readers. Any legislative enactment which is contrary to either of these in a Christian community is admitted by all jurists to be no law. Every law, properly so called, is one that is in accordance with the universally acknowledged principles of right and wrong. Hence between such law (solely deserving of the name) and what is meant by the "higher law" there can be no conflict, no opposition.

You are the State, or the State's legislator, and you enact a law binding me, as under the old Cæsars, to offer incense to the statue of the Emperor in token of divine worship, or to sacrifice to Jupiter or Diana. Am I, who believe in the one true God and revere His commandments, bound to obey you? Is there not a "higher law" in the very first precept of the Decalogue forbidding the act you enjoin? From the harem of the Mormon Prophet, or of some one of his loathsome compeers, a victim of polygamy escapes beyond the limits of Utah and takes refuge beneath the roof of a free citizen of a free State. Can any law which Congress may make to compel that freeman to restore the fugitive to her lord, or to give effectual aid in capturing and restoring her, be binding on that citizen's conscience?

Again, I am a citizen of Geneva, or Cologne, or Posen, and my Catholic conscience teaches me that no bishop, no priest can minister to my soul in her need—let me say at death's hour—the sacraments instituted by Christ, save alone those appointed and commissioned by the head of the Church. You, the State, declare that the Pope shall henceforth have no more jurisdiction over me and my fellow Catholics; that I shall have neither priest nor bishop to minister to me, save such as you appoint; and you banish the pastors who refuse to acknowledge you as the source of spiritual jurisdiction, and forcibly instal in their place the criminal and the apostate. I know as clearly as I know my own existence that these intruders have no power to pardon or to heal, and that to accept their ministrations would be deadly sacrilege; am I bound to obey you? No! Your enactment is no law; it is contrary to the first principles of legislation. I am in Russian Poland, and the ruthless autocrat sends his Cossacks to compel me at the point of the lance to attend a schismatical worship, to enregister publicly my renouncement of all spiritual subjection to the Bishop of Rome and those in communion with him. Is the edict which compels me to be dignified with the name of law? Or has such an edict binding force on my conscience?

When, therefore, you mean that there should be no conflict between the laws of the State and the "higher law," you can only mean this—that the will of the legislator enjoins nothing that is not in known conformity with the divine will as declared in the law of nature and the revealed law. All things, and only these, which so conform are "lawful." When the civil ruler enjoins these, and these only, I am bound to obey him as God himself. There is then "a reservation" which it is in the very nature of things to make in speaking of our obedience to human legislation in Church or State, that the laws shall enjoin no wrong. Pagans and Christians, citizens of every creed and clime, are agreed on this point. It means the same thing the whole world over and under every government.

I venture to say that before a month has passed you will hear the same explanation from Archbishop Manning. "In all things lawful" is a reservation that you yourself make when you imply, while obeying the law, that it shall not enjoin what nature and nature's God declare to be unlawful. Beyond this extent, which is common to all classes and creeds in the community, I know of no reservation ever made by the Catholic Church. There is a great difference between this "reservation" as here explained and the interpretation commonly given to the "higher law" during the anti-slavery agitation.

The framers of the constitution, or at least a majority of them, had found slavery existing as an established fact. I am not aware that a single one of them at that time praised it as a blessing. It was an inheritance partly bequeathed to us by the old colonial administration and partly due to our own cupidity. It was considered by moderate men as an evil; but the difficulty was now to abate it. How it became a sectional institution all know, as well as how its increase and permanence led to fierce strife and fearful bloodshed need not here be told. Even before the Fugitive Slave law was passed, while one party considered slavery, even apart from its abuses, as "an essential evil" and appealed to a "higher law" commanding all to aid in suppressing it, there was an equal number who considered it a still greater evil to expose the Union to disruption and the country to the horrors of a civil and, eventually, of a servile war. When the Supreme Court had decided that slavery was constitutional and citizens were called upon to enforce the laws of Congress the perplexity of the law-abiding became greater, while the indignation of the others grew more violent and active.

There can be no doubt that the anti-slavery party contained many men who, considering "the institution" as essentially wrong, believed themselves bound in conscience to overthrow it. But it is equally certain that here in the North other conscientious motives, just as weighty, influenced the conduct of their opponents. Catholics, as a body, though averse to slavery and deploring its abuses, did not condemn it in itself and apart from these as "essentially evil." They feared from its violent suppression greater mischief to the country, and considered, too, that, in their doubt, the law of Congress was binding and the decisions of the Supreme Court valid. I believe that during the agitation their attitude of conciliation and moderation received high praise.

Now, had the country been Catholic, had we lived at an epoch when the Holy See was recognized as the high tribunal of Christendom, it is not unlikely that the doctrinal as well as the constitutional questions involved in Southern slavery would have been referred to the Pontiff's arbitrament. Slavery would have been done away with here as in every country in Europe, without commotion, warfare and bloodshed, and without entailing any one of the miseries which the next two generations of Americans must have to deal with.

No such opportunity of interfering, directly or indirectly, in our national discussions may ever again present itself. What is more, since our civil war, and, indeed, since the definition in 1870 of the Pontifical infallibility, the Pope has again and again expressed himself in terms of grateful admiration of the religious liberty existing in England and the United States. We cannot have forgotten his utterances to the Prince of Wales about England, and his affectionate sentiments expressed in Rome to Mr. Seward himself and to others.

Mr. Gladstone has made, for party purposes, a suicidal mistake; and the party among ourselves that might, in extremity, raise a "No Popery" cry, would meet with the same fate.

PRUDENTIUS.

RELIGIOUS WARS IN THE PAST.

A Historical Retrospect.

Ever since the Reformation the annals of England have been crowded with reports of religious excitements growing out of the real or fancied designs of the Pope to bring back that country to the fold of the Catholic Church. The mass of the people have been taught to believe that the boasted free institutions of the kingdom would be subverted in the event of such a calamity occurring, and that the privilege of liberty of conscience which they prize so highly would cease to exist. The Catholic body in Great Britain is comparatively small, though it embraces among its members many of the most distinguished and aristocratic of the inhabitants. No charge has been made against their loyalty to the Crown, and there is nothing to show that they are not a law-abiding and estimable class. They, however, are recognized as earnest in their devotion to the Holy See, and in the cause of Christianity. This was made apparent to have recently, as it has on former occasions, given offence to many of their Protestant countrymen. The Catholics, it cannot be denied, have suffered severely under English penal legislation, and still have relics of discriminating laws against them still remain on the statute books. Their efforts to have these enactments repealed have been characterized by moderation and a spirit of patience that certainly entitles them to the greatest respect. There are some persons, however, who are unwilling to give them any credit for this conduct. Such men as Messrs. Whalley and Newdegate throw aside all ideas of charity and good feeling when considering the rights of their Catholic fellow subjects; but it was not expected that Mr. Gladstone would come forward to stir up religious strife and seek to embroil the country in a dangerous and uncalled-for doctrinal war, which, it is believed, involves the allegiance of about one-fourth the population of the United Kingdom. It will be seen in the following that even in recent times the public feeling has been deeply moved in reference to the claims of Roman Catholics, and that the originators of the excitements have either lived to acknowledge their errors or died under melancholy and distressing circumstances. Lord John Russell, when in power twenty-four years ago, under singular circumstances to be stated hereafter, created a general reform all over Great Britain and Ireland, and procured the enactment of a law which was intended to curtail the hierarchy which Pius IX. had just created. During Mr. Gladstone's administration this law was repealed, thus conceding that the dangers apprehended in 1850 had no foundation. The alarm was as great and widespread then as now, and was created to as large an extent by Lord John as the present agitation has been by the ex-Premier. It will also be observed that those who feared the evil effects of the act of emancipation in 1829, proved in the end to be mistaken.

LORD GEORGE GORDON'S RIOTS.

The oppressive laws that existed against persons professing the Catholic faith in Great Britain and Ireland ever since the time of Elizabeth were partially modified in 1778 and subsequent years before the close of the eighteenth century. Catholics were allowed to enter the army, permission was granted to have their children educated by their own instructors, and there was no longer an inducement to become a Protestant by offering rewards for conversion. An act introduced by Sir George Savile was passed granting some privileges to the Roman Catholics which gave great offence to a portion of the population. In 1779 a proposition to procure the repeal of this act (known as Sir George Savile's act) caused an extraordinary excitement in Scotland, which Lord George Gordon took up with much zeal. Gordon was the third son of the Duke of Gordon; he had served in the navy and entered Parliament, where he was considered a man of unbalanced political agitator and a man of almost mania. Early in 1780 he presented a petition praying for the repeal of Sir George Savile's act to all Roman Catholics took for the petition applies. [illegible]

THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION,

which he had organized in London, of which he was president, with a view to the repeal of the act. On the day appointed a concourse of 60,000 assembled in St. George's fields and accompanied him to the houses of Parliament, in which the Commons were at the time assembled. The House having several times refused to take the petition into consideration, the populace, inflamed by the harangue which Gordon addressed the mob from the top of the gallery stairs, [illegible]. The Protestant Association and the Papists [illegible] in London who formed the great body of the bearers [illegible] were graphically described in Dickens' "Barnaby Rudge." The chapels of the Sardinian and the Bavarian legations were burned [illegible], the prisons were broken open and the houses of the Chief Justice (Lord Mansfield) and many others were destroyed.

TROOPS NOW BEGAN TO POUR INTO THE CITY.

The rioters were quelled after more than 200 had been killed and wounded. Gordon was arrested on a charge of treason, but on trial he was acquitted on the ground that his intentions in assembling the people were not malicious or traitorous. In May, 1786, he was excommunicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury for refusing to appear as a witness in an ecclesiastical court. Two years later Gordon was sentenced to several years' imprisonment and to pay heavy fines for having libelled the administration of criminal justice in England and the Queen of France. He then retired to Holland; but there he was arrested, sent home and placed in prison, where he died, after some years of confinement, in a state of insanity, a number of his life. He even appealed to the National Assembly of France to interpose in his behalf. His last moments were embittered by the knowledge that his religious zeal had been the cause of the riots that [illegible].

THE EMANCIPATION ACT.

It will be remembered that this famous measure was passed in 1829, through the long continued agitation carried on by O'Connell in behalf of the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland. The excitement in England against the bill was great, and the election of O'Connell as a duly elected member of Parliament the House of Commons, in 1828, was a sign of the [illegible] oaths framed to exclude Roman Catholics, and the excitement which the event produced was so great that Peel and Wellington had to concede to the [illegible] alluded to above. From the history of religious rancor or fanaticism, and in their [illegible] to the political and religious views or feelings of the dominant party. The English Parliament [illegible] the measure in 1691 that Irish members should take the oath of supremacy, and three years later a series of penal statutes were passed which made the Roman Catholics in a worse position than at any period of their history. The whole population was disarmed and

THE PRIESTS BANISHED

from the country. But what was still more intolerable was the interference with the private management of family affairs. No Catholic could act as guardian, and no Catholic orphans should be brought up as Protestants, but no Catholic to be allowed to [illegible]. Catholics were forbidden to purchase land or to hold leases for more than thirty-one years. [illegible] and they were denied the right of suffrage and of admission to the Bar, and there was a regulation that Catholic burial [illegible] of the Catholic should be prohibited. The priests were [illegible] the churches, and [illegible] persecuted [illegible] for a long period [illegible] between Catholics and Protestants was gradually repealed [illegible] referred to above, but the [illegible] and Gordon riots, many of

THE DISQUALIFYING STATUTES

were repealed in 1780. During this period until the final liberation was obtained by the efforts of O'Connell, O'Connell rapidly became a power, and as early as 1825 Sir Francis Burdett introduced a relief bill, which was passed by the Commons by a vote of 268 to 248, but was rejected by the Lords. A slight reaction in favor of Catholic emancipation was made in 1827, and in consequence a new "No Popery" cry was raised, which was subsequently carried in the Commons by a majority of four. In the brief view of the Catholic question brought before the House in 1828 by the Duke of Wellington, who, under [illegible], held that the [illegible] emancipation, and in the king's speech in the following year the Duke of Wellington [illegible] the measure, and on the 10th of April, 1829, the bill became the law of the land.

PROVISIONS OF THE LAW.

The chief feature of the measure was the abrogation of the obstacles in the way of Roman Catholics entering Parliament. They were allowed to sit in either House of Parliament on taking an oath, which [illegible] to interfere with the Established Church. They were admitted to all corporate offices and to all civil and military appointments except [illegible], and the offices of Regent, Lord Chancellor of England, Ireland and of Viceroy of Ireland; positions in the universities and in schools, and from all manner of Church patronage. The army and navy had been opened to them before, but a £10 was substituted for a £2 qualification in Ireland. The Roman Catholics were placed upon the same footing with the other dissenters, five thousand of which the Bishop of Liverpool [illegible] declined to incorporate [illegible] before, many [illegible] was enacted in the emancipation [illegible] to the [illegible] of the Jesuits. Since [illegible] in Ireland, which had [illegible], has been [illegible] registration. Some portions of the Emancipation act have since been repealed. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland can now be a Catholic, but the penalties for the assumption of [illegible] titles [illegible].

RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY.

Mr. Gladstone in his recent pamphlet took occasion to refer to the Emancipation act, in which it was [illegible] that the allegiance of Catholics to the Pope was purely spiritual and did not interfere with their allegiance to the reigning monarch. The theological bodies, though [illegible], in [illegible] bishops as vicars apostolic, [illegible] but Protestant [illegible] Dr. Wiseman, created Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Lord John (now Earl) Russell, who on that occasion, like Mr. Gladstone now, spoke of a letter to the Bishop of Durham in the most insulting terms, [illegible] of awakening in England a storm of religious hate. The Papal brief was issued in 1850, [illegible].

UNDER THE RING OF THE FISHERMAN,

and was almost immediately followed by a pastoral by Cardinal Wiseman, "given out of the Flaminian gate." This measure, for which the Protestant public was but little prepared, [illegible] a struggle much more formidable in the language which was [illegible] bearing altogether on the spiritual concerns of Catholics, was supposed to involve an invasion of the rights and prerogatives of the Church and the Crown. As stated, a tempest of religious agitation [illegible] was unexampled during the memory of the living generation. In the excitement it was [illegible] Cardinal Wiseman, who had gone to Rome, returned to England and published an explanation of the [illegible], [illegible] that he [illegible] the strictly constitutional rights [illegible].

APPEAL TO REASON AND GOOD FEELING

of the people of England on the subject of the Catholic hierarchy. Meantime public meetings were held, at which [illegible] addresses were delivered to the Queen, and to her ministers, [illegible] followed by a return made to Parliament it was shown that no less than 3,145 addresses had been presented to [illegible]. Violent debates took place in both Houses. [illegible] circumstances that Lord John Russell introduced the Ecclesiastical Titles bill, which was passed in 1851, the provisions of which [illegible] any person in England and Ireland to assume titles of archbishop of any province, bishop of any bishopric, or dean of any deanery, under a penalty of £100. Notwithstanding the bill, the [illegible] reputation and great literary eminence of Cardinal Wiseman [illegible] of the British public, [illegible] and his successor, Archbishop Manning, to public sympathy. [illegible] the Rev. Dr. Harold Browne, of [illegible] sympathy [illegible] with the movement of the moral and intellectual advancement of the people he [illegible] the sympathies [illegible] of cultivated English men of every degree. The Ecclesiastical Titles act [illegible] any event be enforced in Ireland without serious consequences. It was [illegible] repealed in 1871. A remarkable fact in this connection is that Lord John Russell, who so fiercely opposed the creation of the hierarchy in England, has lived to see the fulfilment of his [illegible] and the appointments made under it [illegible] measure and the [illegible] of the religious fears and bigotry of his countrymen in 1850.

THE PROPOSED CONGRESS.

Referring to the proposed meeting of an International Catholic Congress in London to take into consideration the interests of the Church, to re-assert the Pope's right to temporal power and to proclaim the [illegible] all Christians to return to allegiance to Rome, it will be remembered that the Council of the Vatican in 1860 [illegible] the international and diocesan—are to be summoned. An international congress could [illegible] organized [illegible] country. Such a [illegible] of the [illegible] Holy Father. Since the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in England, in 1851, [illegible] in that kingdom. The first was held in 1852, the second in 1855 and a third in 1859. The last met in 1873, and was presided over by Dr. Manning. The latter eminent prelate is, of course, now [illegible] suffragans of any Archbishop in the Catholic world. In addition, [illegible] since 1851 [illegible] with the [illegible] sees:—Most Rev. Dr. Brown, Bishop of Newport; Most Rev. Dr. Vaughan, Bishop of Plymouth; Most Rev. Dr. Clifford, Bishop of Clifton; Most Rev. Dr. Brown, Bishop of Shrewsbury; Most Rev. Dr. Amherst, Bishop of Northampton; Most Rev. Dr. Cornthwaite, Bishop of Beverley; Most Rev. Dr. Vaughan, Bishop of Salford; Most Rev. Dr. O'Reilley, Bishop of Liverpool; Most Rev. Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, and Most Rev. Dr. Chadwick, Bishop of Hexham.

IS THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY A PROTESTANT BY BAPTISM?

[London (Nov. 5) correspondence of Dundee Advertiser.]

The controversy with regard to the baptism of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to which I referred some time ago, threatens to become serious. The frenzy of hatred with which the High Church party have regarded Dr. Tait ever since the introduction of the Public Worship bill instead of abating only waxes more and more furious, and the baptism controversy [illegible] with the view of discrediting the Primate. A letter has now been addressed to the Bishop of Winchester, asking him to "relieve the consciences of churchmen" by satisfying them that Dr. Tait was validly baptized. He says that this [illegible] Whether Sir Harold Browne will [illegible] Presbyterian form, [illegible] it was never [illegible] under the Anglican form. It will be remembered [illegible] Archbishop [illegible] the High Churchmen, [illegible] letter to the Emperor of Germany [illegible] Pope Pius IX, [illegible] any superior to Presbyterian baptism.

LONG ISLAND SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

The Queens County Sunday School Trustees' Association met in semi-annual convention at Jamaica yesterday in the new Methodist Episcopal church. The exercises were from half-past ten to three o'clock, the others at half-past seven P.M.—and a collation at the Town Hall from five to six was provided by the ladies of the village for their visiting friends. The convention was largely attended. [illegible] William T. Hill, of the Jamaica Methodist church, delivered the address of welcome; the Rev. Oliver E. Cobb, of Flushing, discussed the question, "What is the Mission of the Sunday School in Relation to the Growing Infidelity of the Age?" Papers were read upon the subject by the Rev. J. F. Freeman, of New York, upon "How can the Pastor Promote the Interest of the Sunday School?" Addresses by the Rev. B. M. Adams, of Hempstead, and the Rev. W. W. Knox, of Huntington, gave a series of blackboard illustrations. The railroads ran special trains for the occasion.

The second convocation of the Sunday schools of the Episcopal diocese of Long Island was held in Grace Church, Jamaica, at half-past two o'clock on Monday evening next. The Right Rev. Bishop Littlejohn will preside, and there will be special trains run over the Brooklyn and Jamaica and the Southern Railroad. The subjects discussed will be "The Best Method of Conducting Teachers' Meetings." The ladies of the congregation have made the usual arrangements for the entertainment of visitors.

THE GOVERNOR'S MILITARY STAFF.

In the article headed "The New Deal," published in Monday's HERALD, relating to the offices of which occupants will be appointed by the incoming Governor and Mayor, it was stated incorrectly that all the members of the Governor's military staff receive annual salaries, ranging from $1,800 to $2,400. The truth is that only the Adjutant General, the Inspector General and the Commissary General of Ordnance receive compensation for their services, while the Engineer-in-Chief, the Judge Advocate General, the Surgeon General, the Quartermaster General, the Paymaster General and [illegible] the Governor's Aides-de-camp perform their duties at their own expense. Indeed, the duties are so exacting [illegible] considerable personal expense.