

heaven on the earth, and there was given to him the key of the bottomless pit. And the smoke of the pit arose as the smoke of a great furnace, and the sun and the air were darkened with the smoke of the pit, and from the smoke of the pit there came out locusts upon the earth. And power was given to them as the scorpions of the earth have power.”

CHAP. III.

OUR BISHOPS AND PRIESTS FAITHFUL TO ZION—THE ANNIVERSARY OF TOM PAINE—CATHOLICS AND THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE—FALSE CHARGES AGAINST OUR AMERICAN BISHOPS—LIBERTY AND THE CHURCH—PROTESTANTISM IN LEAGUE WITH DESPOTISM—THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL POWER—THE RELATIVE POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT MINISTERS OVER THEIR CONGREGATIONS.

TELL me, ye defamers of God's Holy Church, that her bishops and priests are opposed to human liberty! Falsehood, black as hell, and ugly as the rotting carcass of Henry VIII! How dare you tempt the Lord our God! But the good Lord is merciful and slow to anger, and he permits you like tares to grow up with the wheat until the harvest. Our bishops and priests are not only sentinels on the watch towers of Zion, defending the gospel of salvation, but in every age from the day that St. Peter stood in the hall of Pudens, the Roman Senator, denouncing the tyranny of Rome, and proclaiming mercy and hope to the captive and the slave—the same privileges to the bondman and the free, down to

this very hour, they have always stood up for the rights of man, not as the infidel Paine defines them, but as Jesus of Nazareth taught and commanded.

And here let me say, by way of parenthesis, that the followers and admirers of Thomas Paine hold their blasphemous anniversaries in that section of *liberal* Christianity from which I understand Dr. Clark emanated. Year after year they unblushingly inculcate impiety and unbelief—making a mockery of Christ and His saints—pouring forth soul-destroying doctrines like streams of molten lead and burning lava. Notwithstanding all this, Dr. Clark remains as silent and as dumb as the Pyramid of Cheops. Why should he offend men of wealth and distinction belonging to that organization? It is modern progress that inspires such choice spirits, and moreover, they have nearly all been educated in the *common schools* of New England, where each in turn read his Bible and construed its meaning to suit his own taste and fancy.

Let but the Catholic Church proclaim her authority in matters of faith and discipline, and the great oracle of the "two steepled church" would awake to life, as if struck by a wizard's wand, and in his fulminations he would kick seven pulpits to pieces, and bang the inwards out of a dozen Bibles.

The accusation that Catholicity promotes despotism, as has been alleged by Clark & Co., is not only false, but highly criminal. Catholics form no mean portion of the census of these United States; Catholics first discovered this continent and planted the cross on its virgin soil. They took an active part in the early warfare of the country, and no part of Washington's army were braver or more enthusiastic in casting off the yoke of Great Britain than they.

But Dr. Clark asks, what brought Catholics here, why did they not go to Mexico or South America? Such a question would sound better coming from the lips of an

ignorant know-nothing, rather than from the mouth of a man having as much intelligence as the Doctor pretends to possess. Did George Washington and his compatriots, in 1776, ask Lafayette, Pulaski, Count de Grasse, Kosciuszko, De Kalb, and the brave Commodore John Barry (who was appointed by Washington to form the first naval fleet in the war of independence, and who never struck his colors to a British man of war), what brought them here, why did they not go to South America or Mexico? No! Washington's idea of patriotism was far different from Dr. Clark's. It is well for the cause of American freedom that such men as the hero of the North Dutch had no hand in its early deliberations. Washington was a soldier, a patriot, and an honest man; Clark is neither. This creature of circumstance has the hardihood to assert that Catholicism is incompatible with republican institutions. Does he not know that Catholic republics existed long before Columbus discovered

America? Did he never hear of San Marino, founded by a monk more than 1500 years ago, and the little republic of Andorra founded by a bishop in the ninth century? The people of these territories remain, even to this day, free and independent, thoroughly democratic in their principles, well educated, happy, and contented in their mountain homes.

Some of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Catholics—they have occupied positions of trust in almost every department of the government, and formed a large proportion of the army and navy. Now, will these calumniators of our Catholic brethren show us one, who proved unfaithful to the trust reposed in him? Among them all, there could not be found one Benedict Arnold. Can Protestants say as much? Our late war has given additional proofs of the loyalty of our bishops, although Dr. Clark asserts they are not and cannot be citizens of the Republic, because they owe allegiance to a

foreign power. There never was a grosser libel than this! 'Tis true that our ecclesiastics do not take an active part in politics, and it would be well for Protestant ministers if they followed their example in this regard, for it is my candid belief, that they did more to foment strife and discord in the body politic, by their political preaching, than any other class of our citizens. The office of the Catholic priest is too sacred—his labors too arduous, to allow him much time to devote to politics; but in his fealty to the government and to the laws he yields to none. A more thorough American than the late Archbishop Hughes never breathed the air of human liberty—and what we claim for him, may be said of all our bishops throughout the Republic. We cannot do better, perhaps, than give an extract from the transactions of the sixth provincial council of Baltimore in 1846, wherein the assembled bishops officially declared as follows:

“It is unnecessary for us to tell you,

brethren, that the kingdom of Christ, of which the Bishop of Rome, as successor of Peter, has received the keys, is not of this world; and that the obedience due to the Vicar of the Saviour is in no way inconsistent with your civil allegiance, your social duties as citizens, or your rights as men. We can confidently appeal to the whole tenor of our instructions, not only in our public addresses, but in our most confidential communications, and you can bear witness that we have always taught you to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, to God the things which are God's. Be not, then, heedful of the misrepresentations of foolish men, who, unable to combat the evidences of our faith, seek to excite unjust prejudice against that authority which has always proved its firmest support. Continue to practice justice and charity towards all your fellow-citizens—respect the magistrates—observe the laws—shun tumult and disorder, as free, and not as having liberty as a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God.”

The bishops of the fifth council of Baltimore made a still stronger declaration, in an official letter to the Pope, in answer to which the Holy Pontiff expressed his satisfaction thus: "Your letter was most pleasing to us." The extract from that letter reads thus: "They spread doubtful rumors against us among the people; with untiring efforts, they circulate among the ignorant and uninformed, books, which calumniate our most holy religion; they leave no means untried to infect with errors their Catholic servants; and . . . although our forefathers poured out their blood like water for the defense of our liberties against a *Protestant* oppressor, they yet seek to render us, their fellow-citizens, suspected by, and odious to the government, *by falsely asserting that we are reduced to servitude under the civil and political jurisdiction of a foreign prince, namely, of the Roman Pontiff, and that we are therefore unfaithful to the republic!*"

Did Dr. Clark take any pains to examine the subject well, before making such a sweeping and savage attack on the allegiance of our American bishops? It must have been a part of malice, and not a want of intelligence, that actuated our belligerent parson, for no well informed man in our day believes that the Pope of Rome claims any obedience from his children, scattered as they are all over the earth and under all forms of government, other than what they owe him in spiritual matters. The question of papal jurisdiction was long since discussed in both houses of the British parliament. Mr. Pitt took great pains to investigate the matter, and if those persons who admire Dr. Clark for his honesty, will look into Butler's Book of the Church, page 287, if they do not come to the conclusion, that the worthy pastor is possessed of the spirit of lying, they are as bad as he is. Mr. Pitt's investigations resulted in this: "that the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, can-

not absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever." There is not a monarchial government in Europe, that believes to the contrary of this. How comes it then that our brave, intelligent Americans of the Protestant stripe, allow themselves to be frightened by such a bugbear, which has no existence, save in the addled brains of their religious teachers? If Dr. Franklin, when minister to France (and we take it that he was as good, as pure and as patriotic as our worthy friend of the "two-steeped church," and his name will be cherished as a benefactor of his race long after Rufus W. Clark, D. D., shall be buried in oblivion and rotted out of memory), had such squeamish fears of Rome as our modern patriots, would he have solicited the Pope's Nuncio to appoint a Catholic bishop for America, lest American Catholics might be dependent on an English bishop; and recommended his friend and companion the Rev. Dr. Carroll, for that position?

Protestants are continually accusing the Church of intolerance, and, with a great flourish of trumpets, appeal to the Goddess of Liberty upon all occasions, especially when the See of Rome asserts her authority. As freedom from restraint is always agreeable to the carnal-minded, audiences applaud and accept the gilded bait regardless of consequences, never stopping to inquire whether their orator speaks truth or falsehood. Let me tell such people, that truth is only safe and lasting in its effects, in proportion as it maintains its authority; for the instant it compromises with falsehood it becomes hidden and lost to view, and error will stalk through the land corrupting the heart of man and outraging common sense. Christ has always spoken with authority, so have the Apostles and their successors. If religious truth is left to the caprice of the human mind, ungoverned and alone, heresies must necessarily arise, which the history of our race during the last eighteen centuries proves conclusively. Free thought without

a governing voice, has sped from one theory to another until finally it ended in Pantheism or Atheism. It is a thing impossible to reconcile the various opinions of mankind on a single article of faith when it is left an open question. The human mind being finite and limited in capacity, it cannot reason beyond a certain point — then again, men have different measures of intellectual strength — besides, pride and selfishness are too powerful ingredients in the composition of our nature, to allow truth at all times its natural supremacy. It follows, then, if the wisest man cannot penetrate into the mysteries of his own being, that, to make him a responsible agent, he must have a supernatural intelligence bestowed upon him, else he is compelled to grope his way through the maze of life, unable to get over his perplexity. How necessary therefore it is for him to have some faithful guide, to point out the way that leads to the promised land, the realms of truth and happiness, where the mists of error and ignorance shall

pass from before his eyes, and he be ushered into the full and perfect light of everlasting day.

The Catholic Church, from the first, promulgated and maintained, that truth was the very source of all liberty, and that mankind, rich and poor, black and white, from the king to the beggar, are equal in the sight of God, dear to His heart, created by His own august power, and destined to reign with Him forever in the Kingdom of His glory. Why, then, should the church that claims to be the spouse of the Most High, desire to despise and degrade his dear children in the flesh? To accuse her of such a crime, is a base and wicked fabrication — the Church not only established the principle of equality, but she made it practical. The child of the poorest Catholic peasant can aspire to the Papal chair as well as he of the blood royal. I have seen the poor French peasant, with his wooden shoes, tread the grand aisles of Notre Dame, side by side with the proudest and most wealthy citizen

of *la belle* France—kneel before the same altar—partake of the same sacraments, and no distinction made between them. What say the poor people of the First Reformed Church? All superiority is left outside the doors of the Catholic Church; inside, the king and the beggar are brought to the same level. By her divine philanthropy she elevates and ennobles the lowest creature in society, and has frequently brought kings and princes down from their exalted positions, to wash the feet of the poor. Is a religion that teaches such noble virtues as these, to be accused of favoring despotism? If an oppressed people, under a cruel and despotic government, wish to overthrow the oppressor, the Church permits them to arm themselves in defense of their liberties, and shake off the yoke that tyranny imposes upon them; but in case they are too feeble to resist, they are counseled to bear patiently the wrongs inflicted, rather than place themselves in an attitude which would surely bring destruction upon them. The

Church teaches them to die like Christians, knowing full well that the blood of martyrs is destructive to tyranny.

The Church is not, and never was, hostile to liberty; on the contrary, she is, and ever was, favorable to freedom. The doctrine that "all men are born free and equal," was held by her more than a thousand years before Thomas Jefferson was born. As early as the accession of Henry I, of England, an ecclesiastical council, held by St. Anselm, denounced slavery as contrary to the laws of God. The great synod of Armagh, at a time when Englishmen were in a state of bondage in Ireland, decreed and ordained that slavery must be abolished in that country; and it was done. That land, now in a condition of slavery herself, has the honor of the first general act of emancipation known in history.

A voice that teaches sovereigns that they should be the dispensers of kindness and benevolence to the people whom they govern, that they must reign according to the

spirit and letter of the law, and that there is a Judge and Prince in Heaven, who will one day bring them to an account for any wrong done to the subject, cannot be in league with despotism.

Let us now investigate the Protestant side of this question. Did not Henry VIII, the head and chief of English Protestants, cause his ministers to preach the *divine right* of kings, and obedience to royalty? In 1540, a miserable party of sycophants got together, obtained Parliamentary sanction, and compiled a work to show that subjects could not withdraw their obedience from their king, for any cause whatever; that the people must obey all the laws, proclamations, precepts and commandments, made by their princes and governors; that they must not draw their swords against their prince for any cause; nor against any other person without his leave. This work was written by those who called themselves Christian teachers. Archbishop Cranmer, at the coronation of Edward VI, declared that

his right to govern did not depend upon any engagement made at his coronation; that his crown was given him by Almighty God, and could not, by any failure in his administration, be forfeited. Bonner, in 1549, declared in a sermon at Paul's Cross, that any resistance to royalty would certainly bring eternal perdition on the rebel; that all such as rebelled against their prince, no matter the cause, get unto them damnation! "Those," said he, "that resist the high power, resist the ordinance of God; and he that dies in rebellion, by the words of God, is utterly lost, body and soul." Bonner was obliged to preach this doctrine, else lose his head or his diocese. The difference between him and a Catholic bishop, would simply be this: the latter would forfeit both, sooner than give utterance to such a doctrine, while the former would preach any thing prescribed to him, rather than lose either. In the Book of Homilies, the "right divine" is maintained, and in the tenth sermon of the first book,

Elizabeth caused the same doctrine to be preached after the following manner: "The high power and authority of kings, with their making of laws, judgments, and offices, are the ordinances not of man, but of God." And further, "it is not lawful, for inferiors and subjects in any cause, to resist and stand against the supreme powers;" and again, "this is so manifest, it is an intolerable ignorance, madness, and wickedness, for subjects to make any murmuring, rebellion, resistance, commotion or insurrection, against this dear and dread sovereign, lord and king (Elizabeth), ordained and appointed of God's goodness, for their commodity, peace, and quietness." This was the kind of doctrine preached and backed up by a few texts of Scripture, from that period to the time of Queen Anne; and so the Protestant Church of England taught in the reign of Charles II, and of James. In 1622, a man named Knight attempted to inculcate principles differing from the above, when a law was passed and put strictly in

force, and the graduates of Oxford had to make oath, that "in no case is it lawful to use force against the sovereign." The book from which poor Knight obtained his proofs was ordered to be burnt publicly before the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Mainwaring was made bishop by Charles I, for holding to the doctrine of the "right divine," and the Protestant Church in convocation adopted his views, adding, that "under the most fearful penalties, the subject must give tribute, aid, and subsidy, and all manner of support to kings, by the law of God, and of nature, and of nations, in all cases, and that the subject has not so good a right to his individual property as the king has to it." The House of Commons, however, having a higher appreciation of justice, condemned the canons after the church had passed them. This act brought the Commons in direct antagonism to the church and the king; until at last the Commons triumphed, and brought the king's head to the block. Anarchy and con-

fusion became the order of the day in Protestant England, and the blood that was shed by contending factions was fearful to contemplate, and although Cromwell dissolved the long parliament and seized the reins of power, the "right divine" still asserted its authority. Tillotson wrote a letter to the unfortunate Lord Russell, previous to his execution, informing him that non-resistance was the doctrine of all Protestant churches.

Let us contrast such teachings, with what the Church prescribed, and which the learned doctor willfully ignores. Does he not know that the doctrine, that "the people are the legitimate source of civil authority," was of Catholic origin? Let him turn over the pages of English history, and he will find the Holy Pontiff proclaiming the decision, which afterwards became a law, as far back as the time of Edward the Confessor, "that unless the ruler properly discharge his duties towards the people of his realm, he shall not be allowed the name of king, even

by courtesy." The Catholic Judge Bracton, in the reign of Henry III, says, "he is a king when he reigns well, but a tyrant when he oppresses the people." In another place, this learned advocate proclaims, that "when the king ceases to govern according to law, he is not a king; he is a tyrant, and a minister of the devil." Both Edward and Richard II were deposed by a Catholic parliament, for misgovernment and injustice to the people. Fortescue, Catholic Chancellor of Henry VI, publicly declared that "a king was placed by the people to defend the laws of his subjects, their bodies and their goods." Thus the Catholic Church and Catholic doctrine ever stood between the people and their tyrants. Does not the minister of the "two steepled church" know well that *Magna Charta*, the basis of English rights and liberties, was wrung from King John by Catholics, the priests and bishops at their head? They taught the people their civil rights, and took care that the king duly observed his oath of office.