



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. IV.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1853.

NO. 8.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ANGLICAN THEORY.

(From the Catholic Standard.)

"Its Prayer-book is an Act of Parliament of two centuries ago; and its cathedrals and colleges are the spoils of Catholicism."—DR. NEWMAN.

We will suppose that it was the religious views, not of the King and Parliament, but of the bishops and convocation, which revolutionised the Establishment and that it was the clergy who in solemn synod deliberately and voluntarily resolved to remodel that Church which had existed in this land ever since the conversion of the Saxons. It seems almost ludicrous to entertain such a hypothesis even for an instant in the face of history: but we wish to give every possible advantage to the Anglican in the discussion of his theory. Let us, then, imagine such a synod to have assembled together for the purpose of reforming religion. They are animated with a deep sense of Roman error and Roman usurpation, and are determined to renounce the one and shake off the other. Now, the first question which meets them is the ascertaining of their powers; by what authority, in what name, do they take upon themselves to carry through such measures? You are only a part of a large society, they might be told, ruled by a central government, which has enjoyed a sway of many centuries, such as no temporal kingdom in the world can boast of. You propose to sever yourselves from its allegiance, and to set up an independent sovereignty of your own. In civil affairs such a proceeding, where it fails, is called a rebellion; when successful, it changes its name to revolution, and the new organisation which emanates from it is legitimised by its existence *de facto*, and the right of communities of men to self-government. But you abjure such principles; legitimacy, for you can come from no other source than that divine corporation, instituted for ever to rule the Church and to declare the faith. You are rebelling from that universal corporation in the judgment of every other member of it but yourselves. You are throwing yourselves out of the Church altogether. On what principle do you take your stand? The Church of Rome, you reply, has corrupted the faith and usurped a dominion to which she has no title. Who says so? Do not attempt to answer that you can show that Rome teaches both in regard to government and faith what is not Catholic truth. Before we inquire into the truth or falsehood of Roman doctrine, we must first settle what is the *tribunal* by which that issue is to be tried. Upon your principles the question with you logically can never be what the doctrine is, but *who pronounced it*. The divine right of the episcopate to rule Christians, and expound the faith, is the centre of church principles. In framing new articles of belief, you are bound to produce the express warrant and commission of that episcopate. You are but an insignificant minority of the bishops with whom you have been in communion: an overwhelming majority declares the Roman faith to be the true faith, and the Roman government to be the divine government instituted by Christ. The power of the keys, the ultimate determination of doctrine and practice, resides in the majority of the episcopate, or does not reside at all in the institutions as such. To refuse submission to the decisions of the majority is to recognise a tribunal higher than the episcopate, a tribunal whose only seat can be the individual mind of each Christian. If, therefore, the decision of the majority of the episcopate is the sole authority which you can recognise as binding the Church, and holding it together as one society, on what basis would articles of religion voted by a few bishops rest, and how would the Church of England escape the condemnation of having broken away from the Church of Christ altogether, and being upon church principles no Church at all?

We are a national Church, you answer; we are not creating a new independence, but vindicating an old one. National episcopates are for their several nations integral church unities. But what is a national church? and what is a nation? A political and secular division, defined by geographical and other principles wholly foreign to church: in no way is it a constituent and organic element of the great corporation of the Christian Church as described by church principles. A thousand worldly accidents determine the limits of a nation; how can they furnish a principle for investing a portion only of the bishops of Christendom with sovereign rights? A nation is a purely secular institution; whatever is national has the state for its ground and basis; it can have no principle higher than the state. It is in the last degree preposterous in upholders of church principles to seek from the state an authority which shall break up the episcopate into fragments, and enthrone in sovereignty an arbitrary number of bishops. Yet this is what they do who try to obtain a sanction for the Reformation, by representing it as

the regular act of an independent episcopate. Had the King and Parliament chosen to stand aloof at the breach with Rome, the whole episcopate of England would not have had a valid church reason for enforcing the concurrence of a single bishop who refused to share in their reforms. Such a one could have successfully pleaded that a national church was a purely administrative body, subordinate to, and acting in the name of, the universal episcopate which ruled over all Christendom, and that no number of bishops connected by geographical and secular ties could constitute themselves a sovereign power, or furnish him with a justification for rebelling against the Church; for the voice of the universal episcopate, and not that of a few bishops dwelling in the same land, was the voice of God. Nothing short of an Ecumenical Council could on Church principles have compelled such a dissentient to submit to his colleagues. He would have had as much right to excommunicate them for revolting against the Pope, as they to excommunicate him for not joining in that revolt.

And if the absurdity is great of attempting to found independence of church government consistently with church principles on a relation determined by the state, how much greater the absurdity and impossibility of rendering the state the arbiter of the faith? The size of a nation may be enlarged or reduced by a single battle; the number of its national bishops may be prodigiously altered by a treaty or an invasion; new provinces may send to its synods prelates entertaining theological views diametrically opposed to those held by the ancient clergy; how is a principle of religious certainty—a certainty which theory makes to rest solely on the dictum of the national synod—to be found amid such purely mundane contingencies? England had two convocations. If Canterbury had pronounced for the two elements in the distribution of the sacrament to the laity, and York for one only, how should an Anglican have learnt the right faith and practice? Would Canterbury have been orthodox, because its province was geographically larger? or would two different creeds have been respectively true in the northern and southern divisions of the Anglican Church? Nay, would there have been one or two Anglican Churches? Ecclesiastical history furnishes an unbroken record of the conflicting opinions of national churches, and of the decrees and counter decrees, accompanied by the direst forms of mutual anathematising of the bishops of the same national church. Where is the Anglican to find amid such perplexity that authority which alone determines for him what true religion is? He will find it he says, in Catholic consent. But if the bishops as such cannot declare wherein that consent truly consists; if opposing bishops utter conflicting oracles; if he is to seek for the authority of a doctrine or a church, not in the decisions themselves of bishops, but in his own view of the rightness or wrongness of those decisions, then the episcopate does not possess the prerogative of declaring the faith authoritatively, and the unhappy Anglican is launched on the great Protestant ocean of private judgment.

One harbor of refuge, indeed, may present itself to his mind, but to reach its shelter he must leave the Church of England. He may logically and consistently place the oracle of truth in an Ecumenical Council, but such an opinion must make him despair of the legality of his Church. For not only was the Church of England not constituted by a general council, but it is also notorious that the last thing which an assembled synod of all the bishops of the world would do would be to sanction the doctrine and constitution of that Church.

It is plain, then, that the Reformation was not the work of English bishops, and even if it had been did not derive its legitimacy from them. The theory of the apostolate is unable to justify that great event. For the faith then professed, and the ecclesiastical system then set up, the Anglican can get upon his principles no other authority than *the private judgment of so many individual bishops*: for their union into one national church, defined by geographical and political limits, cannot, except upon the Protestant principle of the right of every society to govern itself, make them a sovereign power.

FREESOILISM, ENGLAND, AND IRELAND.

(From the N. Y. National Democrat.)

The English "philanthropists," still further inspired by the presence of Mrs. Stowe, and the reading of the Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin, are mighty busy in determining what can be done with slavery in the United States. They have made up their minds, that all they can do is to "agitate—agitate—and leave the result with Providence."

Well, that they have already been doing, in com-

pany with the abolitionists and free-soilers of our own country, and so far, Providence seems to have treated their agitation with contempt; for the institution of slavery has been both extended and strengthened by that very agitation.

We do not, however, regret this late intimate coalition between the English "philanthropists," and the American abolitionists and free-soilers—they form together a band of fanatics and impostors which will evermore carry the remedy for its own evils.—The fact that the slavery agitation is hereafter to be clearly understood as being "half English" will sufficiently disgust and outrage the whole American mind, to draw new disgrace upon the whole movement.

The immense Irish population of the United States will hereafter be more powerfully aroused than ever against every possible shape of abolitionism—through this channel alone the masses will be mightily exerted against every form of it. Enough that it is English aided and abetted by a few traitors at home. And what capital we shall have to fight this English agitation! We shall have but to compare the condition of the working men of the South, with England's treatment of Ireland, and have a perpetual rebuke for the hypocrisy of abolitionism.

Let England first settle her account with God and mankind for her ruination of Ireland, before she sends her money and her fanatics to agitate in the United States. She will labor in vain to stifle American sympathy for Ireland, through her Agents and allies, the free-soil press of this country. One of these hirelings has recently shown its English (cloven) foot by a direct assault upon the capacity of Ireland and the Irish for self-government. The natural capacity of Ireland for self-government is, in all respects, equal, if not superior, to that of Canada.

By its geographical position it is the natural commercial depot of western Europe for all the trade of the East. Then she has the most fruitful soil of western Europe, varied with every degree of elevation, that renders it most favorable for all kinds of agricultural produce, with the most inland districts traversed by rivulets and streams; having also the largest river of the three kingdoms all situated in a mild and uniform climate, where the dews of heaven fall gently on all parts, as if to make it the peculiar abode of happiness and freedom.

Then the geological structure of the country is alike remarkable for variety and richness, with rocks of slate, quarries and limestone and granite, iron ores, sand-beds and coals, the most extensive in those islands. The iron ores of Leinster and Connaught are said to average even those used in England.—Then there are extensive mines of copper, and rich veins of lead stretching all the way through Wicklow, Wexford, Cork, Down, King's County and Clare.

Then Ireland possesses unlimited capabilities of water power. The banks of the Shannon, the Lee, the Liffey, the Blackwater, the Boyne, or the Bann, invite every variety and extent of machinery; where factories for the manufacture of flax, cotton, or wool might work incessantly in the midst of a greedy market. And what is best of all the raw material might all be found at home. Wool especially, could be had at their very doors in unfailing supplies. Ireland has two millions of acres of the first pasturage, at an elevation of eight hundred feet above the level of the sea. What a wool-growing country it might become.

Then to all these natural advantages for national independence and wealth, we must not forget to add her fisheries which have been called "a girdle of gold encircling the island."

Ireland has eighteen maritime counties out of her thirty-two; and it is estimated that at least 120,000 heads of families might be profitably employed in working these inexhaustible sources of wealth.

But notwithstanding these exhaustless treasuries with such facilities of transit, the soil is poorly cultivated, the mines are unworked, the rivers and streams flow idly on to the ocean, and the richest land in the world is crushed into beggary. England must manufacture, and Ireland, with immeasurably rich resources, must be only her market place.—Hence there was an English law to crush Irish manufactures. There was a penalty upon industry, and upon the investment of Irish capital, which stopped at once many thousands of spindles, turned many thousand Irishmen and women out of employment, put a seal on the mine's mouth, and still sits by the waterside, like a foul witch, frightening honest industry from its path!

It is estimated that Dublin city alone sends several hundreds of thousands of pounds, annually to Newcastle and Whitelaven to buy coal, while under the soil of Leinster according to Sir Robert Shane, the total quantity of pure solid coal is 63,000,000 of tons. We see here how effectually English law has

broken up, in Ireland, the natural relation of town and county; a policy that would impoverish and destroy any country on earth even were it peopled by men as pure and faultless in habit as the angels of God in Heaven.

In this case of coals we see what is true of nearly every article of consumption in Ireland of food, clothes, and furniture; the cities the towns are made the channels through which the country is drained of its wealth. The city's trade is only the robbery of the country. That is just what Ireland gets from England.

Ireland's independence would re-establish that natural relation between her town and country, by which the city's wants are made the country's wealth. That alone would save the country. An Irish Republic would at once re-establish the legitimate trade of its old strongholds, such as Dublin, Ballingarry, Kilkenny, Carrick, Loughrea, and Limerick, by mufletting the soil and the treasures of those English laws that now condemn them to barrenness and uselessness.

Once the noble land of Sicily was the granary of Rome and was administered as a province of the Roman Empire under a Praetor, (so the Lord Lieutenant was called) whose duty was to see that Sicily sent her tribute of corn, and wine and oil punctually to her master's gates. For many generations this process went on; but the end came; the richest island in the world began to be desolated by a perennial famine, and as the eyes of Cicero saw it thus: "Those very fields and hills, which I had once seen in all their verdant pride and beauty, look now squallid and forsaken, and appear as if in mourning for the absence of the husbandman. The fields of Herbita, of Enna, of Murgantium, of Machra, of Assorium, of Agyra, are mostly deserted; and we look in vain for the owners of so many jugera of land.—The vast fields around Leontini, the pride of corn counties, which, when sown, seemed to defy scarcity, have become so degenerated and wasted, that we in vain looked for Sicily in the most fertile part of Sicily."

Such was the fate of Sicily. Such is precisely the fate of Ireland. Only Ireland has a worse misery than the steady drain of her resources in the endless distraction of her population. A people staring at each other with mutual distrust and horror—made enemies to one another by every artifice and falsehood which the prolific mind of England could devise—that is the crowning misery of Ireland. This has been a never-resting labor of both the religion and law of England, to sow Ireland with fire-brands and distract with mutual hatred and jealousies her population.

So much for the effort which the "English philanthropists" and the American "free-soilers" are making, to throw the present degradation and misery of Ireland off the shoulders of Ireland. It is a worthy compact, truly a most excellent precious band of impostors in the prostituted name of philanthropy—these "English philanthropists" and American "free-soilers."

A REVELATION WORTH LOOKING AFTER.

(From the N. Y. Freeman's Journal.)

Mr. Brownson in an address delivered last June at Mt. St. Mary's College, Md., made a statement of great importance respecting the origin of the State-School movement in the State of New York, and now spreading over the country. He asserted as of his own knowledge that many who have taken the lead in this godless State-Free-School movement were members with him of the Fanny Wright and Robert Dale Owen crusade against marriage, religion and property, and that a "secret organisation was formed at that time having in view precisely what has been done by the advocates of the State-School-System in the banishment of religion from the schools."

This is a revelation of great importance, and we think that no better service could be done to the country than to drag forth to public execration and denunciation the names of some, if not of all, whose Free-School "patriotism" originated in the abominations of Fanny-Wright-ism. We presume that some of the leaders of the Free-School movement, some who have reputations as men of morality if not of religion, will call upon Mr. Brownson to produce all the names he knows of. Otherwise the charge brought against many who took the lead, will lie against all the active leaders of a scheme whose origin is thus exposed. "Fanny-Wright-ism and Free-Schools!" Let those who object to the association of the two endeavor to disprove it.

The following are Mr. Brownson's words:—"It is not without design that I have mentioned the name of Frances Wright, the favorite pupil of Jeremy Bentham, and famous infidel lecturer through our country, some twenty years ago; for I happen to know, what may not be known to you all, that she and her friends were the great movers in the scheme of godless education, now the fashion in our country. I knew this remarkable woman well, and it was my