

## The True Witness.

## CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS,  
GEORGE E. CLERK AND JOHN GILLIES,  
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.  
All communications to be addressed to the Editor,  
G. E. CLERK.

## TERMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance; but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, price 3d, can be had at this Office; Pickers' News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dalton's, No. 3, St. Lawrence Main Street.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 20, 1860.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE now famous pamphlet—"The Pope and the Congress," being generally accepted as a proof of Louis Napoleon's hostile designs towards the Holy See—has given much satisfaction to British Protestantism; thus verifying the old adage that, whenever Christ is to be crucified between two thieves, then Pilate and Herod are made friends together. On the other hand, the Catholics of Europe are naturally indignant at the conduct of the French ruler; and even the French press, usually so docile, cannot restrain the expression of its opinion. Foremost amongst the latter stands *L'Univers*, which has already received its "second warning" for an article and an address to the Sovereign Pontiff, signed Louis Veuillot. The Pope too, is determined not to sacrifice his rights, or the rights of his successors, nor to allow his Representative to appear at the coming Congress, until such time as an official denial shall have been given to the report which attributes the sentiments of the offensive pamphlet to the inspirations of the French Emperor himself. It is asserted however, on the strength of a telegram, that Count Walewski had declared to the Diplomatic Corps in Paris, that, so long as he remained at the head of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the pamphlet in question should not be considered as the programme of the French Ministry. It is hinted too that Austria, Spain, and Naples have signified their intention not to send representatives to the Congress, unless the Pope be there represented;—Russia rejects the policy indicated in the pamphlet; Austria accepts it as equivalent to a menace; the Catholics of Europe look upon it as a declaration of war against the Pope; dissensions of a formidable nature, on account thereof, are spoken of as existing in the French Cabinet;—and it is to be hoped that Louis Napoleon, if his connection with the pamphlet be what it is affirmed that it is, will yet see the prudence of reconsidering his position, and of repudiating officially the sentiments of the writer. If thrown out as a "feeler" merely, and in order to ascertain the general sentiments of the European public towards the Pope, it has answered its purpose.—It has shown that the great Catholic Powers are not prepared to recognize the "right of inspiration;" that they are not desirous of degrading the Sovereign Pontiff to the abject condition of a stipendiary. Better far that he should again be driven into the Catacombs, than drag out a wretched existence as the pensioner of Louis Napoleon; and indeed so preposterous is that section of the famous pamphlet, wherein this scheme of a yearly income or pension to the Pope is broached, that it is difficult to believe that it could have been the work, or that it has received the sanction, of such a sagacious statesman as the French ruler undoubtedly is. Such an arrangement, even if accepted by the Pope, could not endure ten years; and the Protestant subjects of the Powers parties thereto, would naturally protest against being taxed for the support of him whom they profess to look upon as Anti Christ, and the "Man of Sin."

From England we have tidings which will cause deep regret to every reader of the English language, to the friends of literature throughout the world. Lord Macaulay, whose pen has so long charmed the public, died in London on the 28th ult., of disease of the heart. As a brilliant writer of fiction, the deceased Peer has left no equal behind him. "*Waverley*" and Macaulay's "*History of England*," will long retain their position as the two most exquisite Historical Romances in the English, or indeed in any, language. The one is written from a Tory, the other from a Whig standpoint; and if to the author of "*Waverley*" an impartial posterity yields the palm, as the more honest and accurate narrator of facts—to the illustrious deceased, the author of the "*History of England*," it will assign the tribute of its admiration for the inexhaustible fertility of his genius, and the skill with which he has contrived to invest the creations of his brain with the attributes of reality. If Sir Walter Scott is the more faithful historian and remarkable for his rigid adherence to facts, Lord Macaulay is certainly entitled to precedence as the better poet—as the true representative of the ancient "*troubadour*," or "*finder*." We believe in his William Prince of Orange, as we believe in Ariel, as we believe in Caliban, as we believe in the Baron of Bradwardine, or in Caleb Balderstone, or in Meg Merrilies; and herein consists the highest merit of Lord Macaulay. He has been to us a poet, or maker; and though we know that William of Orange, as drawn by his hands, is a sheer fiction, as much the creature of the poet's fantasy as is an Ariel, we willingly yield our reason captive to our imagination, whilst lingering over his glorious word-pictures; and for the time almost forget that the hero of his brilliant romance was one of the most detestable scoundrels that ever escaped the gallows or the whipping post. Macaulay, in short, has done for the hero of Glencoe what Milton in his great epic has done for another Whig, the first or Prince of Whigs. As we read the *Paradise Lost*, the figure of him of whom we are told that he was a "liar," that is

to say, "Whig," "from the beginning," rises before us in awful majesty; despite our reason, we are almost made to sympathize with him, and to wish that he had been victor in the conflict which he waged with Michael and his angels. As Milton dealt with theology, so Lord Macaulay dealt with history; and if the one has given us a poem, so the other has left us a romance, which will be read and admired so long as the English language shall itself endure.

The Colonial Legislature has been prorogued to the 13th of February, not then to meet for the dispatch of business. It is not yet certain when the session will actually commence; but it is said that this event will occur in the course of the month of March.

By the *Anglo-Saxon* from Liverpool, the 4th inst., we learn that serious doubts had arisen as to the meeting of Congress: by some it is said to be indefinitely postponed, whilst by others it is confidently asserted that the Congress is to meet on the 12th of Feb. A dispatch from Rome of the 3rd inst., informs us that the Duke of Grammont had given the Pope assurance that the pamphlet, "*The Pope and the Congress*," did not speak the French Emperor's sentiments; and that with this explanation the Pope expressed himself satisfied.

FAITH AND REASON.—Our readers must of course remember Dr. Cahill's lecture recently delivered in New York upon "Faith and Reason," and wherein he laid down, and established his thesis, that, of itself, human reason, a natural faculty, was inefficient to acquire Christian Faith. This proposition, which no one can contest without by implication, either asserting the competency of the natural in the supernatural order, or dragging down "Christian Faith" from the supernatural to the natural order—has however been assailed—and as the *Quebec Gazette* assures us with great success—by a Rev. Mr. Clark, a Protestant minister, who as our cotemporary pretends "has triumphantly met and refuted the proposition of the Irish orator." As however, we entertain a different opinion; as, after a careful perusal of the Rev. Mr. Clarke's lecture, as reported by the *Quebec Gazette*, it is clear to us that the former has never attempted even to meet or grapple with Dr. Cahill's proposition—"The inefficiency of human reason to acquire Christian Faith"—we purpose to say a few words upon the subject; and so to give our readers an idea of the manner in which it has been treated by the Protestant lecturer.

The question at issue is simply this:—"Is human reason inefficient, *per se*, or is it sufficient to acquire Christian Faith?" The question is not "Is human reason a faculty which man is bound to use, and which must therefore be of some assistance to him, in his religious enquiries?" but whether it is of itself sufficient to attain to the certain knowledge of any of the truths propounded by the Christian revelation? But this question is answered by its own terms. If human reason be not "inefficient" in the premises, it is "sufficient;" and if sufficient, revelation is unnecessary, and therefore there can be, properly speaking, no Christian revelation. In other words; to deny the inefficiency, is to assert the sufficiency, of human reason to acquire Christian Faith; and to assert the latter, is to reject revelation, and the entire supernatural order in Christianity. Now though we have not the honor of an acquaintance with the Rev. Mr. Clarke of Quebec, and though we do not even pretend to know to what denomination he belongs, yet we presume from the fact that he lectured before the Wesleyan Methodist Biblical and Literary Society, that he admits to some extent a supernatural element in Christianity, and recognises its truths as truths supernaturally revealed, and hence not discoverable by human reason; he must therefore recognise the inefficiency of human reason, and thus admit the very proposition which the *Gazette* boasts that he has "triumphantly refuted."

According to Dr. Cahill's definition, Faith consists in believing facts which we cannot comprehend, and which reason could never have discovered—upon testimony or evidence which we cannot deny without doing violence to our reason. Thus Dr. Cahill by implication clearly asserts the competency of reason to sit in judgment upon the testimony or evidences of Christianity—which like all other evidences are and must be addressed to the reason; but he demands from reason this—that having once satisfied itself of the competency of the witness propounding, it shall humbly and unreservedly submit itself to the dogma propounded.

The questions—whether there was a person called Christ?—whether He was put to death?—whether after death He appeared to, and conversed with, His disciples?—whether He commissioned a certain number of those disciples to proclaim to others the dogmas by Him revealed to them, promising to them His continual presence and assistance even to the end of the world?—are questions in the natural order; and upon which, therefore, human reason is as sufficient to sit in judgment, as it is to decide upon any other historical question—e.g., as to whether there was a Roman Emperor called Tiberius?—as to whether Charles I. was beheaded?—or whether the Duke of Wellington fought the battle of Waterloo? But—whether Christ was a creature conceived in the ordinary manner, or the eternal God? whether in the Godhead there be two or more Persons? whether there be a Holy Ghost? whether certain writings were directly inspired by that Holy Ghost? whether the death of Christ upon the Cross is of spiritual benefit to the human race? and in short all other questions upon matters of Christian faith, are, as lying in the supernatural order, questions upon which reason is utterly incompetent to form any opinion whatsoever. It may accept them, not as questions, but as truths; but if it does so, it will be, not on account of any intrinsic evidence of their truth, but solely because of its conviction of the competency in the supernatural order, of the authority by which those truths are presented for its acceptance. If the Quebec lecturer demurs to this, we would take the liberty of asking how, by human reason alone, he would establish the fact of the Trinity? and if human reason, un-

aided by revelation, cannot do this, then of itself it is not sufficient to acquire Christian Faith; and if it is not sufficient, then it is "inefficient," which is all that Dr. Cahill pretends that it is. This too is all that the latter attempted to establish; for, as revelation, by implication asserts a reasonable being—to whom alone revelation can be made—so, when we deny the efficiency of human reason in matters of faith, we no more make abnegation of reason in order to extol faith, than, when we assert the inefficiency of nature to merit a supernatural reward, we deny nature in order to extol grace.

How, then, does the Rev. Mr. Clarke meet and refute Dr. Cahill's proposition? By elaborately proving that which no man ever dreamt of contesting; and by dexterously assuming that which he is unable to prove. We will give specimens of the manner in which our Quebec lecturer accomplishes these marvellous feats.

For instance, in the report of his lecture, as given in the *Gazette*, we find several paragraphs devoted to prove that reason is sufficient to establish the authenticity, or historical credibility—(a fact exclusively belonging to the natural order)—of the Gospel narratives of the life and death of Christ, in so far as the facts therein narrated came under the cognisance of the writers' senses. The *Gazette* may style this a "triumphant refutation" of Dr. Cahill; but to us it appears as a work of supererogation, of which so evangelical a person as the Rev. Mr. Clarke should entertain a profound horror.

Of the other process by which he meets and refutes Dr. Cahill, the annexed paragraph, in which the lecturer seeks to establish the fact that reason is *per se* competent to ascertain, not only the "authenticity" i.e. the historical credibility—or credibility in the natural order—of the Gospel narratives, but their genuineness and inspiration—that is, their credibility in the supernatural order—is an amusing specimen. We submit it to our readers; premising that, according to the *Quebec Gazette*, the Rev. Mr. Clarke "is a good sample of his countrymen and coreligionists in this respect" (religious controversy with Papists); and certainly in this case we accept the *Gazette's* eulogy of the Rev. Mr. Clarke and his coreligionists, as well merited by the latter:

But the task of reason is not yet finished; she must not only satisfy herself as to the certainty of the main facts of the Gospel history; but as to the genuineness of the professedly sacred books which record these transactions. Were they really written by the men whose names they bear, and during the age to which they are ascribed? Here reason will find abundant materials to help her to a satisfactory conclusion. She will find an uninterrupted chain of testimony in favor of the genuineness and inspiration of the sacred books, reaching down from the apostolic age to the present.

Mark the adroit, if not honest, manner in which this "good sample" of Protestant controversialists slips in the little words "and inspiration." His thesis, that with which he started, was, that reason could establish the "genuineness" of the books of which the Bible is composed; that is, that they were written by the persons whose names they severally bear; a fact purely in the natural order, and to be ascertained by the same process as that by which the authorship of the *Waverley Novels* or *Junius's Letters* must be ascertained—and which, because a fact in the natural order, can be established by witnesses in the same order. "Inspiration" on the other hand involves a fact in the supernatural order, to which none but witnesses in that order can testify; and yet, though he started with the "genuineness" only of the sacred books, our lecturer ingeniously contrives at the end of his paragraph, to squeeze in the small, but all important words, "and inspiration"—as if genuineness and "inspiration" were one and the same thing; or as if a work because it were "genuine" was, therefore, necessarily "inspired."

Granting for instance, that natural reason can establish the fact that the book called the Gospel of St. Luke was actually written by a person of the name of Luke, how would it thence follow as the natural logical sequence, that the Gospel of St. Luke was inspired? or that its writer was entitled to be believed when narrating events of which it is morally and physically impossible that he could have had any immediate knowledge? We may of course believe him, and accept of him as a competent because honest witness, when testifying to events of which he had himself had personal cognisance; but his testimony will not of itself suffice to establish the marvellous facts recorded in his introductory chapters; and where he testifies to a class of facts which, if judged of by human reason, must at once be rejected as false, because opposed to all the known physical or physiological laws with which the human reason is acquainted. The writer himself nowhere pretends that he obtained his knowledge of the events connected with the birth of Christ through any supernatural channel; we know that he could have had no immediate cognisance thereof; so far from setting up any pretensions to "inspiration," he, himself, assigns as his reason for writing on the subject at all, not that he been specially moved thereto by God's Holy Spirit, but—that "many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things." How then are we to conclude from the premise, that Luke was the writer of the book that bears his name, to the fact of its "inspiration," and the credibility of its narrative of facts recorded in its first chapter? It is in vain for the Rev. Mr. Clark to appeal to "tradition," or an uninterrupted chain of testimony; for as a Protestant he must reject tradition, as competent to establish any fact in the supernatural order; and he can assign no more constant tradition, no stronger "chain of testimony" in favor of the inspiration of the writings which bear the name of Luke, than the Catholic can adduce in support of the doctrine of the Real Presence. Natural reason cannot establish the fact of inspiration. For instance, at the promptings of human reason, we are prepared to admit that the Rev. Mr. Clark actually delivered the lecture reported in the *Quebec Gazette*, because the "genuineness" of that lecture is a fact in the natural order, in which order the *Gazette* is a competent witness. But if the Rev. Mr. Clark, or his friends for him, were to claim for his lec-

ture the quality of "inspiration," we should most reasonably reject their testimony without necessarily impugning the honesty of their intentions; because "inspiration" is a fact in the supernatural order, in which order human reason is "inefficient," and which no witness in the natural order can satisfactorily establish.—If the Rev. Mr. Clarke thinks otherwise, here is the problem we propose for his solution—"Given the genuineness of the books which bear the name of Luke, to prove their inspiration."

We do not intend—not pending the solution of the above problem is it necessary for us—to follow the Rev. Mr. Clark through his argument against the faith of the Catholic Church in the Real Presence in the Blessed Eucharist. This only would we observe, that there is nothing therein "more contrary to reason" or to those "physical" laws to which the Rev. gentleman appeals, than there is in the doctrine of the Trinity, or in the stupendous mystery of the Incarnation. That a virgin should conceive and bear a son, is irreconcilable by human reason with those well-known physical laws; and he who accepts it, as a truth, but rejects the doctrine of the Real Presence because of the physical difficulties with which the latter dogma is attended, is as one who strains at the gnat, but swallows the camel. This too would we add.

The doctrine of the Real Presence is beyond the reach of, but is not contrary to, our senses; for in so far as the latter can take cognisance thereof, they confirm the teachings of the Church—that, after consecration, the accidents, or phenomena of bread and wine remain unchanged. Of "substance," as supersensible, no one will pretend that the senses can take any cognisance, nor, as the most illustrious Protestant philosophers of modern times admit, is it possible to argue from phenomena to noumena. The assertion that,—"the Syrian language which our Lord used, contains no equivalent to 'represents' or 'signifies'—and thus the substantive verb 'is' is used instead"—is simply false, and indicates that the lecturer either is profoundly indifferent to facts, or that he is woefully ignorant of modern Oriental philological researches. There is no language richer than, perhaps none so rich, in equivalents for "signifies" and "represents" as the Syrian language which our Lord used or is upon grounds held to have used.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW.—Second New York Series. No. 1, January, 1860.

- I. Christianity or Gentilism.
- II. The Soul's Activity.
- III. Manah's Triumph of the Church.
- IV. The Bible against Protestants.
- V. The True Cross.
- VI. The Yankee in Ireland.
- VII. Literary Notices and Criticisms.

*Brownson's Review* is always a welcome visitor; and even when Catholics may honestly differ with the Reviewer on questions not involving any point of Catholic teaching, they must still admire the energy with which he defends his views; they must still admit the honesty of his intentions, and applaud the motives by which he is actuated.

The first article on our list is devoted to a notice of a recent work, "*Pope or President, Startling Disclosures of Romanism as Revealed by its own writers. Facts for Americans.*" The Reviewer places the controversy as between Catholicism and Protestantism on its true grounds; showing how greatly that controversy has altered its position since the days of Bossuet, and how little adapted to the wants of the non-Catholic world of the present day are the arguments which told with crushing effect upon the heretics of the XVI and XVII centuries.

The Reviewer also alludes to the hostile criticism which his article on the "*Romanic and Germanic Orders*," in his number for October last, has provoked from the greater part of the Catholic press of this Continent, and contends that he has been unfairly treated. His object in the offending article was not to disparage French or Irish Catholicity; but to refute the illogical, and indeed anti-Christian arguments of those who falsely pretend that the Celt is by nature more predisposed to Catholicity than is the Teuton; and to assert the fundamental truths of the unity of the human race, and that God has made of blood all the nations of men. Upon these points there should be no difference amongst Catholics; and if this be all that the Reviewer meant to say in his October article, we for one most heartily agree with him, and join with him in his protest against the absurd and anti-Christian sentiments of Dr. McElheran's work—a work, even in a literary point of view, too contemptible for the Reviewer's serious notice.

Yet the Reviewer himself must we think, upon cool reflection, admit, that the manner in which he treated his subject, was calculated to give serious, and not unreasonable offence to his Catholic brethren of Celtic origin. To reprove the unfounded boastings of some amongst them, and to maintain the great truth that Catholics are so, not by nature, not because they are in virtue of their Celtic origin more predisposed to Catholicity than are men of another origin—but by grace, and by grace alone—is one thing; to assert, as did the Reviewer—that "as far as we can judge, the contradiction between the Church and German nature is far less striking than the contradiction between her and Celtic nature"—and that the nature of the Irishman and Frenchman "is always not only un-Catholic as all nature is, but anti-Catholic"—is another and very different thing; and seems to us, we say it in all humility, close akin to the very error with which the Reviewer justly reproaches his opponents—that of claiming a greater "natural" aptitude for Catholicity, for Teutonic than for Celtic races. That all human nature is *per se* un-Catholic is most true; for Catholicity belongs to grace not to race, to the supernatural not to the natural order. But seeing that God has made of one blood all the nations of men—that He is their common Father, we cannot believe that He has endowed any of his children with an "anti-Catholic nature;" for this would suppose that He Himself has made their nature essentially antagonistic to Catholicity or to the supernatural order. We do not believe, it is true, that by nature the Celt is one

whit better, or worse, than the Teuton, or that the Irishman is naturally Catholic; and the Anglo-Saxon naturally Protestant; neither do we hold with the Reviewer in his article of October that "the German genius and temperament are naturally far less averse to Catholicity than the so-called Celt." We hold in short that by nature, Celt and Teuton are equally remote from the supernatural order, or Catholicity; and that it is unjust and anti-Catholic to claim the least natural superiority, or aptitude for Catholicity, for either. The Reviewer however placed, or to his readers seemed to place, the Celtic nature in decided antagonism to Catholicity; and it was this that provoked the severe comments of the Catholic press upon his article upon the "*Romanic and Germanic Orders*."

In his present number he has, however, put himself right:—

"What the writer in the passage that appears to have given much offence was aiming to show obviously was, if we assume that nations are Catholic or Protestant, according to the genius and temperament of the race to which it is assumed they belong, the Germanic nations should be Catholic, and the Celtic nations Protestant, contrary to what the adversaries maintain, and therefore the attempt to make the adoption of Catholicity depend on race, and to reduce the Catholic religion itself to a simple Gentile religion must be abandoned, and the theory rejected as not being sustained by facts"—p. 29.

This explanation will we hope suffice to remove any little soreness that may yet be felt in certain quarters; and as the Reviewer explicitly disclaims any design of giving offence, so we trust that his disclaimer will be frankly and generously received by a Catholic public, and that *Brownson's Quarterly* may long retain its position as the leading Catholic periodical on this Continent.

A short but brilliant article on the philosophical system of Gioberti, is succeeded by a highly eulogistic notice of a work by Dr. Manahan on the "*Triumph of the Church in Early Ages*." The next article is controversial in its character, and is designed to refute the prevalent Protestant prejudice that, betwixt the Bible, or printed Word of God, and the Word of God made known to us through what we may call His organ of communication—the Catholic Church, there is or can be any antagonism. The following passage does but reiterate an old established truth, one too which daily experience adds continual confirmation:—

"The notion that all that is needed to make Catholics turn their backs on their spiritual mother, and embrace the Protestant movement, is the free reading of the Holy Scriptures, is not worthy of any serious refutation. We have yet to learn the first well authenticated instance of a Catholic becoming a Protestant by reading the Bible alone.—The story told of Luther and the Bible he one day came across in the convent library is too incredible and absurd for any sensible person really to believe. Men never leave the Church and embrace Protestantism from simple love of truth, or respect for the written word of God. There is always some other motive operating. One man has got offended at his Bishop, believes, justly or unjustly, that great wrong has been done him, and in his anger becomes blinded to the truth, loses his judgment, charges upon the Church what is due only to the individual, or perhaps to his own morbid fancy. Another finds that he cannot, without more violence to the flesh than he has courage to practise, preserve the chastity he has pledged, and so becomes a Protestant and takes unto himself a wife. Another finds that the Church imposes too much restraint on his licentious thoughts; and with a heart hardened, and intellect darkened by his passions, abandons his Mother, and gives himself up to strange women"—pp. 87, 88.

An article wherein the errors of Calvinism are well lashed, and a review of a tale that originally appeared in the *Metropolitan*, together with the usual "Literary Notices and Criticisms," complete one of the most interesting numbers of *Brownson's Quarterly* that has appeared for some time. We should add that it is also the first number of a new series; and that the Review will in future be published by the Messrs. Sadler & Co., of New York. That it may have an extensive and continually increasing circulation is our ardent wish; for if we have presumed to signify, on one or two matters of secondary importance, our dissent from the views of the learned editor, we cannot in justice refrain from acknowledging how much we owe to him, and to his labors in the cause of our holy religion.

AN OBJECTION ANSWERED.—From a certain quarter it has been objected to us that we have hitherto refrained from expressing any opinion upon a trial for libel now pending, and in which a Catholic cotemporary is an interested party. A few words therefore upon this subject may not be inappropriate.

We have refrained, and intend to refrain, from expressing any opinion upon a matter which is yet before the legal tribunals, because we deem it the duty of the Catholic journalist to apply on all occasions to himself, those rules which he would desire to apply in analogous circumstances to his non-Catholic cotemporaries. We contend that it would be unfair on the part of the latter to write a line calculated to prejudice a question upon which a jury was called upon to decide; we deny to them the right of arrogating to themselves the functions of the judge; and we insist that, *pendente lite*, it is their duty to observe a strict silence upon the merits of a case which has been submitted to the action of the ordinary tribunals. This is the rule which, of course, we desire to impose upon Protestant journalists.

Well then! we must begin by imposing the same rule upon ourselves; by showing by our acts, as well as by our words, that we desire to do unto others, as we would that others should do unto us; and therefore upon the same principle as that upon which we insist upon the duty of the observance of silence in certain cases by the Protestant press, do we recognise and endeavor to practise the same duty in our own case, and towards our separated brethren. We cannot in short admit the existence of one rule for them, and another for the Catholic press.

If, as Catholics, we want to enforce respect for ourselves, we must begin by manifesting a scrupulous respect for the rights of others; if we would be treated with courtesy and justice, we must be prepared to treat others with justice and courtesy; and if we would insist upon our rights as British subjects, we must show the