THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.
TERMS:
To Town Subscribers. . . . . $3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . . $2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, *post paid.*

We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, *who will give receipts for the same.*

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Parliament had adjourned for the Easter holidays, and was to reassemble on the 16th inst.; the political news is consequently of little or no importance. A dissolution in May or June is spoken of as possible; but the intentions of the ministry, in that respect, are not as yet positively known. In the mean time, great preparations are being made, in all parts of the United Kingdom, in anticipation of the coming elections; addresses from candidates to their constituents, breathing the most noble and patriotic sentiments, are as plentiful as blackberries. In Ireland, the great question is the Tenant League, and a pledge to support the principle of Mr. Sharman Crawford's Bill is exacted from every candidate. The *Telegraph* lays down the following instructions, for the guidance of the Catholic electors of Ireland:—

"The Irish Brigade in Parliament never ceased in their labors until they had palsied the hand that wrote the Durham letter: they never rested until the party in power that had passed the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was driven from out the Cabinet to the Opposition benches. And now that others, foes to the Catholics, are in office, they will assail them in every way, until they also cease to be 'a Government.' The Irish Brigade will make misgovernment for Ireland an impossibility, and an administration of the affairs of this empire, conjoined with the persecution of the Catholics, impracticable.

"Let the electors imitate, at the hustings, that which has been done in the House of Commons.

"Where the Catholics constitute, as they do in most places in Ireland, the majority of the voters, let them meet together, as they did in Belfast, and there come to the resolution to vote but as one man, for the candidate or candidates on whom they have agreed—taking care, where they have the power in their hands, not to select any one as a candidate but a declared opponent to the Whigs and Tories—a man who will pledge himself to vote against every party in office, but the party bound to put an end to all persecuting laws against the Catholics—to remove the Established Church iniquity—and to do justice to the industrial agricultural classes in Ireland. Let the Catholic electors of Ireland pursue this course, and they will, at least, have sixty members of the Irish Brigade in the next Parliament."

The contest between the operative mechanics and their employers, has at length been terminated, the former having been compelled to accede to the terms of their more wealthy and powerful opponents. For the rest, the columns of the English papers are mainly taken up with the dreary records of crime, sad testimonials to the rapid spread of immorality and barbarism amongst the lower classes of English society: we read of little, but cases of mothers destroying their offspring, husbands poisoning their wives, wives poisoning their husbands—of murders, rapes, beastiality, and all abominations. As a set off to this, and in proof of the sound religious feeling of England, the conduct of Lord Cowley, the English Ambassador at Paris, is highly eulogised by the Evangelical press. It appears that the President had invited the Minister to dine with him on a Sunday, but Lord Cowley piously declined the invitation, on the plea that he did not eat public dinners on the first day of the week—upon the same principle that the true Puritan would not take a dose of castor oil on the Saturday, for fear it should work on the Sunday. Verily this is an age of cant and humbug.

The most important item of intelligence from the continent, is the death of Prince Schwartzenberg; this event has created considerable excitement amongst the political circles in Paris. The re-establishment of the empire is still spoken of; many of the well informed pretend that the 5th of May is the day definitely appointed for the restoration of the Napoleonic dynasty: this event is to be accompanied by the restoration of hereditary titles of honor; already, it is rumored, patents of nobility have been issued.

There is nothing new from the Cape of Good Hope. The immense gold fields of South Australia are attracting the attention of speculators at home. Labor is high, and the tide of emigration is setting strongly in that direction.

The Franklin and Niagara Steamers have arrived; the news is unimportant. In France all continued quiet; a grand review of all the troops in Paris, to be accompanied by the distribution of the eagles, was announced for the 12th May.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATION.—On Sunday last, at the Cathedral of this city, his Lordship the Right Rev. Dr. Blanchet, Bishop of Nesqualy, conferred the sacred Order of Deacon on Mr. R. L. Fournier, and Minors on Messrs. W. Halley and J. Quinn, all three of the diocese of Montreal.

We have much pleasure in announcing the return to Canada, of the Rev. Mr. Desautels, curé of Rigaud, and E. Frechette, Esqr. of Chambly. These gentlemen started last autumn, on a tour of Europe, in company with Mgr. Prince, Bishop of Martyropolis, Coadjutor of the Bishop of Montreal. They arrived on board the *America*, and had a most agreeable passage.

Great distress prevails amongst the settlers in the Eastern Townships. His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal has given the sum of £23 for their relief.

DR. BROWNSON'S LECTURES.

Dr. Brownson gave his Third Lecture on Friday evening to a full house. He said:—

In my previous Lectures I have assigned some of the reasons why I am not a Protestant; I proceed now to offer a few reasons why I am a Catholic.

But before proceeding to offer any direct proofs of Catholicity, you must permit me to remark that the reasons I have already given for not being a Protestant, are so many valid reasons for being a Catholic; for between Catholicity and Protestantism there is no middle term. I do not say that a man cannot reject one or another form of Protestantism, without asserting the truth of Catholicity; a man may, no doubt, renounce Presbyterianism, Anglicanism, Methodism, Unitarianism, Universalism, &c., without becoming a Catholic. But no one can disprove Protestantism itself—Protestantism in its essential principle—without proving Catholicity, for the essential principle of Protestantism is the denial of the Church, or a protest against her authority. If, then, I disprove that denial, or show that that protest is unwarrantable, I have the right to conclude at once the truth and authority of the Church.

Protestantism, I have shown, has in itself, no positive element; it is purely negative in its character, and leads to universal negation. There are but two orders,—the positive and the negative,—Being and Non-Being. All truth is in Being and its positive creations; all falsehood is in Non-Being, and consequently when any alleged system is proved to be purely negative, and to belong to the order of Non-Being, it is proved to be false: consequently, when it is proved to be false, the positive system which it immediately and directly contradicts, is proved to be true; for of contradictories, if one must always be false, one must always be true. Protestantism, the immediate direct contradictory of Catholicity, cannot be denied without affirming Catholicity, or that which it contradicts; for as pure negation is in itself unintelligible, no system can be set aside by a pure negation, or without opposing to it, not a negation, but a truth which contradicts it. Nothing more, then, is necessary to prove Catholicity, than to reduce Protestantism to pure negation. This I have done in my previous Lectures, and, therefore, I have the right to say I have proved Catholicity.

Protestants do not ordinarily see this, for they do not sufficiently analyze their own principles and carry them out to their last logical conclusions. They ordinarily suppose that Protestantism contains a positive element, as well as a negative, and that it asserts Christian doctrine as well as denies Catholic doctrine. Protestants—not Protestantism—no doubt, do assert some Christian doctrines, maintain some elements of Christian truth, but these doctrines, these elements, are not peculiar to them as Protestants; they are simply Catholic doctrines which they have retained from the Church. Protestants are poor logicians; they have two sets of principles, perfectly incompatible one with the other; but they do not ordinarily see it. They suppose the two sets are perfectly compatible one with the other, and that they may, without the least inconsistency, hold and contend for both. They do not distinguish them, and follow each set out to its last logical consequences, and hence, they do not feel the justice of the assertion that Protestantism is purely negative in its character.

But the positive elements, they evidently do not hold as Protestants, but in the sense in which they do not protest against the Church, and if they followed them out to their logical conclusions they would find themselves obliged to embrace Catholicity. It is only by virtue of these doctrines, always held by the Church, that they claim to be Christians, and they can never, by virtue of them, claim to be Protestants. They are Protestants, not by virtue of what they affirm in common with the Church, but by virtue of what they deny, or protest against, and consequently their Protestantism is in the negative principles, not in the positive principles, they hold. If they were accustomed to reason, and to carry out their principles logically, they would see this, and recognize their Protestantism as purely negative, and their principle, as Protestants, as necessarily involving universal negation, or the denial of all things, God, the universe, whatever is, or exists.

The fear or inability of Protestants to reason logically, is the reason why they fancy it possible to assert their Protestantism, without denying the whole of Christianity. They do not see that, in their denial of certain Catholic doctrines, they deny the principle on which alone they can assert those they profess to retain. The doctrines *they profess to retain may* be true, *may* even be contained in the Bible; but they can be deduced from the Bible only by the aid of universal Christian tradition. Take the Bible alone, interpreted by private judgment, aided only by Grammar and Lexicon, without any resort to tradition, and no man can assert that they are contained in the book. Nay, your Grammars and Lexicons cannot be constructed without the aid of tradition, which determines the usage of the language and the meaning of its words. If tradition is rejected, what reliance can you place on your lexicographers? The Hebrew of Gesenius is almost another language from the Hebrew of Buxtorf, and there can be no doubt that his definition of Hebrew words has often been influenced by his peculiar views of religion. Even language itself is meaningless without tradition, and to deny tradition is to render it useless, and to cut off all means of communication between man and man. Yet the essential principle of Protestantism is the denial of tradition, and, therefore, if Protestants did but know it—to deny the Christian doctrines they profess to retain, no less than those they avowedly reject.

All heresy involves the same logical inconsistency. No man who reasons logically, and pushes his principles to their last consequences, can ever be a heretic. Heresy, by the etymological force of the word, means *choice*, and consists in choosing from a number of doctrines, all resting on the same authority, some to be held, and others to be rejected. In other words, heresy is following private judgment as the rule, in distinction from objective, positive authority, and Protestants in contending as they do, for private judgment, contend for heresy in its very principle. It is in this respect that they are distinguished from the earlier sects. The *oriental sectaries in the earlier times*, rejected, indeed, the teachings of the Catholic Church, but, so far as I recollect, they all acknowledged a Catholic Church, and its authority to teach; they never asserted, in principle, the right of private judgment against the Church. But Protestants erect private judgment—the principle of heresy—into a rule, and hence Protestantism is not a particular heresy, or a particular form of heresy, but *heresy in itself, heresy in its very principle, involving all actual, and all possible heresies.*

The principle of heresy being the denial of all authority for belief, it is incompatible with the assertion of any christian doctrine, and, therefore, the man who chooses to be a heretic, has only to reason logically to become an infidel, in the fullest sense of the words. The principle, logically carried out, leads to universal negation, and it is only by not so carrying out their principles, that Protestants can even pretend to believe some portions of Christian truth; consequently, in examining Protestantism, and judging of its merits, we are never to take into the account the Christian elements Protestants profess to retain. The element distinctively Protestant, being only the principle of heresy, of unbelief, of denial, the alternatives presented to the mind, able and willing to reason, are, on the one hand, Catholicity, and on the other, universal negation. But universal negation is inconceivable, is the denial of all truth, and therefore the denial of itself, and therefore cannot be asserted. Therefore, Catholicity, as the contradictory, must be asserted, and its truth follows logically and undeniably.

Here then I am; I must either be a Catholic, or else remain in universal negation. This last is not possible, for I cannot deny my own existence, even if I would—I cannot then remain a Protestant; but if I desert Protestantism, where can I go, except into the Church—shall I go back to ancient Gentilism? But were I to go back to Gentilism, I should only be asserting Protestantism, in its primitive form. Gentilism was, to the ancient world, only what Protestantism is to the modern. It was the falling away of the nations from the primitive or patriarchal religion, as Protestantism is the falling away of the modern from the Catholic Church.

It is true, that some of your modern philosophers, who pretend that man began as an infant, and that the savage state is the primitive state of the race, and that religion is nothing but the outward expression of a sentiment innate in the human heart, contend that Gentilism was the earliest form of religion. They would have us believe that the original form of religion was low and disgusting Fetichism, or the worship of sticks and stones, and the lower orders of animals, and that as time went on, the religious sentiment gradually fortified itself and clothed itself with the poetical forms of Greek and Roman polytheism, whence it has advanced to pure monotheism. But this is all pure theory. The lowest forms of religion are not the earliest, but the latest, as the savage state is not that in which men began, but that in which, when abandoned to themselves, they have ended. History presents us the true religion before the false, and shows us men offering true worship to the true God, before it gives us the least hint of Gentilism.

No intelligent man can study the ancient Gentile religions, without perceiving in them the internal evidences that they are not original, primitive, but corruptions of an earlier and purer religion. They all bear internal evidence of being a departure from the patriarchal religion, which had obtained from the creation to the giving of the Jewish law. The type from which all Gentilism departs, not that which it seeks to realize, is evidently the patriarchal, and a profound study of its various forms would enable one to reproduce substantially the very religion brought to our notice in the earliest records of our race, that is, the book of Genesis. It is easy from the examination of Gentilism, to prove that it was in none of its forms an incipient religion, struggling to purify and perfect itself, but the corruption of a purer religion, once held, but now abandoned. Its very tone is that of regret for a lost truth and purity. It everywhere seems oppressed with the memory of good once possessed, now possessed no more. It is penetrated by a secret melancholy. Its very joy is sadness, and its gaiety is that of despair. Its festive songs, its frantic dances, its wild Bacchantes, its drunken Corybantes, its lascivious rites, all speak of a memory oppressed with a sense of what it has lost, seeking to drown itself in intoxication and sensual pleasures, from which, however, both the reason and the heart turn away with loathing and disgust.

Gentilism was nothing but the natural expression of our corrupt nature, left to itself. It originated in pride and concupiscence; men would not obey the law which God had imposed; they would not seek after God as their final cause, or Ultimate End. They would be a law unto themselves, follow their own inclinations, and seek their own pleasure. The result was the various forms of heathenism in which nearly the whole world was sunk when our Lord came to die on the cross to redeem it. Protestantism was born of the same spirit, and does but continue ancient heathenism, under the necessary forms of modern society. Men grew impatient of the authority of the Church; their natural hearts rebelled against it; they would again be a law unto themselves, and seek, not God, but their own pleasure, and as in ancient times they had broken away from the patriarchal, so now they broke away from the Catholic religion.

This is evident from the time when Protestantism was born. It was born at the precise period of what is called the Revival of Letters, the *Renaissance*, that is, the revival of Greek and Roman literature and philosophy,—when the systems of ancient Greece and Rome and Alexandria had taken possession of the schools, and the great literary ambition was, in poetry, to imitate the sweetness of Virgil, and in prose, the exquisite graces of Cicero. The scholars of the time looked with contempt on Christian antiquity, disdained its schools, its principles, its literature and art, and sought only to reproduce the old world, revealed to them by the Greek and Roman classics. Heathen tastes and maxims became widely prevalent, and the very men who took the lead in the Protestant movement, were those who mostly showed them, and who had the least knowledge of, and the greatest contempt for, Christian antiquity. Luther despised the schoolmen, and Henry the Eighth was a distinguished Humanist. Calvin knew little of Christian theology, but he was a good classical scholar. History proves that Protestantism originated in the paganising tendencies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

I gain nothing, then, by going back to Gentilism; I am at best only going back from the later to the earlier form of Protestantism. Besides, I cannot go back to Gentilism—Gentilism has been tried, and found wanting. It has been refuted by the earlier Doctors and Fathers of the Church, and judgment was irrevocably pronounced against it, when the humble Christians, emerging from the catacombs, planted the cross in triumph on the capitol of the world. Paganism is no longer an open question—I must either be a Christian or nothing. The blood of millions of martyrs, the stupendous miracles of the early Saints have settled that question for ever. I have no alternative but to be a Christian.

But if I am Christian at all, I must be a Catholic. Between Catholicity and no Christianity, there is no alternative. Will you speak to me of the Greek Church, separated from the Roman? The Greek Church was once in communion with the Roman. The Roman Church was then the true Church, and therefore true Christianity, or it was not. If it was not, the Greek Church was then a false Church, because to commune with a false Church was to be false itself. It could become the true Church only by separating from the false church, and coming into communion with the true Church; but this last it did not do, for it came, after its separation, into communion with no other body. If the Church of Rome was the true Church, then the Greek Church is false, for to separate from the true Church is to become false; so in either case, the Greek Church is a false Church, and I cannot become a true Christian by becoming a member of its communion.

Will you refer me to some one of the ancient sects—to the Nestorians for instance? Nestorian in principle is nothing but the denial of the Incarnation and Divinity of our Lord, and the assertion of Pelagianism, or man's ability to work out his own salvation without Grace, that is, modern Unitarianism, a form of Protestantism, which I must *reject in rejecting* Protestantism. I shall fare no better with any other oriental sects. All sects are heresies, and all heresies are virtually included in Protestantism, which, as I have shown is, in principle, all heresy—heresy itself.

Again, then, I come round to the conclusion, if I am to be a Christian at all, I must be a Catholic. Christianity and Catholicity are identical, and the same thing. It is, then, Catholicity or no religion—if no religion, then no God—no truth—no law—no morality—no rule of life—no purpose of existence—and all that we can say is, let every one live as he listeth, give loose reins to luxury, rob every meadow of its flowers, make the most of the present moment—eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die—the last word of all heathen morality. But our hearts recoil from this, and religion we must have; we cannot live without it. Then we must be Catholics.

I did not, in my own case, even after I had detected that Protestantism was worthless and a blunder, come at once to this conclusion; I felt that religion, and even a Church, were necessary, but I was not prepared to become a Catholic—what think you I then proposed? Nothing less than to make a new Church—a Church for myself. Do not laugh too much at my sublime folly, for it was a folly I shared with greater and wiser men than myself; what I attempted is only what the whole movement party were then, and are even now, aiming at. Mazzini avows it, and the Chevalier Bunsen brings forward what he calls "The Church of the Future," precisely as I had done before him; I saw clearly enough that Protestantism was nothing, and the Protestant movement was a sad blunder; but I did not see that in ceasing to be a Protestant, I must necessarily become a Catholic. I admitted that the Catholic Church had been a noble institution in its day, and had done good service to the cause of humanity; but I looked upon it as having become effete. It had expired, I held, with Leo. the Tenth, and was dead and buried; I would not insult the dead, I would plant flowers on its grave, and drop a tear to its memory; but I would not hope for its resurrection.

The Church being dead and buried, and Protestantism being purely destructive in its mission, and negative in its character, nothing remained but to attempt the construction of a new Church. I did not suppose myself inspired, or specially commissioned by Almighty God to be the founder of a Church; I simply proposed, by the exercise of my own reason, to select from all past religions the portion of truth contained in each, separated from the error heretofore combined with it, and to mould the several partial truths, thus collected, into one complete and harmonious body of doctrine. I would go forth and preach this doctrine, deposit it in the minds and hearts of men, and it would make to itself hands, and with these hands erect the temple—construct the new Church, which should be as much in advance of the old Church as the nineteenth century is in advance of the first.

To this work of obtaining a new Church, I devoted ten years of my life, but I found, at length, that man is a poor Church-builder, and that a Church to be worth anything, must descend from above, not ascend from below. I wished a Church that should elevate man above his present condition, give him new strength, and enable him to live a truer and a diviner life; but I found that a man could not well lift himself by his own waistband; that to elevate him, I must have a whereon to stand, outside of him, and that no weight applied to the lever can raise a body on which the fulcrum rests for its support. From man, do my best, I could get only man, and a Church made by man, could give me only the expression of what he already is, and therefore, nothing above him, or able to raise him above himself. It was, therefore, idle to attempt to make a new Church; either God must construct a Church for us, or there could be no Church for us worth having.

As yet, however, I retained my old prejudice, that the Catholic Church was dead; I had not investigated the question; my attention was first directed to the examination of her character and claims in the Winter of 1840-41. I was invited to give in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, a course of Lectures on Modern Civilization. I was then an advocate for the modern absurd doctrine of progress, and held that there had been *continuous progress of man and Society from the* first. I wished to trace in my Lectures, this progress in modern history; I wished, especially, to trace the influence of Christianity in the improvement of social institutions, especially in ameliorating the condition of the poorer and more numerous classes. To my astonishment, I found that, starting with the fall of the Western Empire, or from the beginning of the sixth century, and coming down to the beginning of the sixteenth, through a period of one thousand years, I could trace a most wonderful progress of Society, but no further. From the latter epoch, down through the last three centuries—which ought in my own theory, to have been centuries of progress, and which were, by all my Protestant friends, boasted of as such—I not only could not trace any progress, but I found undeniable marks of deterioration. This, I said, cannot be; I must have made some mistake; I reviewed the history, I consulted all the monuments and records within my reach, but this only served to confirm the astounding fact. Under the old Catholic Church the nations had advanced, Society had been ameliorated, and civilization promoted; but after the birth of Protestantism, there had been an evident decline, and a decided tendency, especially in Protestant nations, towards barbarism.

I am not proposing this as an argument for Catholicity, but as a fact which induced me to examine the character and claims of the Church, and the degree of