



VOL. VII. MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1856. No. 15.

REV. DR. CAHILL  
ON SPAIN.  
Ballyroan Cottage, Oct. 22, 1856.  
(From the Dublin Telegraph.)

All the political convulsion and civil strife which have occurred in Spain during the last forty years, may be truly ascribed to British interference and intrigue in that chivalrous and divided country. Indeed from the earliest period of Christian history: from the fifth to the sixteenth century, Spain may be said to be under foreign dominion, and has been, from many relations and circumstances, the most eventful nation in Europe. It was successively overrun by Vandals, Visigoths, Goths, and Moors: although reduced, and conquered by the warring wars of eleven hundred years, yet it was never subdued; and thus it stands before mankind as a triumphant instance of the ultimate success of the cause of national liberty, when the flame of independence is kept continually burning, and the cry of freedom is raised from age to age by succeeding generations pledged and bound together. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, they expelled the Moors, after a struggle of more than seven hundred years: and Spain, in the year 1516, for the first time since the year 427, saw all her children united under one Government, ruled by a King of her own choice, and raised her proud head free from civil war and foreign yoke. The discovery of America, under her favorite Queen, Isabella, opened mines of gold, and added extensive territories to proud Castile; and for upwards of two centuries with some slight political and national disasters, Spain ranked, amongst the surrounding nations, the first-rate power of Europe.

But how trivial the cause, and unexpected the event, which sometimes lays the foundation of the humiliation, or the overthrow of national greatness; in fact, nations, like individuals, bring on paralysis and death from neglecting to remedy symptoms of disease or decay. And the French Revolution, which was foreshadowed at least fifty years before the explosion of the disastrous event, reached Spain like the shock of an earthquake, and well nigh buried every vestige of her former power, and wealth, and liberties, in one confused wreck of national ruin. And neither the Visigoths nor the Goths were so much to be dreaded as the enemies who began to overrun that country in the year 1808, and who, up to the present year, exercise dominion over her liberties, her morality, and her Christianity, far and away more fatal than all the Northern Pagan Invaders, united in one army, with Atilla (the scourge of God) at their head. The man who has not had time to read the history of the Spanish Peninsula since, cannot conceive what is the cause of the permanent civil strife, social divisions, and ecclesiastical disasters in a country containing, by almost common consent, the most noble, the most generous and the most religious people on the face of the earth: while the individual who happens to read the "Foreign Correspondence" of the English press is so completely deceived by the mis-statements of these hired defamers, that he is loud in his indignation against their Kings, their Laws, their Religion, their Priesthood; and as a remedy for all these supposed evils, he cries out for a monarch nominated by England, for the laws framed by England, for institutions borrowed from England, for the Anglican Bible, and for the Anglican rope, and gibbet to re-enact in Hispania, the murders of Mullaghmast, to light the fires of Smithfield, and to recount the canon of Tom Cromwell for the total extirpation of the Priests, Nuns, Friars, Monks, and even for the demolition of the very stone walls of the Catholic church. The writer of this article regrets he cannot devote in the present publication sufficient space for the full development of these important issues; but he hopes to say enough in the current number of this journal to enable the reader to comprehend the main prominent features of the subject under consideration.

The French Revolution, completed in the year 1793, was the volcano that shook France, remodelled her very surface, and spread a terrific commotion throughout all the surrounding states; and in the eruption of this volcano, Napoleon the First was ejected, raised high above all his fellows, and ruled the tempest, and rode the political whirlwind up to the year 1806, when with his own hand, in the presence of the Pope, he placed first on his own head and next on the head of Josephine, his wife, the two imperial crowns of France. He had already conquered the four best Generals of the Austrian army; he had reduced Italy; he had humbled Europe; and his Imperial enlarged fancy now decided on giving new monarchs (like himself) to several neighboring kingdoms, and putting the crowns on their heads as he had already put one on his own imperial brow. Francis IV. of Spain had at this time, from state necessities, abdicated the throne in favor of his son Ferdinand VII.; Napoleon summoned or inveigled the father, and the son to meet him at Bayonne; induced the son to restore the crown again to his father, who, on the spot,

made a present of it to Napoleon, and thus abdicated the Spanish Throne in favor of the French Emperor. The son Ferdinand was instantly made a prisoner, and Napoleon sent his brother Joseph to the Escurial, and crowned him King of Spain. Every one of feeling, reason, and patriotism in any country, must feel unbounded humiliation and irresistible indignation to see a father and son thus give away, like an old hat, the crown of Spain, the throne of their ancestors; but in Spain this feeling rose into frenzy, and Spanish pride was so mortally wounded that the nation struggled, as it were, in a death agony against this baseness of their King, selling or betraying the crown of Charles V., and covering with cowardice and dishonor the national pride of Arragon. This act of Charles and his son divided the Spaniards into two hostile parties; the one hating, abhorring the race, the name of Bourbon; the other, amongst whom the nobles and the clergy were found, still clinging to their legitimate King, and hoping that in some favorable turn of affairs, the old regime would be restored. This act of Charles had also, as is clear from the premises, the further effect of alienating a large section of the people from the clergy, as each side maintained antagonistic opinions and feelings in reference to the Bourbons.

This part of my case brings me to the beginning of the Peninsular War, where the two hostile camps—namely, the French and English, amounting on both sides to two hundred thousand men—reddened the fields of Spain with blood up to the year 1813; and worse than even the blood of the dead, leaving behind them for examples for the living the demoralisation, the cruelty, the odour, the irreligion, the sins, and the scarlet crime which invariably follow in the guilty track of contending armies. Who does not see that a country thus deluged with war for seven years must have been drained of her resources, must have had her agriculture, her commerce ruined, and must in the tumult of battle and in scenes of blood have had their religion blunted, their conscience seared, and their very faith imperilled? Add to this that the Duke of Wellington, under pretence of taking away all mode of defence from the French, threw down all the Spanish mills, factories, &c., and thus annihilated their trade. This glance at Spain about the time of the battle of Waterloo will give some idea of the material state of the country, and will also furnish some imperfect notion of the division of parties, and of the state of national feeling between the clergy and a large section of the people. But when to this heap of confused grievances we now add the new fact, that the hated, the vile Ferdinand is restored to his kingdom in 1814, we may conclude that the swollen rage of the people boiled over, at seeing the mean betrayer of their nation again placed on the throne. The worst part of the case is, that it divided the clergy and the people! and again, that division became so wide, from the terrors and crimes of a long war, that the section of the people referred to not only were simply divided but were inoculated with infidelity towards the creed and with insatiable hatred towards the restored vile monarch, and revenge towards the persons and names of the priesthood.

This part of my narrative ends the period during which Spain was overrun by the French: and now commences the epoch when it is doomed to be overrun by the English; and this era, unless checked by an overruling Providence, tended of itself to be more fatal to Spain than the most terrific, thrilling period of the very worst days of her past history. The hour when the filthy Ferdinand was restored, two results clearly followed—namely, National division became enlarged and confirmed; and next, England assumed the reins of Government, and really and *bona fide* ruled Spain through her agents and her Ambassadors. It may be well supposed (now a historical fact) that England moved the mind of Ferdinand to reduce the power of the Catholic Clergy; and as Ferdinand's brother, Don Carlos, the heir of the throne, was devotedly attached to the Church—and as Ferdinand had no son (his children being two daughters) it formed part of the English stratagem to abolish the Salic Law in Spain (forbidding females to ascend the throne), and thus exclude Don Carlos, the legitimate heir, and the friend of the Clergy, of order, and religion.—In 1831 the shabby King fell into a lethargy, in which he remained, with limited intervals, for two years; his daughters being then respectively one and three years old. When he awoke, in 1833, from this partial insensibility, he abdicated (abdication was his forte) the throne in favor of the present Isabella; and a law was passed, through English intrigue, repealing the Salic Law, and excluding Don Carlos. On the knowledge of this treachery being circulated, the kingdom broke out into open revolution: England despatched her navy to the Spanish coast, and commissioned Sir De Lacy Evans to the command of the British Legion, ten thousand strong, to support the young Queen against her uncle; and in two or three partial engagements, overthrew the Carlist party, and supported the usurper. In

the same and following year all the Church lands were confiscated; the churches, in several instances, were converted into theatres; seventy-five thousand friars and nuns were forcibly expelled from their convents; and one hundred and ten priests were shot in the streets of Madrid, or burned alive in their houses, on the 31st March, 1833. This is the picture of Spain, overrun, not by the leader of the Huns, but by the English. On the death of Ferdinand, the Queen Mother Christina, married a handsome Lieutenant of Cavalry, the son of a country tobacco-merchant, (now Duke of Rianzaves), with the approbation of Lord Palmerston: and thus England added scheme to scheme, and covered the crown and the name of Bourbon with such contempt and infamy that the people (as a nation) were ashamed of their name, and maddened with the outrages of the throne. England, which, since 1813, has created all these divisions, has pushed her advantages to the last point of even Spanish endurance; her press has misrepresented everything Spanish, has belied the Spanish clergy, although now beggared and denationalized, and has repeatedly calumniated the habits, the characters, and the virtue of the Queen. England meditated a still deeper wound on Spain: she planned the ruin of her Catholic faith; her agents, her ambassadors, urged it; her statesmen precipitated it; but yet, like Ireland, although Spain has fallen, she abhors the lies, the crimes, the treachery, the persecution of England; and, like Ireland too, though some of the children of Spain are traitors to their country, she has never changed her faith, or bent the knee before the golden calf of that Protestantism which she abhors with all the furious combination of hatred and contempt which the Irish feel towards a calumniating tract-distributing parson, or towards an apostate perjured souter.

The present Queen is one of the most amiable creatures in existence: and ornaments the throne with every virtue which can give value to life, add grace to woman, elevate Christianity, and adorn the palace. But, placed as she is between two hostile parties: being dependant on England, while she is the guardian of her own royalty: sincerely devoted to the Church, while compelled to assent to the sequestration of its sacred property, it is almost impossible to steer a safe, steady course through such impending dangers on all sides. The removal of England from all connexion and control with the throne is the only remedy, under wise heads, to heal divisions, to unite all the people, to make peace with the Church, to arrest infidelity, and to give security to the throne. All these desired results are by none more ardently wished for than by the Queen and on a late occasion, when Napoleon gave some indication of lending his support to the Spanish Queen, England has become wrathful, the *Times* has given up all *future interest* in Spanish affairs, Palmerston is dumb. Spain seems to have enlarged its views, to have grown in power, to speak in tones of National confidence, since Madrid has been saluted in the unmistakable language of protection and friendship, from fifteen thousand armed Frenchmen, encamped in the famed Bayonne, where the father of the Spanish Queen, and her grandfather, formally resigned the Spanish crown into the hands of Napoleon I., on the 10th June, 1808. After England will have been expelled from Spain, from Portugal, and from Naples, the days of English domination will have passed away; and Catholic Europe will be freed from civil strife, the Catholic faith from English infidelity: and, indeed, the Gospel of Christ will be released from bribery, apostacy, and the mockery of worship. The affairs of Spain must undergo a change in the right direction, as long as Napoleon will evince the same feeling of support, which he has lately shown at Bayonne; and England has somewhat too much to do just now in other quarters to exercise her usual dominion in Spain; and the policy of Lord Palmerston is doomed to receive a shock from which it can never recover. By the power, the decision, and the Christian faith of Napoleon, France will command the destinies of the surrounding nations, and thus the English revolutionary schemes, the proselytising views of the last forty years, worked at an expense of hundreds and thousands of millions of money, are defeated and blasted by a single blow. England once removed, the discontented, the factious, the infidel party must unite with the friends of order and religion, and the whole nation will be free to frame their own laws, and adopt those institutions which are suited to the genius of the country, and the national character of the people. The year 1856 is likely to be the epoch of England's downfall; surpassed by France in the Crimea, laughed at in Naples, ousted in Spain, despised in Florence, baffled in Rome, and challenged and kicked by Austria, now armed to the teeth in Lombardy, England at length feels the disgrace of Palmerston's policy, and has no shelter from the universal contempt of Europe, save in the further humiliation of licking the feet of Napoleon, and uttering through her press, her literature, her despatches, her music, her very dinner toasts, the meanest

adulation of the greatness, the glories, aye, and the *friendship* (?) of France! The year 1856, beyond all doubt, will witness the downfall of Protestantism, and England's cruel domination: and it will also herald before the world, the elevation of Catholicity, and of true human liberty in the surrounding countries.

THE ESTABLISHMENT.  
(From the Tablet.)

There are a thousand things which everybody knows and owns, in defence of which nobody has got a word to say, and yet people fear to attack them, or, if they summon courage so to do, they simply vex their readers' spirits, and give occasion to the shrewd and practical men of the day so lecture, banter, and deride them on the injudicious selection of their topics. It requires some skill, and, indeed, it is said to be the chief essential in a journalist, to discern the right moment when his views on any point will find an echo in the public mind, and touch some chord in his readers' breasts that will yield a responsive vibration.

It is not enough that the writer of a leading article should extort the assent of his readers to his arguments; they require to "know the reason why" their assent should be demanded and their feelings put in motion on this particular question at this particular time. This want of "rapport" between the speaker and his audience, between the writer and his readers, is the gravest charge that can be brought against either an orator or a journalist. And thus it often happens that one is compelled to wait for some event which may arrest public attention, and afford an excuse for treating of a general question in connexion with it. The case of Archdeacon Denison is one of those events which has obtained such notoriety, and on the ulterior consequences of which speculation is so rife, that it has naturally led writers to look beyond its special bearings, and treat it in connexion with the wider question of the Church Establishment. We, Catholics, are too apt to confine our views to our own section of the population. We look at our own numbers, our diminished, divided political strength, the small effect that our united action would produce upon the nation, and withhold our interest from any measures which our own strength would prove unable to carry. But we constantly forget that, besides ourselves, there are hundreds of thousands of our Protestant countrymen, with the same ends as ourselves, thoroughly hostile to the same abuses, suffering under the same grievances, and desirous of the same redress as we ourselves. The Denison case has called for demonstrations from some of the ablest and most influential organs of public opinion, which show that so far from a dislike to the Establishment, a conviction of its hollowness and falsehood, a contempt for its absurd pretensions, and a hearty desire for its downfall being confined to Catholics, these feelings are not only shared, but far more strongly felt, by a large portion of the community exercising great influence, wielding immense resources, and ready for action on the first favorable opportunity. It scarce seems wise or right that we, more interested than any others in the result, should be the slowest and slackest in the strife.

Yet so it is. The *Morning Star*, the new cheap London morning paper, which rivals the *Times* in ability, and in which, of all the Protestant press, we find the nearest approach to accord with the aims and objects of the Catholic party, has fired a broadside into the Establishment, which, for telling force and damaging effect, surpasses anything we have met with from a Catholic source since the unapproachable exposures made by his Eminence the Cardinal at the time of the Papal aggression, and the lectures delivered by the Rector of the Catholic University. The *Morning Star* finds that the recent case of Archdeacon Denison "is suggestive of some very painful reflections as to the position occupied by the Clergy of the Established Church." The article is directed against the Clergy, but, of course, the case of the laity is involved in that of those whom they deliberately follow as their spiritual teachers. The *Morning Star* finds that the Denison case, taken in conjunction with that of Mr. Gorham, reveals a state of things as existing in the Church "which is really appalling to the unsophisticated and moral sense of the community." It says:—

"The case may be stated thus. Every individual who takes Orders in the Church of England does, at the most solemn moment of his existence, and in language of most unequivocal explicitness, subscribe willingly and *ex animo* the following things:—That the Book of Common Prayer and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, contained in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that all and every one of the Thirty-nine Articles are to be agreeable to the Word of God. That there may be no mistake as to the sense in which this is done, we are told, on the authority of 'the supreme Governor' of the

Church, that 'no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.' Let it be remembered that all the thousands of the English Clergy throughout this realm are bound by these declarations. But it is a fact perfectly notorious and undeniable, that there are in this body different classes who profess and teach—and that in reference to the very doctrines embodied in the Articles and canons of the Church—views that are diametrically opposite the one to the other. Nay, more, every candid man will admit, that among them there are those who seem, to the plain understanding of common men, to preach doctrines that contradict in the most express manner, in some cases the formularies, and in others the Articles, which they have sworn to believe and defend. These are the views also they entertain of each other; for nothing can be more explicit and emphatic than the language in which charges of heresy and false teaching are exchanged between them. Now, the question which startles and bewilders multitudes of honest persons, who are as far as possible from being unfriendly either to the cause of Christianity or to the Church of England, is this: How is it possible that men who hold and propagate sentiments so utterly discordant and repugnant, can use the same formularies and subscribe the same Articles? In answer to this simple question, we are met with a variety of shifts, subterfuges, and evasions, which, in connexion with any subject, would be most pitiful, but when taken in connexion with the solemn belief and offices of religion, are absolutely revolting. Sometimes we are told that the deliberate assent and consent given, and the willing *ex animo* subscription made, does not mean a declaration of belief in all things that are contained in the forms thus ratified, but only a promise that the declarant will or may hereafter, believe them when he comes to understand and approve them. Sometimes we are told that every man has a right to make these declarations with a mental reservation, or to interpret the words in his own sense, though the authoritative language of the Church expressly demands that they be admitted in their plain, literal, and grammatical sense. So, again, when any of those whose ministrations appear to differ from either the formularies or the Articles are charged with this divergency, there ensues such a distortion of words, such tortuosities of evasion, such hair-splitting distinctions and refinements, that plain men become utterly bewildered, and begin to doubt whether it is possible ever again to attach any definite significance whatever to the English language. Most certain it is that, if any individual in ordinary commercial transactions, or in the common intercourse of society, were to adopt such a mode of interpreting his own declaration and promises as are deemed allowable by those who have subscribed religious formularies in the presence and in the name of God, he would be, if not branded as a knave and a cheat, most certainly avoided as a man utterly unsafe to be dealt with.

"Now, is this a desirable state of things? Is it honorable to religion? Is it safe for the Church? Is it consistent with either the integrity or dignity of the Clergy? Is it perfectly manifest to every man who pays the least heed to Ecclesiastical matters in this country, that there is no real unity in the Church of England? Noah's ark did not hold a more promiscuous population. Then why attempt to maintain the outward semblance of unity at the cost of everything that we ought to hold most dear? Is it meet, or comely, that that institution, which is hypothetically the fountain whence those moral and spiritual influences flow that are to purify and invigorate the national life, should itself exhibit a conspicuous example of equivocation and sophistry?—of playing fast and loose with the claims of truth and the obligations of conscience?

"It is not for us to prescribe a remedy. Indeed, it seems to us that no thorough remedy is possible, save one: to sever the golden chain which binds the Church to the State. And would not this be felt by the worthiest and noblest of her sons to be an infinite deliverance? Is it not an unspeakable degradation for a spiritual body, which professes to derive its authority and inspiration from Heaven, to be obliged to go, with 'bated breath and whispering humbleness,' to ask of the secular power what it must believe—and teach in the name of its Divine Master? It is not necessary for the Church to be clothed in purple and fine linen, to dwell in kings' houses, and to 'lift its mitred front in courts and parliaments.' But it is necessary, if it would be saved from dishonor and contempt, that it should speak its message from God to man, with a bold and unfettered utterance. It is necessary that it should bear firm and high before the eyes of the world, the standard of truth and righteousness."

"We can add nothing to this scathing denunciation; but let it be remembered that this is no *ex-parte* statement. Its truth is universally ad-