

John Mitchell and His Two Popes.

From the True Freeman's Journal.

In the last week's issue of the "Citizen," John Mitchell treats his readers to an essay on "The Pope," whom, in his own queer logic, he makes to appear in a two-fold aspect. Such a specimen of sophistry we presume has scarcely ever appeared in our city hitherto. It seems some of his readers threaten him with the Pope, while others warn him against his ITALIAN HOLINESS; and in order to direct his attention to a proper channel a "TRUE FRIEND" undertakes to tell him "that the redemption of one nationality (Ireland) is quite enough for one man and one newspaper." In reply to this he says, "God knows it is." . . . "The British Government, indeed, is Ireland's sole original enemy." Ah, Mr. Mitchell, who has informed you that the British Government is Ireland's sole original enemy? Had the Pope of Rome nothing to do in this? We open the pages of history and find that it is not England, but the Pope himself that was Ireland's sole original enemy. Such cant about England might have done very well among the "young Ireland party" in the green fields of Erin, but intelligent Americans look for something more than mere bombast. What did England do to oppress Ireland before the days of Pope Adrian IV., in the year 1155? Who gave Ireland to the English monarch? Was it not the Pope of Rome? Come, Mr. Mitchell, be candid for once, and answer as a freeman ought. But lest the prejudice of a *pervert to Romanism* may prevent you, allow us to direct your attention to documentary evidence in behalf of "Ireland's sole original enemy." The following is the Bull of Pope Adrian IV., addressed to King Henry II. of England, granting him the permission of taking possession of Ireland and the islands adjacent, saving the rights of the Church of Rome and of other churches:

"Adrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our well beloved son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

"Your Highness contemplates the laudable and profitable work of gaining a glorious reputation on earth, and enhancing the recompense of future bliss in heaven, by turning your thoughts in the true spirit of a Catholic prince, to widening the bounds of the Church, and explaining the true Christian faith to ignorant and uncivilized tribes, and exterminating the nurseries of vices from the heritage of the Lord; and in order to the better execution of this project, you implore the counsel of the Apostolic See. In which matter the more mature the deliberation and the greater the discretion with which you proceed, so much the greater, we trust, will be the success that will, with the Lord's permission, attend your exertions.

"Certainly there is no doubt but that Ireland and all the islands upon which Christ and the Sun of Righteousness hath shined, and which have received instruction in the Christian faith, do belong of right to St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church, as your Grace admits. Whereupon we are the more ready to introduce into them a faithful plantation, and a stock acceptable to God, in proportion as we are convinced from conscientious motives that this is urgently required of us.

"You have signified to us, Son, well-beloved in Christ, your desire to enter the island of Ireland, in order to bring that people into subjection to laws, and to exterminate the nurseries of vices from the country; and that you are willing to pay to St. Peter an annual tribute of one penny for every house, and to preserve, uninjured and inviolate, the ecclesiastical rights of that land.

"We therefore, treating your pious and laudable desire with the favor which it deserves, and graciously acceding to your petition, express our will and pleasure that in order to widen the bounds of the Church, to check the spread of vice, to reform morals and inculcate virtues, in order to the advancement of the Christian religion, you should enter that island, and do what shall tend to the honor of God and the welfare of that land. And let the people of that land receive you in an honorable manner, and respect you as their lord: provided, always, that ecclesi-

astical rights be uninjured and inviolate, and the annual payment of one penny for every house be secured to St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church."

Now was it the Pope as bishop, or the Pope as prince, that gave Ireland to England? The Pope requires one penny from every house for St. Peter. But St. Peter was never a prince, but a simple primitive bishop. But just hear what Peter's pretended successor says: "IRELAND, &c., DO BELONG OF RIGHT TO ST. PETER AND THE HOLY ROMAN CHURCH." Then it is St. Peter's right to give away what he possesses. The Pope as bishop is St. Peter's pretended successor, therefore as bishop, and not as prince, the Pope gave Ireland to England. But as King Henry did not act in conformity with the above, but neglected Ireland, Pope Alexander, Adrian's successor, reminded him by a *new bull fully horned, and roaring loudly*, in the year 1172. Now, before these bulls began to roar, Ireland's Church was independent of Rome. The following is Alexander's bull:

"Alexander, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our well beloved son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, health and apostolical benediction. Forasmuch as those grants of our predecessors, which are known to have been made on reasonable grounds, are worthy to be confirmed by a permanent sanction: We, therefore, following the footsteps of the late venerable Pope Adrian, and considering the fruits of our desire, do ratify and confirm the permission of the Pope, given you, relative to the lordship of the kingdom of Ireland: reserving to Blessed Peter and the Holy Roman Church, as in England, so also in Ireland, the annual payment of one penny for every house: to the end that the FLIRTY PRACTICES OF THAT LAND MAY BE ABOLISHED, and the Barbarous Nation, which is called by a CHRISTIAN NAME, (!) may, through your clemency, attain some decency of manners; and that, when the Church of that Country, which has been hitherto in a DISORDERLY STATE, shall have been reduced to order (?), that people may by your means possess for the future the *reality* as well as the *name* of the Christian profession."

Now we would like to know who was Ireland's sole original enemy in 1172?

If England is Ireland's enemy, which we deny, it was the POPE OF ROME THAT MADE HER SO. So much for misrepresentation. It is a notorious fact that Ireland is more prosperous to-day than ever she was—politically. We admit that Ireland would be able enough to govern herself had the time come; but why hold up England as a tyrant when she does not manifest any such intention. If a few Roman Catholics, who have always hated Protestant England, conspired against British rule in Ireland, under the mask of making Ireland free, but really with a worse intention, have, in common with other disturbers of the nation's peace, been banished their country, it was certainly, in a political sense, for their country's good. Was there any patriotism in disturbing the peace of the nation in 1848? This talk about patriotism is passing strange, indeed, when it can be shown in the most indubitable manner that no nation had ever received greater kindness from the other than Ireland has, since the year 1800, received from Britain.

With respect to the Pope, Mr. Mitchell says:

"But our friendly correspondent assures us that the Pope and the Catholic Church are ranged on the side of Despotism. There is some mistake here. It may help to clear up the mistake, if we consider that the Pope of Rome is a double personage, and has two distinct characters. Or rather there are two Popes—the one is a bishop, the other is a prince—the Bishop-Pope is God's vice-gerent upon earth—the Prince-Pope is Austria's vice-gerent at Rome.—This Bishop has the power of the spiritual keys, the power to bind and to loose, to bless and to ban,—and derives it (for aught we know) from a divine commission. The Prince has the keys of the castle of St. Angelo, and has power to lock up men's bodies there, power to tax and to fine, power to hang and to shoot, and derives these latter powers from the bloody bayonets of Austria, and, we are ashamed to say, France.—But there is no occasion why the Bishop of Rome should also be Prince of Rome. And perhaps

he would be more a Bishop if he were less a Prince. While the Pope was in exile at Avignon, while he was a prisoner to Charles V., he was not the less Head of the Church, and had not the less power to bind and to loose. Moreover the temporal power is one which may at any time, and even soon, be taken away from him—because as Prince he is merely one of the small fry of kinglets and Serene Highnesses, waiters upon Providence and the "Great Powers;" but as Bishop, his see is founded upon a rock, and neither Red Republicanism nor the very Gates of Hell can prevail against it."

Here are two Popes—one a Prince, the other a Bishop; and yet, strange to say, both are united in one person. The Prince-Pope is the creature of Austria—the Bishop-Pope is God's vice-gerent upon earth. What a queer creature he is! To be both despotic Austria's creature, and, at the same time, God's vice-gerent upon earth!!! To draw the line of demarcation between the "creature of Austria and the vice-gerent of God" is about as difficult as it was to draw the difference between a certain Roman Bishop in his ecclesiastical character as distinguished from his political.

Using too profane language one day for his clerical dignity, he was thus accosted by one of his compeers:

"My lord, why do you swear?"

"Oh, I do not swear as a bishop, but as a lord," was the sage reply.

"But, my lord," said his compeer, "when the devil gets the lord where will be the bishop?"

We grant that the Pope is the very slave of Austria, but Austria never gave one inch of the States of the Church to the Pope. Ravenna, Lombardy and the State of Rome were deprived of their liberty by Pepin, Charlemagne and Lewis—kings of France—and bestowed upon St. Peter, all before the year 817.

But who made the Pope Head of the Church? Was it Christ? No. Was it Peter? No. Just hear what Gregory, the great Bishop of Rome, in 598, says:

"I proclaim it boldly, that whosoever calleth himself Universal Bishop is the Forerunner of Anti-Christ."

Yet in the year 606 who proclaimed Boniface III. Universal Bishop? Was it not the bloody emperor Phocas? Tell us no more that palpable falsehood—that as "Bishop, his see is founded upon a rock, and neither Red Republicanism nor the very Gates of Hell can prevail against it." Tell us no more that you are a Protestant. Could such language proceed from a Christian's lips, or be written by a Christian's pen? Again Mr. Mitchell says:

"But we say it is not true that the Church, or the Pope as the Head of the Church, is at all concerned in the cause of despotism, or at all averse from universal Republicanism. On the contrary, Republicanism claims the Church for a potent ally; and one at least of the greatest Catholic divines has long since given his voice for accepting that alliance, and guiding the inevitable movement to good and salutary ends.

"We will not believe that the Catholic clergy are hostile to the British power merely because it is a Protestant power, and stand by the Emperor of Austria because he is a Catholic tyrant."

How can any man in his sense; upon the above when the universal testimony of history makes the Pope always arrayed on the side of despotism. Where is the Republican government under the control of the Pope? You may say San Marino is, but it is wholly ruled by Priests, and its people are ignorant and degraded. Look at Rome, at the States of the Church, at Sardinia, at Naples, at all the other Italian States, at Portugal, Spain, France South America, Mexico, and Lower Canada. What has made these countries so degraded, so ignorant, so superstitious? Has it not been Popery? Not the system of the Prince-Pope, but of the Bishop-Pope. Can they compare with Protestant Germany, Holland, England, Scotland, and these United States? Can the West and South of Ireland compare with the North of Ireland? Can Tipperary compare with your own County Down? Now we ask, was it as Prince or as Bishop that the Pope excommunicated John of England and Philip Augustus of France, the