

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

IS 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 so 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; Pick-up's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dutton's, No. 3, St. Lawrence Main Street.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 6, 1860.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

PENDING the meeting of the long announced Congress, there is a lull in the tempest of European politics. If we may believe their official language, the Emperors of France and Austria are on the most amicable terms, and the affairs of Italy will be so settled as to give general satisfaction to the people, without infringing upon the rights of the Pope. It cannot be denied however, that in many parts of the Italian Peninsula, the revolutionary spirit—the spirit of '92 with its hatred of priests and Kings—is rife; and that it will require skillful diplomacy, perhaps strong measures, to soothe, or keep down the hideous monster whose ugly features are again troubling the repose of sincere lovers of order and rational freedom. It is only when considering it as essentially an anti-Christian movement, as much anti-Christian as was the first French Revolution, that we can estimate at its proper value, the insurrectionary movement in progress in the Papal States; which, if successful, will but substitute for the Gospel of Christ, that of Jean Jacques, Voltaire, Tom Paine and the other great Protestant evangelists of the last century. Professing to strike only at the temporal power of the Popes, its real *mot de guerre* is—"écrasez infame;" and its crowning achievement will be the entronement of a prostitute upon the altar of the living God, after having strangled the last priest with the bowels of the last King. The language of its leaders may be trifle less gross than was that of the Marats, and the other chiefs of the French Revolution, but their objects are identical, as are also the means to which they have recourse.

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.—

The question at issue betwixt us and the *Montreal Gazette* is not as to whether the government of the Papal States is susceptible of any reforms, whether its finances are well administered, or the people subject to its rule contented and in the enjoyment of great material prosperity? but simply this—Is the Papal Government so essentially bad, so necessarily despotic, that good Christians and friends of liberty, cannot in conscience pray for its deliverance from the many dangers that now menace it? Of course if the temporal power of the Pope is necessarily despotic, harsh and cruel to its subjects, no man should pray for its continuance; but if, as we contend, its defects are accidental only, and proceed, not from its independence, but from the pressure from without to which it has been subjected, and to the interference of Foreign Powers, then, not only is it lawful for Catholics to offer up their prayers for its protection, but, by so doing, they are virtually praying for a removal of those very grievances of which the Liberal press complain. It is for the independent temporal power of the Pope, that, in obedience to the voice of our Pastors, we pray; and as we contend that all the evils which exist in the government of the Papal States proceed from the interference of Foreign Powers, and have been by that interference perpetuated, so by the re-establishment of the temporal power of the Popes in perfect independence do we believe that those evils will most speedily and effectually be done away with.

For we do not pretend that the Pope as a temporal Sovereign is infallible, or impeccable; for we do not claim for his secular government, as we do for the Church of which he is the Sovereign Pontiff, a divine origin. Serviceable as is the temporal sovereignty of the Pope to the free exercise of his spiritual authority, we fully recognize that the former is not indispensable, and that like all things human, therefore, it is subject to infirmity, and is liable to be abused. When so abused, it should of course be reformed; but in that we contend for its reformation, when and where reform is necessary, we virtually protest against its destruction. We are not of those who pretend that the civil administration of the affairs of the Pontifical States is perfect, for we remember that its affairs are administered by fallible men, and that of nothing human can perfection or incorruptibility be predicated; but we believe from the testimony of history, even as related by Protestants, that if left perfectly free and independent of all foreign influences, the Papal Government has been, and therefore may be, eminently conducive to the material prosperity of its immediate subjects, as well as to the spiritual interests of the Catholic Church. Therefore we pray God to restore, and to preserve the independent temporal Sovereignty of the Popes; because we firmly believe that when all external pressure—whether from intriguing princes, or Italian revolutionists—shall have been removed, the embarrassments which have produced the disorder in its finances will be quickly shaken off; and the Papal Government

will again become what it was of old, a blessing to its subjects, and the envy of surrounding nations. For this, all that is requisite is that the Papal Government should be again, as it once was, really and thoroughly independent.

This it has not been for many years. In a material point of view, and considered solely with reference to the number of sabres and bayonets that it can bring into the field, the Papal Government is the weakest in the world; hence it has always presented a strong temptation to the ambitious and unprincipled Sovereigns and statesmen of Europe. Since the days of Charles V. Italy has been the battle-field whereon France and Austria have contended for supremacy in the Peninsula, but above all, for supremacy over the Papal States. Force and intrigue have been in turn employed by the rival combatants to attain their ends; for their purpose they have sometimes sought to intimidate the Pope by menaces of brute force; at other times to compel him to submission by fomenting strife, and exciting domestic troubles within his dominions. Never for an instant has a Pope of late years been left free to prosecute his own plans for the government of his own dominions, unharrassed by the menaces or intrigues of his powerful and unprincipled neighbors. Before the temporal Power of the Popes, therefore, can be held responsible for any abuses which may exist beneath its rule, it must be shown that those abuses have sprung up under, and have proceeded directly from, the free, unfettered, or independent exercise of that power.—But this is impossible.

Let us see however what testimony Protestants bear to the effects of the temporal power or rule of the Pope when, free from all foreign influence, it could develop itself as it pleased; and for this we must revert to Rome of the XVI century, ere the great apostasy had extended its dark shade over the face of Christendom, and whilst the successor of St. Peter was still in fact, as well as in name, an independent temporal Sovereign, as well as the Supreme Pontiff of the Christian Church. It is from the pages of the Protestant historian, Ranke, that we take the following picture of the material condition of the Papal States in those halcyon days: and, we ask—could that government whose results were manifested in such features, have been tyranny or harsh despotism?—

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATES OF THE CHURCH.—

A well situated, rich, and noble region had fallen to the lot of the Popes.

"The writers of the sixteenth century cannot find words to extol its fertility. What beautiful plains did it exhibit round Bologna, all through Romagna! We travelled, say the Venetian Ambassadors of 1522, 'from Macerata to Tolentino through the most beautiful fields; through hills and plains covered with corn; there was nothing else to be seen growing for a space of thirty miles; not a foot of uncultivated land was discoverable; it seemed impossible to gather in, not to speak of consuming, such an abundance of corn.' Romagna yearly yielded forty thousand stara more corn than was sufficient for its own consumption; for this there was a great demand, and after supplying the mountain districts of Urbino, Tuscany, and Bologna, thirty-five thousand stara more were at times exported by sea. While Venice on the one sea, was supplied with necessaries from Bologna and the March; on the other Genoa commonly, and occasionally Naples too, were supplied from Viterbo and the patrimony. In one of His Bulls of the year 1566, Pius V. extols the divine grace that had permitted that Rome, which formerly had not been able to subsist without foreign supplies of corn, should now not only possess it in superfluity, but often be able to supply it of its own growth to neighboring, and distant countries, by land and sea. In the year 1589 the exports of corn from the States of the Church, are estimated at the annual value of five hundred thousand scudi. Particular districts were further celebrated for their several peculiar productions. Perugia for hemp, Faenza for flax, Viterbo for both, Cesena for a wine for exportation, Rimini for oil, Bologna for wood, San Lorenzo for its manna, the vintage of Montefiascone was famous all over the world."—Ranke's *Hist. of the Popes*, b. IV. In a note appended to the above we are further informed that "they"—the people of the Ecclesiastical States—"have no need of foreign goods, with the exception of things of small importance and value, such as groceries, and materials of apparel for the nobility and persons of distinction."

Thus by Protestant testimony it appears that under the truly independent temporal sovereignty of the Popes, Rome was supreme, not only in the sciences, and those arts which tend to embellish life, but in all those arts which more immediately conduce to material prosperity—in the arts of commerce, manufacture, and agriculture. And, under God, this material prosperity so conclusive as to the excellence of the government beneath which it flourished, was the work of the Popes, and the direct result of their independent rule over the States of the Church. Not a century and a half had elapsed betwixt the epoch of the prosperity described by Ranke in such glowing colors, and the return of the Popes to Rome, after their long exile spoken of by Italian writers as the "Babylonish captivity." Now how it fared with Rome during the absence of her legitimate rulers, and the eclipse of their temporal power, the following extracts from the Protestant Ranke will show:—

"During the absence of the Popes in Avignon, thus Rome of the Middle Ages fell equally into decay with the long-ruled Rome of antiquity. When Eugenius IV. returned thither in 1443, it was become a town of cowherds; its inhabitants differed in nothing from the peasants and herdsmen of the surrounding country. The mills had long been abandoned, the dwellings were all accumulated in the plain along the windings of the Tiber; there was no pavement in the narrow streets, which were farther darkened by the projecting balconies and bowed windows, that almost met from side to side; cattle were seen strolling about as in a village. From San Silvestro to the Porta Del Popolo there was nothing but gardens and morasses, the resort of wild ducks. The very memory of antiquity had almost vanished. The Capitol had become the Goats' Mountain, the Forum Romanum the Cornfield; the strangest legends were attached to some monuments that still remained. St. Peter's Church was in danger of falling down."

To such an abject state had the once proud mistress of the world dwindled whilst the temporal power of the Pope was, as it were, in abeyance; and from such an abject condition it required no trifling efforts on the part of succeeding Pontiffs to raise the decayed City. Yet this task they attempted and accomplished. They built up its ancient palaces, they restored the desolate places, and made the barren fields bring forth in gladness and abundance. Within little more than a single century after their return to Rome, the Popes could, by the testimony of strangers and enemies, boast that the people over

whom they ruled were the most prosperous, the best governed, and the least taxed of any in Europe. So notorious was this, that the lot of the people of the Ecclesiastical States was the envy of their neighbors; the rule of ecclesiastics and prelates was eagerly sought for by the towns of Italy—so Ranke tells us; for he adds they "would seem to have had no liking for secular governors."

We have thus shown, and by Protestant testimony, what was the state of Rome when the Popes were absent, and their temporal authority under a cloud—and what its condition when the Popes were restored, and their temporal power re-established in its plenitude of independence. From the two pictures thus presented to us by a Protestant, we have the right to conclude, as from our premises, that the independent temporal sovereignty of the Pope is not necessarily a despotism; that it is not necessarily oppressive upon, or prejudicial to the material prosperity of, those subject to its sway; that if, in the States of the Church, there be to day abuses which call urgently for reform, they cannot proceed from, and therefore cannot justify the destruction of, that independent temporal power of the Popes; and that, therefore, in praying for the maintenance of that power, Catholics do not pray for the perpetuation of a tyranny, or that God would please to take despotism under his special protection.—Our argument in short is this. The actual is possible; what has been, may be; the truly independent temporal power of the Popes, has, by Protestant testimony, been most beneficial to the people subject to its sway, and most conducive to their material prosperity. It may be so, therefore again; and, therefore, Catholics can, as consistent lovers of freedom, heartily concur with the recommendations of the *Mandement* of His Lordship the Bishop of Tloa which enjoins them to pray for the restoration and maintenance of the independent temporal power of the Popes.

It is not within the scope of our argument—whose sole object is to vindicate the consistency of Catholic professions of attachment to the cause of liberty and order, with the Catholic practise of praying for the temporal power of the Pope—to prove that any disorders which may now exist in the administration of the finances, and secular affairs of the Papal States proceed, not from that the Pope is, and long has been, a truly independent sovereign in things secular; but, from the intrigues, armed interference, and spoliations of Foreign Powers. We need scarcely remind our readers of the facts that, since the epoch of the French Revolution, scarce the shadow of independence—in the exercise of their temporal power—has been left to the Sovereign Pontiffs; that some of them have died in exile and captivity; that the States of the Church have been pillaged and had under contribution by armed strangers; and that every attempt to introduce financial and administrative reforms, has been opposed by the Pope's ambitious and powerful neighbors. What—we ask the *Gazette*—what would be the condition of England and its people if they had been treated by foreigners, as Rome was treated by the soldiers of the Directory and of the first Empire?—if within the last half century London had been ravaged by a licentious soldiery?—if the British Sovereign had been dragged from his throne by a French Emperor, and Great Britain had been for years reduced to the condition of a Province of the French Empire? What, we ask, would be the financial condition of England to-day, what its agricultural and commercial prosperity, if all these things had happened to her? And yet all these things have happened to Rome; and to them can the difficulties under which the present Papal Government now labors—its exhausted finances, its languishing agriculture, and its discontented populace—be directly attributed. It is because the Popes have not been left free and independent in the exercise of their temporal power—because their territories have been repeatedly invaded, and pillaged by French armies—because all their efforts to introduce liberal reforms have been opposed by Austria, that their States to-day are not what they were some three hundred years ago, when the Pope was *de facto* an independent temporal sovereign. These things would be the *Gazette* to bear in mind; and ere he again undertakes to sneer at the misgovernment of Rome, we would request of him to reflect seriously upon what the material condition of Great Britain would be to-day, if its shores had been successfully invaded by the conqueror of Europe; if George the Third had been by him dragged a prisoner from Windsor to Paris; if Great Britain had been for many years annexed to France, and the ancient Constitution of England had been replaced by the *Code Napoleon*. Had these things befallen Great Britain during the present century—as they have befallen Rome—would that man be esteemed honest or intelligent who should attribute those financial or administrative disorders which, under such circumstances, would certainly exist, to the independent temporal power of the British sovereign?—or cite the poverty of Queen Victoria's subjects, and the languishing condition of British commerce and agriculture, as a valid justification of armed rebellion against her authority? And yet this is literally the course which Liberal writers, politicians, and journalists pursue towards Rome and the Pope.

Look to Ireland, look to India!—we say to the *Gazette*. Are there no disorders there, no wrongs to be redressed?—are no reforms needed there?—are the people all content with British rule? And yet we can pray, and are by our Church enjoined to pray for Queen Victoria and the maintenance of her temporal power.—We pray God, honestly and sincerely, to bless her, and protect her against her enemies. We do so in simplicity, and unconditionally; and yet most assuredly we do not intend to pray for the maintenance of the abuses of British rule, either in Ireland or in India; although these beyond question proceed directly from the British government itself, and not as with the abuses that may exist in Rome, from a foreign pressure from without. We therefore are consistent, both in that we pray for the Pope, and for our Queen—and heartily bid God bless them both. But where we ask is the consistency of the British Protestant who applauds the cowardly skulking

Mazzini, but denounces John Mitchell who sympathizes with the cut-throats of Italy, and has no words strong enough wherewith to condemn the assertors of Irish nationality—who exclaims against Nena Sahib and the Sepoys, but smiles complacently upon, or glosses over the misdeeds of the assassins of a Rossi or Anvitti—who in a word, fosters and encourages armed rebellion abroad, but proclaims as traitors at home, those who by strictly legal and constitutional means would seek to redress the wrongs inflicted upon Catholic Ireland, by an alien and thrice-loathsome Protestant Ascendancy?

DR. IVES' LECTURES.

This distinguished scholar lectured before the St. Patrick's Literary Association of this city, on the evenings of Friday and Monday last, and more than confirmed the high opinion previously entertained of his great abilities. His audience comprised men of all denominations, and of our Catholic Clergy a good many assisted. The following report we borrow from the *Herald*:—

ROME THE PATRONESS OF LEARNING.

Rome, observed the lecturer, must be judged by her works. Sophocles was accused of madness; he replied by exhibiting his tragedies, and so when Rome was traduced it was only necessary, in reply, to bring forward the great facts in her history. It was, however, difficult to get these facts before the people. To those who had all their lives looked at only one side of the question, and who held their most sacred institutions to be based on the views hitherto held, it was a most painful thing to admit any contrary impressions. To do so was to desert the landmarks of their forefathers; to leave their posterity without inheritance; and even it might be to throw some doubt on the eternal welfare of those whom they loved. He well remembered the painful impression made on his own mind when a knowledge of facts made him begin to doubt the truth of many charges against the Catholic Church—how he felt when he found that all his past mental life, his principles and motives of action, were nothing better than delusions. Deeply, therefore, did he sympathize with those whom reason, justice and honor still called to the same task.—But was there not in the American heart, on either side of the line, that deep love of justice, and principle of self-sacrifice, which would prompt sympathy for the injured, and secure to Catholics a patient hearing—especially when these last protested against the charges brought against them, and offered to make their innocence appear by the most palpable facts? The charges made by the Protestant press, by ministers, and by statesmen, was, that Christian Rome was systematically hostile to mental and social improvement, and had a settled design of keeping the people in ignorance and social degradation, and this, though the contrary had been made clear by the confessions of Protestant writers. It was not his intention, however, to show that the Catholic Church had been favorable to the spread of all sorts of knowledge without regard to its suitability or safety, for Catholics maintained that it was the prerogative of the Holy Father to guide the flock, and shield it from indiscreet teachers and from the impositions of science, falsely so-called. He, therefore, had never shrunk from opposition to dangerous error, or even to the untimely publication of intrinsic truth. It was to be expected, then, that instances would be found in which infidelity and latitudinarianism would consider the interference of Christian Rome hostile to mental progress, though she was really in those very instances the foster-mother of pure reason and essential truth. Nor did he hold that, though this was the course of the Catholic Church, there were no instances in which individual ecclesiastics had been opposed to enlightenment, though in a somewhat extensive reading he had met with few such examples.—Such as there were they did not militate against his proposition, which concerned not individuals. Nor did he maintain that there had been no periods of mental depression; but he said this—that whatever the natural character of the age, Christian Rome had always been ahead of the State, and of every other body, to prompt the diffusion of sound learning. If the contrary were true, the fact must be expected to appear in the time of the early establishment of her power; because then all the circumstances were favorable to her success. But look at the facts.—Gregory the Great lived in the heart of the Dark Ages, and was celebrated for his zeal for the spread of Catholic truth. Did he do this by the discouragement of knowledge? Icorne and Hallam had intimated that he did; but they differed between themselves, and both differed from other writers. Some expressions in the writings of this Pope were directed against the use of the Pagan poets in the schools; but that was because he feared the influence of these writings in spreading Pagan ideas and corrupting the morals of the young. He was himself the most learned man of his age; he tried according to unanimous testimony, to raise the standard of learning in Rome, so that the arts and sciences attained a high degree of excellence even before his death. He required his missionaries to be men of learning, having provided adequate schools and a library remarkable for its extent for their instruction. When he sent them forth to convert the nations he also provided them with libraries, the proof of which was to be found in the list of manuscripts brought by St. Agustin to England, and which might yet be found in the libraries of that country. Pope Celestine, too, sent learned missionaries to Ireland; and no sooner had the Catholic Church arisen, than there arose also a Catholic college; and no long time passed till Ireland was studied with literary institutions. This fact was admitted by the Protestant Hallam. In the time of Julian, also, who by his edict shut up the Christian schools out of jealousy, many such schools, and of a very high order, already existed at Rome, so that St. Augustine was, on account of their excellence, induced to finish his education there. In 440, St. Leo boasted of the number and eminence of the schools. In Spain it was required by a council in the fourth century, that there should be not only a college, in every diocese, but a school in every Parish Priest's house; it being alleged that this was common through-

out Italy. In England, when the glorious work of the Monks had been destroyed by the sword, who was it that tried to rekindle the light of knowledge? Rome, in the persons of her missionaries whose labors were so successful that in the next age the Church was adorned by such men as Bede and Alcuin. In France, Charles restored the schools in order to raise the people from their state of ignorance; but he did so according to his own statement because he was prompted by the Holy Father at his third visit to Rome. The 9th century opened prosperously for education, yet it had not proceeded far without the appearance of a decline, not however without an effort by the Church to prevent it;—as a Council urging upon Charles the Bold the necessity of encouraging learning. It was, however, sometimes urged that these Catholic schools were designed for the training of ecclesiastics, or for teaching such as desired instruction in the dead languages alone; and that, therefore, the instructions were in the Latin tongue. But he replied that the Latin tongue was then generally used and understood all over Europe.—Sismondi said that it was employed by soldiers in their songs; and a writer who wished to counteract the ill effects of the plays of Terence, wrote Christian plays in Latin, which produced a great moral effect, such as could not have arisen from them unless the people had understood them. In England, Bede testified that Latin and Greek were as familiar to the people as their native tongues. But it was said again that the literature thus encouraged was not meant to enlighten, and was at best truth mixed with fable—consisting chiefly of untrue legends of the Saints, aimed only at the promotion of superstition. Yet Guizot, the Protestant philosopher, in his history of civilization, had defended the Catholic Church from this charge, and had pointed out their eminent moral power. But it was not necessary to rely on his defence. Admitting that this legendary literature had in it much that was fabulous, the true question was what was its tendency. Did it debase the mind, and contribute to the ascendancy of the vulgar passions of the body, or did it not on the contrary tend to strengthen faith and keep before the minds of men the mutable nature of earthly things? It was not the fictions of this literature which were objected to, for who objected to the fictions which swarmed at the present day. It was the spiritual tendency of these legends that caused the outcry against them in a generation that seemed to derive to know nothing of the spiritual. It had further been objected that in the instruction of these schools, there was a total neglect of the holy scriptures. It was true that the absence of the art of printing made it impossible to put the bible into the hands of all scholars;—but in each school ample means were afforded for obtaining a correct knowledge from manuscript scriptures, and each student had to go through a biblical course in his first year. To those who desired to understand the subject fully, he would recommend the work of the Protestant Mantland on the Dark Ages, and a number of a work called the Christian Remembrancer of 1st January, 1855. It was incontestable that the knowledge of the bible in that period was more perfect and general than in this boasting bible reading age. He might there rest the argument; but he would now mention some facts with regard to more recent times. In these the scholars of St. Benedict might be seen carrying out the three objects of their founder; the conversion of souls; the reclaiming of the soil; and the carrying everywhere of the torch of literature and science.—Their manuscripts exhumed from thousands of convents, formed at this day the basis of all reliable history; while their edition in more than 150 volumes of the Greek and Latin fathers showed their capacity to impart knowledge. The Dominicans might also be seen raising the standard of education at Bologna, Oxford and Cologne, and creating such a galaxy of erudition as the world has never seen—a galaxy composed of such stars as Albertus Magnus in the exact sciences, and Thomas Aquinas in the theological learning. So great was their learning that, according to the confession of Gibbon, one of their monasteries had produced more literary and scientific works than both the English Universities. They could, moreover, boast of a *cursum completus*, written by their own order. A century or two later there arose the formidable array of combatants formed by the magnanimous Society of Jesus; but what were their weapons?—those of ignorance and fanaticism? Did they, like some of the sects with whom they contended, claim to be heard because they spoke by inspiration? Let their rule be looked into, for proof of their long training in literature and science; let their classification be regarded with the appointment of their profoundest scholars for the schools, and their most eloquent members for preaching; let their course of study be examined to see the high standard of knowledge required from them—let the popularity of their educational system and the memorial of their members distinguished in every sphere of knowledge be considered; read the list of their Bossuets, Bourdaloues, Kirchers, and Pakavicinus, and say if the Catholic Church could fairly be accused as the fosterer of ignorance. The learned lecturer then referred to the monuments of ancient art preserved in Rome—to the immense library of manuscripts and books in the Vatican—and asked whether this care for the preservation of the monuments of art and science, was a proof of a desire for ignorance.—As to educational institutions, Christian Rome with 160,000 inhabitants, had no less than ten colleges; three for higher education for Italians; ten others for foreigners; and two for the Monastics, besides the University of the Sapienza.—How many had New York with five times the population? Three colleges, and two Seminaries. In the Papal States there were seven Universities, in a district measuring less than half the area of the State of New York. They were open to all classes and nations, and numbered 28,899 students. He might go farther, and compare the educational institutions of Catholic countries with those of Protestant ones—those of this noble city, with any to be found elsewhere on the Continent, and he might again