

And whirl the red leaf from the tree, Thy wail is suited to my mind, And withered leaves are types for me; And closed be soft compassion's eye, Nor miss her sobs with Mary's moan; Who leaves for her the plying sign, Must count her sorrows as their own.

And the few and left the masses in ignorance; secondly, they concentrated all power, spiritual as well as temporal, into the hands of the governor of the state; and thus we learn that the mass of the people were degraded in slavery and without the freedom which the Church taught the world to give even to the lowliest. At Athens alone there were 40,000 slaves to 20,000 citizens, and we know the Roman Senate at one time passed a law that the enumeration of the slaves should not be taken on account of their immense number, and the consequent danger of an uprising amongst them if they once realised how vast was the proportion of slaves to freemen. In the third place, the pagan civilisation made Caesar pontiff, emperor, temporal sovereign, and even divine—he was made into a god; and thus we find, in the days of Pliny, Christians were condemned to death because they refused to sacrifice at the command of the sovereign to an image. The emperor assumed absolute power. "Remember all things are lawful to me, and I have power over every one according as I will," this was the pagan principle. "That which is the will of the prince has the force of law." These were the principles which underlay the Greek and Roman pagan civilisation which the Catholic Church overthrew. The Catholic Church came into the world while the great mass of the people were suffering the deprivation of their liberty, and living under the reign of tyrants. She drew the charter of her constitution from the mouth of her Divine Founder, and the words which she determined were—"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." The basis of Christian civilisation rested upon the distinction between the temporal and spiritual powers, and the Catholic Church taught that the spiritual power was founded by God, which power God was pleased to give in a certain manner to certain men and to those only. She recognised that the spiritual power is also His creation; they pursue two different lines, yet run in parallel lines, both distinct, but acting in harmony for the good of mankind. The first thing the Church did was to deny the divinity and priesthood of the Caesars; she told the Emperors they were not above law, but like all other men, were subject to the law of God, and that law was the law drawn from the Gospel, and written in the heart of man. Next she laid down what was the nature of the law. Hitherto the principle had been that the law depended upon the will of the governor, and not upon reason. The Church, seeing the world was reduced to slavery through the will of her governors, taught the governors that the law was not the reflex of their will, but the reflex of reason, and as laid down by St. Thomas, "law is a rule dictated by reason, the aim of which is the public good, and promulgated by him who has the care of society;" therefore the maxim that "the will of the prince is the law was abolished, and the tyranny of kings, or princes, or governors, was censured and condemned. Again, the Church laid down this principle, that the king exists for his kingdom, and not the kingdom for the king, and to sum up this doctrine in the words of Saint Thomas, "The kingdom is not made for the king, but the king for the kingdom, for God has constituted kings to rule and govern and to secure to everyone the possession of his rights." This was the idea which the Catholic Church formed of the power of a king, and if a king seek his own interests alone he ceases to be a king and becomes a tyrant. In this manner the Church proclaimed to the world, by her practice and teaching, the liberty of the subject. Again, she taught that the civil power is limited, that governments cannot do all they pleased, but are limited in their sphere; that they may not trespass, first of all upon the rights inherent in the individual, and secondly, that they may not trespass upon the rights inherent in the family, nor upon the rights which belong to the spiritual power which is ordained directly by God. St. Augustine says, "An unjust law does not appear to be a law, because a law to be really a law should be just." It was by inculcating these various principles that the Church of God from the very beginning suffered trouble and persecution from the civil power. She appeared before the great powers of the world and told them they must give up the power they held in one hand if they would retain the power they held in the other, and consequently the pagan powers were not illogical when they persecuted the Catholic Church; they knew, as by instinct, that the Catholic Church would be the ruin of the pagan civilisation, and seeing it was a war which should obtain the mastery, they determined if they could to crush out Christianity, and to rule supreme both as emperors and pontiffs; but the Church, the work of God, receiving her mission from God, could not be suppressed, and from the year 30 to 311 no fewer than thirty-two popes laid down their lives and were martyred by the civil pagan power in testimony to their adhesion to those principles which he had detailed. Even for some three hundred years after the time of Constantine, great efforts were made to return to the old pagan civilisation. It was when Leo III. crowned Charlemagne as "Emperor of the West," that they obtained in him an ally—a barrier was set up to the destruction of the pagan despotism which had so frequently troubled the world, and there grew up those principles which were the foundation of the constitution of Christendom—that the king must be a Christian if his country was Christian, that a Catholic people must be governed by a Catholic king.—This was the principle settled by the states of Europe, which the people, together with the supreme pontiffs, saw was for the benefit of the human race, and was to expel those pagan principles which had been the tyranny of the world, and which the Catholic Church came to destroy. Who was to determine, therefore, if any man became an apostate, heathen, or heretic, and should cease to have power to reign? Who was to determine whether the king was a rebel to the Church or not? Not his subjects. It was left to the determination of the head of the Catholic Church, the head of Christendom; it was left to the determination of the popes whether a king was to be excommunicated, cut off from the fold of the Church, whether he shall cease to be looked upon as a Catholic or still to be so regarded; and it was from this principle, accepted by Christendom, that arose the doctrine of the deposing power of the sovereign pontiffs, which was that a man should cease to be a king if he ceased to be a Catholic. People will say that this is a spiritual tyranny not for a moment to be endured, an example of the usurping spirit of the papacy; and yet, what is the fact? Let those who condemn the doctrine held by the states of Europe for many centuries look to their own country, and see what is the law prevailing in this land of liberty. It is the same principle, and this principle is embodied in the fact that if the reigning sovereign of this country should cease, not to be a Christian, but should cease to be a Protestant, and become a Catholic, that very moment she would be deposed, because according to law, no person can reign over this empire unless a Protestant, and were the Queen to throw up the national religion and embrace the religion of the Catholic Church, from that moment she would cease to reign, and this by the law of the land. This is the very principle carried out in the Middle Ages—the principle with which the Catholic Church has been taunted, and it is the principle accepted by their Protestant countrymen, and is part of the law of the land. The struggles which the Catholic Church went through with the civil powers have all been against the tyranny which they attempted when they sought to unite the civil and spiritual powers in one hand. There was the power of Mahomet he rose in the East an armed heretic; and when the attempt was made to concentrate the civil and spiritual power, it was the Catholic Church, constrained by her character and mission that opposed Mahomet, and in the course of some two hundred years instigated and

carried on the crusades, which, indeed, failed in this respect, that they did not put into the hands of the Christians permanently the holy places of the East; but they did succeed in this higher and more important respect, they tended to break the immense power of Mahomet, and it was in those struggles, consummated in the battle of Lepanto in 1579, that the power of Mahomet was broken. The Turk, the Mahomedan, and the Moor, were overrunning Europe, and had that battle been lost, the whole of Europe would have been flooded with Mahomedism, and Christianity would have been crushed out. Another instance was the contest which the Roman pontiffs carried on with the Emperors of Germany, who at first were truly Christian, truly Catholic. Wherever he has been in power there has been in the heart of man a determination to usurp to himself greater power than the Church could tolerate, or than could be tolerated in the interests of the liberty of mankind, and the first claim of the German Emperors was this—to govern according to their own will rather than according to law. Another principle put forward was, that the emperor should reign throughout the whole of Europe, and the kingdoms of Europe.—Spain, Italy, England, France—should be considered only as possessing provincial kings, but the universal civil power should rest in the hands of the emperor surveying and commanding the whole of Europe. These German emperors sought the connivance of the Roman pontiffs in this desire for universal sway. The same thing was seen in the days of Paganism, and has been witnessed in more modern times. The pontiffs, however, resisted this encroachment upon the rights of mankind, and when the German emperors found they could not use them as they pleased, they determined—not to become, as Caesar, pontiffs themselves—but to be the makers of pontiffs, to elect the popes themselves, to put into that supreme power the creatures of their own hands; thus we find the anti-popes, who caused such trouble in the Church and so distracted the minds of the people, were the result only of the action of the German emperors attempting to seize again, as of old, dominion over spiritual things, when they could not induce the popes to be their slaves. And this same principle which the German emperors carried out on many occasions was not confined merely to Germany, but spread throughout Christendom; and the kings sought to obtain the power over spiritual things, not by corrupting popes, but by the election of bishops and their investiture, and the quarrel for centuries between the pontiffs of Rome and the civil powers of Europe upon this question of the election of bishops, was a quarrel undertaken by the Catholic Church for the sake of spiritual liberty. To the king belonged the temporal power, but to the Church of God belonged the spiritual power of choosing its own pastors, and it was owing to this usurpation by the princes of Europe of spiritual authority in the appointment of bishops that the morals of Europe became relaxed, that Europe became flooded with immorality, until by and by the princes found it their interest either to appoint no bishops at all, that they might have the money belonging to those bishops—and thus dioceses remained for years without bishops—or, if they did appoint, to take care to appoint men who would be tools in their hands, and would sell the spiritual rights of the people to the civil power; the consequence was, that discipline, as well as morals, decreased, and if we read of immorality and iniquity in the court of Rome, and amongst priests and bishops, as well as amongst the people, in certain periods of the Middle Ages down to the sixteenth century, and a decadence of manners, it is to be attributed in chief to the usurpation by the temporal power of the spiritual authority that St. Thomas of Canterbury laid down his life for. He would select one sentence from an essay on St. Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers, by one of the ablest Protestant historians of the present day Mr. Freeman. He says: "A martyr he certainly was; not merely to the privileges of the Church and the rights of the see of Canterbury, but to the general cause of law and order as opposed to violence and murder." St. Edmund, of whom he began by speaking to them, did not indeed lay down his life for this cause, but went into exile rather than witness the usurpation by the temporal power of the spiritual rights of the people—a protestation entirely in harmony with the spirit and history of the popes. It was not a fact, as was sometimes asserted, that he was opposed to the sovereign pontiff of the day. The revolt of the sixteenth century was prepared in this manner, by the return of the civil powers of certain tyrants which belonged to the old pagan civilisation, when the people of Europe, became degraded, and vice gave, frequently, a pretext for the Reformation which followed, and then it was that the civil power at last triumphed for a time over the pontiffs, over the Catholic Church, over the Church of Christ, which had been proclaiming from its commencement that the things which belonged to Caesar we should render to Caesar, and the things that belonged to God should be given, not to Caesar, but to God. At the Reformation, Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth in this country usurped the power which God had wished to be distinct from the temporal power, the consequence being that the people of England suffered the want of spiritual liberty for two hundred years or more, and only began to taste again the fruits of spiritual liberty when the Acts were passed which relieved the Nonconformists from the tyranny under which they suffered, and the further Acts which relieved the Catholics from the same tyranny to which they had been subjected.—Christianity, in separating the civil from the spiritual power in the sovereign, such as has been done in this country, has carried out the teaching of the Catholic Church, which says that the two powers are separate and distinct, and if left in one hand either will result in tyranny, such as exists in Russia, where the Czar is both emperor and pontiff, or there will be anarchy and religious dissensions and divisions, such as we behold in other lands. It is for this spiritual liberty that the Catholic Church is contending at the present day. The conflict in Germany, in Switzerland, in Italy, is a conflict of the Catholic Church proclaiming that the people must have their spiritual liberty, and that the spiritual authority shall not be usurped by the temporal ruler, and if you ask why is the Catholic Church at peace, and the Catholics happy, in this land, it is because she is free; but she never will be satisfied, she never will be content, with a position in which there is not spiritual freedom, because we are the children not of the bondwoman but the free woman; we are the children of liberty, because the children of truth, and the Catholic Church can exist only while she maintains the principle that men may not forfeit their spiritual liberties; therefore, if he were asked in what does England differ from the rest of Europe, his answer would be that whilst Europe is persecuting the Church and usurping its power, in this country there is spiritual liberty for all.—Catholic Times.

and duly weigh the "proofs" the *Intelligencer* talks about. If the latter, then the *Intelligencer* has simply been substituting its own imaginings for facts, or in plain English, uttering falsehoods, in the hope that they would be received as truth. This talk of a "power at Rome," opposed to "civilization," "progress," "society," "in everything that concerns its political organizations," &c. is an old story. The Jews arraigned our Saviour before Pilate substantially upon these same charges. They constantly brought these very accusations against the Apostles with the view of subjecting them to the penalties of the laws of Pagan Rome. It was on the same grounds that every one of the ten ante-Constantine persecutions were instituted against Christians. The charge was, not that the Catholic faith was untrue, not that Catholics were bad citizens, but always that they obeyed a power which was opposed to the "progress of humanity," to "existing society," to the "existing political organizations." Pagan Rome was "liberal," just as the secular government of Germany and Italy, and indeed of every country in the so-called Christian world, is or is fast becoming. It was perfectly willing that every one should believe as he chose. It only persecuted Christians because they carried out their belief into practice.—It allowed men to pray and offer up sacrifice to any and every god, but it would not allow men to render obedience to Christ, nor to those whom He commissioned as his representatives and vice-gerents to administer the affairs of His kingdom, and exercise authority upon earth. The Roman State demanded that the Emperor be honored as the representative and embodiment both of spiritual and civil authority. The early Christians refused to do this. They were willing to render all honor and obedience to Caesar in things that belonged to Caesar, but not in those which were God's. Hence the cry was raised against them which the *Intelligencer* now repeats, that they were enemies against the State, rebellious, disorganizers, conspirators against the good order of society, &c. It is under the same plea, that every tyrant, who has subsequently undertaken to persecute the Church, excuses his wickedness. Caesar, whether represented by Medieval nobles, Kings and Emperors, or by those of later date, always professes to move against the Church in the interests of humanity and civilization, in behalf of liberty and the good of society. What kind of regard they have for these things their private characters and their public laws and policy indicate. Henry VIII. and Elizabeth of England were great friends of liberty, much concerned for the promotion of virtue and civilization. Napoleon I. and Napoleon III. were exceedingly unselfish and unambitious, and their efforts to make the Church subservient to the State were promoted purely by a regard for the progress of humanity.—Bismarck is a very gentle lover of freedom and virtue. Our Protestant friends a year or two ago couldn't name him without calling him "pious"—So the Emperor William, and so Victor Emmanuel, are devoted to the pursuit of virtue, the promotion of the best interests of humanity, the enlarging of the rights and liberties of their subjects. And that they may accomplish these praiseworthy objects, they rob monasteries and asylums and charitable foundations, banish Religious Orders, drive out to beggary and starvation thousands of devout women who have devoted themselves to works of religion and charity, fine and imprison Bishops, close up theological seminaries under the plea of regulating them and forbid Priests exercising their sacred functions except under the authority of Caesar and in the way that suits his notions. All this tends, the *Intelligencer* thinks, greatly to the promotion of civilization and the progress of humanity; and because Catholics won't submit to this and stand firmly united to the successor of Peter, Pius IX., they are denounced as enemies of human freedom and "Rome" as opposed to the progress of humanity. From such progress the Lord deliver us. What it is doing for Europe is plain enough already, and daily becoming plainer. The press gagged when it attempts to speak in favor of religion and of true freedom, but allowed to utter without restraint the most outrageous libels upon religion. The people ground down by taxation. The flower of the population forced to emigrate or conscripted into the army. Germany converted into a vast camp. Russia, Austria, France and Italy bending every energy to increase their military strength, not knowing when the hand of some one or other of the European nations may be at their throats. Education secularized. The people encouraged to regard a definite religious faith as a delusion, creeds and dogmas as relics of the superstition of past ages. Christ turned into a myth, God virtually driven out of the world, and this life made to comprehend all that is of value to man and all that he need care for. This is the progress which the *Intelligencer* eulogizes. And to every Christian man, and every lover of his race and well-wisher of humanity ought to be equally opposed.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard.

stranger come back again, flaunting in the face of a Catholic nation the strange creed she had learned during her period of absence. What could Ireland do but close her heart and ears against her wiles, and pray for patience to endure her tyranny? Again, a change has come. The power which created that University has risen up against her, and to its stead, the Protestant University has disappeared; and in its stead, a new University, as unobtrusively and as the worst creations of infidelity, is presented for acceptance by Ireland. And in Ireland, far away from the stranger in the pre-Reformation period, if she rejected the Protestant University because it was the foe of the religion she loved with what scorn does she not look upon the University that has cast off its baptism to secure for itself a few more years of existence? But at length, another fair and gentle vision of a University meets the gaze of Ireland! No stranger this one, but the bone of our bone, and the flesh of our flesh; no follower of false religions, but beautiful with the beauty of the holiness of the sacraments, keeping amid the fullest treasures of science, the true faith; with the blessing of Peter on her brow, and the sweet name of Mary, the seat of wisdom, engraven upon her heart; no slave of infidelity, but with the faith and the love of Jesus Christ glowing in her soul, and boldly proclaiming to the world that though now-a-days Christ is to some a stumbling block and to others foolishness to her He is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Like some royal bride bearing in her bosom the hopes of empires, this Catholic University carries within it the best—I had almost said the only—hopes of Catholic Ireland. It is the visible symbol of principles which are essential to the life of Christianity. The example of Ireland is now about to be followed by the Catholics of England who have already laid under the direction of Archbishop Manning, the foundations of a great University in London itself. The Catholics of Belgium have long rejoiced in the University of Liege, whilst our co-religionists of France have the matter of "Higher Instruction" under consideration and will oblige the National Assembly to grant "freedom of Education" to the Church in France. Thus a great growing movement throughout Catholic countries is evident and visible. Ireland has dedicated its University to the Sacred Heart, improved the regulations by which it is governed, and established it on a fair footing. England is busy in founding one and France in removing restrictions. How useless are, therefore, the attempts of the Bismarck's and Victor Emmanuel's of the age to cripple the Church. Their attacks and persecutions are but petty to those she has outlived, and Catholic education is one of the most effective of her means of defence. Its improvement, extension and efficiency should be dear to every one who has even the least spark of Catholic faith or religious feeling.—Phila. Catholic Standard.

A QUESTION FOR IRISHMEN.

BRAIN OR FIST—WHICH IS BEST?

So long as England treats Ireland as a conquered province, and so long as patriotism lives, this will be a living question for Irishmen—How can we help to free our country? By secret societies and bloody revolution, answered James Stephens and the Fenians; and millions of Irishmen heard and believed in them. By moral force and open agitation, said Daniel O'Connell and Isaac Butt; and Irishmen are beginning to examine the merits of the two principles. What is the difference between them? The common answer to this is—Fenianism means physical force, and Home Rule means moral force. The enemies of Home Rule do not fail to say—How can you break a power like that of England unless you strike her with a sword? She does not care for words, they say, for words have no weight. Wendell Phillips says of Daniel O'Connell—"He was an Irishman, despised; he was a Catholic, hated; he was a man of words and nothing else. On words alone he, a Catholic, marched to Parliament to break the Constitution; and when I saw him in London he held the balance of power in his right hand; and I left him there, this agitator, this man of words, standing with the Whig party in one hand and the Tories in the other; and he was deciding to which he would give the government of the realm!" O'Connell was pre-eminently a believer in moral force. He knew there could be no solid physical force in Ireland unless it stood behind the moral force. One is part of the other: the moral is the voice—the physical the body. You may develop a physical force without an atom of moral force. Fenianism did this. But you cannot call forth a moral force without a physical strength behind it. Canning said that O'Connell was "the first man who summoned a race into existence." What did that mean? Let Wendell Phillips answer:— "There stood O'Connell, alone, without an office—he never held one—four millions of Irishmen behind him: poverty-stricken, under them the sod soaked with the blood of their ancestors; and over them such a law that as Henry Brougham said, they couldn't lift a hand without breaking it; behind them a history that is a disgrace to England and Europe alike. What was their teaching?—why they were Irishmen; their blood quicksilver; hating the law, and loving a fight—and they never had an English law that they ought not to hate. Their own bishop of Kerry said, in 1789:—"Allegiance and protection walk hand-in-hand. You never had had protection, and you do not owe allegiance." That was the schooling—that was the blood.—O'Connell said to them:—"He that commits an offence helps the enemy." And for thirty years he waged that battle between homeless, houseless, starved Ireland and the omnipotence of Great Britain, with law on its side; and no sheriff ever put his hand on the shoulder of one of his followers." Here was a true moral force: Ireland was aware of her wrongs, and she was demanding her rights in manful words; and the very demand, in its openness, made her spirit free. This training of the people by O'Connell was invaluable to Ireland. Had it continued for two generations there would have been a race of Irishmen so filled with noble indignation at the refusal of justice that no bonds could bind them. We should then see the outburst of the true physical force, which had been developed, not in secret, but in open agitation. There are two kinds of violence: that of a man or a people filled with a passing excitement, and that of a man or a people filled with conviction of sore need, appealing to arms as the last resort. The violence of the latter is much more terrible and lasting in its effect than that of the former, and it only comes from men who have asked for justice and have been denied in the face of day. Behind all law there must be a physical force strong enough to execute it. Taine says: "Behind every code of laws there is a man" and Emerson says: "There is no true eloquence unless there is a man behind the speech." End O'Connell began by swearing the people into a secret society, he might have rapidly succeeded in forming a physical without a moral force—a body without a conscience or a brain. Instead, with infinite patience he began by publicly telling the millions of down-trodden men that they had God-given rights, which he made clear to them; and every ray of that knowledge shot into their hearts sent them a step higher on the road to freedom. Had O'Connell's lessons been fully taught, Ireland would have been infinitely stronger than any secret society could have made her—for the brain would lead and the arm obey. Fenianism was based on the secret society principle. Instead of making the people feel like injured freemen—which is the only feeling that can support

CATHOLICITY—THE MOTHER OF LIBERTY.

FINE SERMON BY BISHOP VAUGHAN.

"The Aggressions of the Secular Power."

At the anniversary services in aid of the Edgeley Schools, held in the church of St. Philip and James, his Lordship the Bishop of Salford preached in the evening to a very crowded congregation of Catholics and Protestants. His Lordship took for his text, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." The Catholic Church, he proceeded to say, is the mother of our liberties.—She is the most radical of powers, and inasmuch as she is radically and perpetually opposed to the tyranny of the pagan civilisation which she destroyed, she is the most conservative of powers, because it is her business to preserve for ever in the world those doctrines of truth which alone can make us free.—He was led to the consideration of this topic by the pilgrimage which a number of English Catholics have been making to the shrine of St. Edmund.—The Catholics of England are devoted to St. Thomas of Canterbury and St. Edmund, because the one laid down his life for the liberty of the children of God, and the other died in exile rather than behold the usurpation by the king of the spiritual powers which belong to God and his church; and this pilgrimage, which was inaugurated by the president of St. Edmund's College, and formed of some three hundred persons who wished to testify to their devotion to St. Edmund, has been followed in heart and spirit by the Catholics of this country, and for this reason, that they are lovers of spiritual liberty. When he said the Catholic Church is the mother of our liberties, he must justify that expression, and he would endeavour briefly to show what it was the Catholic Church overthrew in the world, and in what manner she had contended for liberty from the time she came from the heart of our Creator until this very hour. The Greek and Roman pagan civilisation did these three things—first, they edu-

THE PROGRESS THAT ROME OPPOSES.

The New York Christian Intelligencer, which is a hundred years behind the age, and hasn't learned that men no longer believe the "raw-head and bloody-bones" stories about Catholics being enshrouded in darkness, intellectual and moral, and led along blindfolded by designing priests, says:—"The history of the Vatican Council will also furnish proofs that there exists at Rome a power which is altogether opposed to the progress of humanity and in open war with existing society in everything that concerns its political organization." We should like to be informed how the *Intelligencer* knows all this. Has it gotten hold of the yet unwritten "history of the Vatican Council" or is its assertion simply the cologne of its own brain? If the former, then by all means the *Intelligencer* should publish that history, that the public may see