

From the Cincinnati Telegraph.

The Catholic church has had enemies to contend with during her career of centuries since Christ, some remarkable for the cruelty with which they wielded the sword against all who professed her doctrines, and some without the physical ability to persecute, but, with all the malignity of Nero. Amongst these latter there is no one whose name is found on the page of history, so violent, so insane in his unholy prejudices against Catholics as Mr. John Wesley. The spirit with which he opposed the struggles of the American people in the revolution, shews the small regard which he entertained for humanity when oppressed by a tyrannical government, and if he was so hostile to his own countrymen, we need not be surprised at the astounding bigotry which he evinced against the Catholic Church. In this he had not only the prejudices of education to aid him, but also the vindictiveness which he cherished for a faith, amongst whose people he could not introduce his novelties—a faith which classed him with the other heretics who have risen up from age to age to confound christianity by their dissensions, and tear the seamless robe of the Saviour.

Wesley, it is well known, was the friend, the advocate of the Protestant association, through whose pious efforts aided by Lord George Gordon, London was almost destroyed by a mob and the government endangered. This association had issued an address to which some friend of charity published an answer, and the fury of Wesley was excited to the highest degree, at his attempt to ask for the few Catholics then in England, some token of mercy or of favor; violent and malicious as his own works prove him to have been, his defence of the association exceeds them all in the expression of his bigotry and the intensity of his hatred. The following is a specimen of the language which he used on the occasion.

"Suppose every word of Pope Pius's creed to be true; suppose the council of Trent to have been infallible; yet, I insist upon it, that no government not Roman Catholic, ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion. I prove this by a plain argument, let him answer it that can!!! That no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established not by private men, but by a public council, "that no faith is to be kept with heretics," whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the church of Rome. But as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain, than that the members of that church, can give no reasonable security to any government for their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mahomedan, or Pagan!

You may say "Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance." True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, "No faith is to be kept with heretics" sweeps them all as a spider's web.

Again. "Those who acknowledge the

spiritual power of the Pope can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this, therefore, they can give no security for their allegiance!

The power of granting pardons for all sins past, present and to come, is and has been for centuries one branch of his spiritual power!

But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power, can give no security for their allegiance: since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever!

Oaths and promises (of allegiance) are no security; they are light as air, a dispensation makes all null and void. Oaths are no security at all; for the Priest can pardon both perjury and High-treason."

Wesley then goes on to complain that the Catholics were allowed "to build chapels to preach openly and made numerous converts." He then tells the following exquisite story—a story worthy of lips polluted already by such monstrous lies.

"Some time since a Romish Priest came to one I knew; and after talking with her largely, broke out "you are no heretic—you have the experience of a real christian!" And would you, "she asked, burn me alive?" He said, "God forbid!—unless it were for the good of the Church?"

The celebrated Father O'Leary had the courage notwithstanding the danger to which it exposed him, to reply to some of Wesley's base calumnies on the persecuted Catholics of England and Ireland. He execrated the wretched man so fully, that Wesley in a short time after published a new tract entitled, "A disavowal of persecuting Papists!" Listen how he whines beneath the lash of his castigator.

"I agree that not only many of these in former ages were good men (as Thomas a Kempis, Francis Sales, and the Marquis de Renty) but that many of them are so at this day. I believe I know some Roman Catholics who sincerely love both God and their neighbor, and who steadily endeavour to do unto every one, as they wish him to do unto them."

To compensate in some degree for this much truth which he was in a manner compelled to utter, he gives us another specimen of the facility with which falsehood could be concocted in his heart.

"On Friday last I dined with a gentleman whose father, living in Dublin, was very intimate with a Roman Catholic gentleman. Having invited him to dinner one day, in the course of conversation Mrs. Gr— (Wesley took good care to conceal the name) asked him, "Sir, would you really cut my husband's throat, if your Priest commanded you?" He answered honestly, "madam, Mr. Gr—is my friend. And I love him well: but I must obey the church!"

"But still, says pious John Wesley, be their principles what they will, I would not persecute them." And the Romanists never have been persecuted in England since I remember. They have enjoyed a full toleration. I wish them to enjoy the same toleration still—neither more nor less." A statement so utterly at variance

with all history, which could be refuted by any page in the bloody statute book of England, proves John Wesley to be either an insane man, or one given up body and soul to the Great Sophist—the Father of lies. In this strain he denounces the Catholics wherever they happen to cross his path, and since he was the founder of Methodism, need we not be surprised at the tone of virulent hostility with which the Preachers and papers of that new sect inveigh against every thing connected with the Church against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail."

In a letter which he addressed in December 1777 to Brother Benson he uses these words. "I believe the Romish Antichrist is already so fallen, that he will not again lift up his head in any considerable degree.... I therefore concur with you in believing that his tyranny is past, never to return."

How happily does the history of a few years confound this false prophet! Not only have the wicked penal laws been repealed, but the Legislative halls are open to Catholics, they are admitted to the privy Council of the Monarch, they are multiplying exceedingly throughout all the land; Churches and Seminaries and Convents are springing up in nearly every County of England, whilst Methodism has reached its highest point and is already sinking into that oblivion which must finally confound the works of men. Last year 2500 members in England deserted Methodism! If the meek Wesley hated us so violently whilst pressed down beneath the weight of a tyrannical government, how would he gnash his teeth could he come up and survey the aspect which his country now presents to the world. May the good cause prosper, for the further it will be removed from the principles of John Wesley, the more it will correspond with human liberty, with exemption from persecution, and with all the saving truth of the Gospel.

From the Dublin Review.

PROTESTANTISM AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

Is the Anglican Church, by law established a portion of the Church Catholic; or is it one of the Protestant communities which occupy parts of Europe; or finally, is it neither one nor the other, but a middle state, detached from the latter yet not attached to the former, floating and drifting between the two; now nearer the one, and now the other; nay, by one salient angle approaching this, and at the same time, by another well nigh touching that? Surely these are important queries: surely too they cannot be incapable of solution. And yet, though to the importance of the enquiry all will assent, on the facility of satisfying it many will differ. We hardly hope to succeed: but we think the work before us will afford us many data for putting the true question somewhat tangibly before our readers.

But first let us ask ourselves, whence arises this great difficulty of deciding? Entirely, we reply, from those the enquiry most concerns. Ask every one in communion with Rome, if he be or be not

a Catholic? If he answer "No," he is none of ours; he virtually excommunicates himself, he is an apostate at once. Ask each of the first hundred members of the Establishment whom you may moot coming out of a parish church, if he be a Protestant, and a hundred to one he answers "Yes," and glories in the name. Rise in the scale of your interrogated. Go into the universities or learned assemblies of the two communities: to similar interrogatories put to ours, you receive the same unvarying answer. Every one that you ask, confesses himself a Catholic. Try the other side, the chances have increased in favour of variety of replies. Some at once reject the name of Protestant with scorn, and will bear only that of Catholic. Others still glory in the more common designation, and consider the title of Protestant a watchword of their Church. A third class are willing to compound the matter; and hence the monstrous chimera of "Protestant-Catholic," to which, among other portents, the prolific energy of modern religion has given birth. Presume, if you please, to ascend higher; on the one side all is unanimity, every bishop enjoying the "grace and communion of the Apostolic see" is Catholic in outward profession and inward conviction; poll the entire body, and you will not find one exception. Will our Anglican neighbours agree to do the same? Or will they abide by the result? The majority of the Bishops of their establishment would avowedly accept the epithet Protestant; their charges and other demonstrations of opinion will justify this conclusion.

At first sight, or under ordinary circumstances, we might appear to possess, in these facts, if correct, the elements necessary for answering our queries. The body of the members of that Church established consider themselves Protestants; the bench of its bishops is considered, without protest against the imputation, to be almost entirely such. Of the intermediate class, a certain portion are for rejecting the name; an equal, if not a larger number, willingly adopt it. Surely a church so constituted can be justly considered and treated as Protestant. But against this mode of reasoning we know that a loud outcry would be raised by some;—a calmer protest entered by others. Authentic acts alone are held by them to bind the Church; neither the voice of the multitude, nor the individual declaration of bishops, is held sufficient. When brought to this point, we naturally ask—what manner of acts shall be deemed the authentic expositors of the Church's belief? "By what sort of declaration shall she be considered bound? Shall we be answered, "By a synodical decision?" If so, we assent; but ask still farther, "By nothing short of this?" Is it to be understood that a church professing to be a "branch of the Catholic," and, if so, endowed with apostolic vigour, with apostolic strength and boldness, may be so fettered, hand and foot, by the civil power, as to absolutely be deprived of every means of fulfilling her commission to teach all truth? Is her mouth closed, and is a seal