



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. VII.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1856.

No. 18.

REV. DR. CAHILL,

ON THE INTERFERENCE OF ENGLAND IN THE POLITICAL AFFAIRS OF NAPLES.

(From the Dublin Telegraph.)
Ballyroan Cottage,
Nov. 13, 1856.

The public have already anticipated the result of the interference of England in the affairs of Naples. Lord Palmerston, in order to fulfil part of his word with the Neapolitan Infidels and English Revolutionists, ordered a flourish of trumpets at Malta, by way of attack on the "obstinate" Ferdinand: notes have been exchanged: Ambassadors have been recalled: the sham-fleet has been put out of commission: and the threatened overthrow of the laws and the constitution of the Two Sicilies has been abandoned for the present! The revolutionary party now see clearly that the English Minister has deceived them, as he has already deceived the Hungarians, the Swiss, and the French: and they shall soon learn the fact, already known to Ireland—namely, that it is better to rely on the promises of the worst King and Constitution in Europe than to place confidence in the perfidious policy of England.—Although the principle of national alliances is as old as human history; although the records of the Babylonian, the Persian, the Egyptian, the Grecian, and the early Roman empires, publish the alliances and friendship of neighboring states for their mutual protection; yet through the Middle Ages nations generally fought their own battles singlehanded, and repelled aggression and maintained their rights by concentrated union, unaided resources, and national bravery. In latter times Napoleon has been crushed by the union of four powerful empires: and within the last two years Russia has been humbled by the confederacy of Turkey, Sardina, France, and England. The result obtained in the Crimea by the last union of nations is a great political lesson; it proves that kingdoms, however strong, cannot invade the rights of a weak neighboring country with success and impunity: and it demonstrates, too, that Cabinets (such as England and France), however opposed to each other from old hostile memories, can forget past individual differences, and cordially unite against a domineering power for the protection of an oppressed neighbor.

But we have no instance in any age (except during the reign of Mahomet and his immediate followers) of any sovereign "sending an insulting message to an independent potentate; threatening him with an immediate invasion; and commanding him to dismiss his Cabinet Ministers, to disband his faithful police, to alter his ecclesiastical discipline, to admit the emissaries of England to publish in his kingdom corrupt versions of the Bible: to permit their press to circulate infidel tracts and soper calumnies through all ranks of society, and to model the entire internal, social, political, and religious policy of his dominions, according to the wishes of the English Cabinet."

This is literally, and faithfully (nearly word for word) the demand which England has made upon Naples. What renders this conduct of the English Cabinet so unendurable is the consideration of the internal policy of the kingdom, from which this command has proceeded. Without doubt no country in Europe has exercised so much cruelty towards their subjects as England has practised on the Catholics of her empire; her confiscations, her expulsions, her plunders, her racks, her gibbets, are by common consent without a parallel of ferocity in any Christian community: while her social derangements: her gross immoralities, her increasing infidelities, her thrilling murders, and her unnatural crimes are the scandal of the world, and the foulest blot on the name of Christianity. The cool audacity, therefore, the unblushing effrontery, and the insufferable insolence with which this same England now stands at the gates of Naples, calling for social reform, for religious improvement and for political liberty, is a case of such obdurate deceit that no other parallel can be found for this attitude towards Naples except in the lies of Satan quoting Scripture on the mountain. As a matter of course, the King of Naples spurned this sermon from Satan; and with Austria, Russia, Spain, and his own faithful subjects, he has set Lord Palmerston at defiance, and exposed the perfidy of the English policy.

And if it were justifiable for England to interfere in the laws of an independent kingdom, on the grounds set forth in her diplomatic notes, and if she further justifies that interference on the additional pretext of "the fear of a revolution," then surely it must equally follow that if the same causes (of which she complains) exist in her own kingdom, France, Austria, Naples, or Russia, can, on the same principle, send diplomatic remonstrances to the Court of St. James's calling for a thorough reform in her laws; and, in case of refusal, withdrawing their Ambassadors, and threatening the immediate presence of their hostile fleet in the Bay of Dublin. Let us suppose that Austria founded her charges against the Court of St. James's, on the conduct of Eng-

land towards Ireland: and that she sent a note to the English Cabinet, written as follows:—

The empire of Austria having just recovered from the shock of revolution in Hungary and Lombardy in the years '47 and '48: being obliged to call in the friendly aid of Russia in quelling this extended rebellion: and being now made acquainted, in the year 1856, through official reports from Ireland, that the laws and internal policy of England are likely to engender in that country a similar revolution which may spread again to Austria, we beg to send through our Ambassador at London, the following friendly remonstrance:—

Firstly—Without stating in the present communication the former law of persecution against the Catholics of Ireland, we beg to remind you that the Catholics of your empire form the third part of the population; that they fight your battles with unexampled courage, and that their loyalty to your throne is beyond all doubt.—Hence, we believe it to be a matter of strict natural justice that they should enjoy their proportion of all places of trust, honor and emolument in the country: whereas, the statistics of England show that the Catholics hold places in the civil service only in proportion of 1 to 251: in the navy of 1 to 144: in the army of 1 to 95: and in the national constabulary, out of thirty-two county inspectors, there is only one Catholic!—We therefore call upon your Government to dismiss the Lords of the Admiralty, to cashier the Commander of the Forces, and to send Sir Duncan McGregor home to Scotland!

Secondly—We see by the list of magistrates in Ireland that the proportion of Catholics is 1 to 56; that in cases of the action and working of the system of the poor law, the ex-officio magistrates are so numerous that they have actually and bona fide the appointment of the Board of Guardians: that in every sectarian case in the poor house (so frequent in Ireland) the ex-officio magistrates can, from their numbers, swamp the Catholic guardians, and can, in fact, carry any question they please: thus leaving the Catholic guardians a mere mockery of legislation! We therefore call on your Cabinet to dismiss the Irish Chancellor and to appoint a Chartist magistrate in his place!

Thirdly—Your members of Parliament in the pay of the Government have made speeches of such impurity, of such gross scandalous impiety and of such rancorous insult towards the Catholic religion, that in the most friendly spirit we demand that you will expel Lord Palmerston, Lord Minto, Lord Roden, together with Messrs. Drummond, Spooner, Whiteside, &c., from the House of Commons: and further, that you will forthwith establish the Inquisition in the Palace of St. James!

Fourthly—The people of Ireland having presented a petition for leave to improve the soil, and to have a right to these improvements so made, the Secretary of Ireland, in his place in the Senate, received the petition amidst shouts of laughter from the entire assembly, he ridiculed, in insulting language, the respectful united voice of the Irish poor; and, as far as he dared, attempted even to give down the avowed leader of the Irish Catholics. We therefore appeal to you in "the true spirit of peace and your own interest," to suspend Lord Carlisle, to deprive the eloquent Secretary of Ireland, Mr. Horsman, of all future place in the empire, and to nominate the celebrated, the patriotic, and the talented exile, Thomas Meagher, of America, as Chief Secretary for Ireland!

Fifthly—The Protestant Church of Great Britain and Ireland enjoys an annual revenue of eight and a half millions sterling, being the plunder of the old Catholic Church of your country; this sum being accumulated since the year 1558, and being calculated in principal and interest during these three hundred years, by any public notary, will amount to something about the prodigious plunder of forty-eight hundred million pounds sterling. Now we, the Cabinet of Austria, seeing this enormous public robbery of the poor; and feeling, moreover, that this church has entirely failed in its office: that in place of teaching the gospel it has ignored the scripture: that it has (as in the case of Archdeacon Denison) accorded a higher authority to an Act of Parliament: that the churches are empty on Sundays: that it sets up the cure of souls for sale as men sell land, old furniture, or black cattle in a public market: that infidelity covers the land of England, and therefore, in perfect kindness to you, we beg that you will unfrock the Archbishop of Canterbury: that you will appoint the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin to superintend the British Museum, or to preside over the Zoological Society: and that you will permit the works of Tom Paine, Carlisle, and Zuzurgem to be hawked through Dublin, thrust under the doors of the houses, and pushed into the faces and mouths of the citizens.

Sixthly—In point of fact these laws of England and this internal policy have actually produced in the year 1848 a small revolution, which required much precaution to check and to crush; and hence we, the Austrian Cabinet, have a clear

case of fact to justify us in sending you this remonstrance to change your laws, to model your Cabinet, to reform your army, your navy, and your police; and entirely to modify, educate, and Christianize your Church Establishment and your clergy. In case of refusal we shall be compelled reluctantly to suspend all friendly relations with you, and to send an armed fleet into Kingstown Harbor in order to protect three Austrian families from the outrage of the Dublin mob!

What would be said of the Austrian Cabinet to make such a demand, and to send such a note; and the writer of this article appeals to the historian of Ireland to say which of the two diplomatic notes referred to possesses the stronger claim before the impartial judgment of the nations of Europe? But, above all, what opinion would be formed of Austria, if the Austrian press every week, every day, every hour, gibed our virtuous Queen, called her sulky, obstinate; ridiculed her by gross nicknames, and calumniously maligned the country. This view of the case will show the insane malignity of England in the Neapolitan affair; will demonstrate the becoming dignity of the King of Naples; and will place the movement of Lord Palmerston in an attitude to degrade his policy, and bring merited disgrace on the sectarian policy of Great Britain.

D. W. C.

Extracts from the most Eloquent and most Distinguished Protestant Writers of Modern Times.

THE PROTESTANT MARTYRS OF THE REFORMATION, BY WILLIAM COBBETT.

CHARACTER OF THE MARTYRS.

The real truth about these "martyrs" is, that they were generally a set of the most wicked wretches, who sought to destroy the Queen and her government, and under the pretence of conscience and superior piety to obtain the means of again preying upon the people. No mild means could reclaim them—those means had been tried—the Queen had to employ vigorous means, or to suffer her people to continue to be torn by the religious factions, created not by her, but by her two immediate predecessors, who had been aided and abetted by every one of those who now were punished, and who were worthy of ten thousand deaths each, if ten thousand deaths could have been endured. They were, without a single exception, apostates, perjurers, or plunderers; and the greater part of them had also been guilty of flagrant high treason against Mary herself, who had spared their lives, but whose lenity they had requited by every effort within their power to overthrow her authority and the government. To make particular mention of all the ruffians that perished upon this occasion would be a task as irksome as it would be useless; but there were amongst them three of Cranmer's Bishops and himself! For now justice at last overtook this most mischievous of all villains who had justly to go to the same stake that he had unjustly caused so many others to be tied to; the three others were Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley, each of whom was, indeed, inferior in villainy to Cranmer, but to few other men that have ever existed.

Hooper was a monk; he broke his vow of celibacy and married a Flandrician; he being the ready tool of the Protector Somerset, whom he greatly aided in his plunder of the churches, got two bishoprics, though he himself had written against pluralities; he was a co-operator in all the monstrous cruelties inflicted on the people during the reign of Edward, and was particularly active in recommending the use of German troops to bend the necks of the English to the Protestant yoke. Latimer began his career not only as a Catholic priest, but as a most furious assailant of the Reformation religion. By this he obtained from Henry VIII. the bishopric of Worcester. He next changed his opinions, but did not give up his Catholic bishopric? Being suspected, he made abjuration of Protestantism; he thus kept his bishopric for twenty years, while he inwardly reprobated the principles of the Church, and which bishopric he held in virtue of an oath to oppose to the utmost of his power, all dissenters from the Catholic Church. In the reigns of Henry and Edward he sent to the stake Catholics and Protestants for holding opinions which he himself had before held openly, or that he held secretly at the time of his sending them. Lastly, he was a chief tool in the hands of the tyrannical Protector Somerset in that black and unnatural act of bringing his brother, Lord Thomas Somerset, to the block. Ridley had been a Catholic bishop in the reign of Henry VIII., when he sent to the stake Catholics who denied the King's supremacy, and Protestants who denied transubstantiation. In Edward's reign he was a Protestant bishop, and denied transubstantiation himself; and then he sent to the stake Protestants who differed from the creed of Cranmer. He, in Edward's reign, got the bishopric of London by a most roguish agreement to transfer the greater part of its possessions to the rapacious minist-

ters and courtiers of that day. Lastly, he was guilty of high treason against the Queen, in openly and from the pulpit exhorting the people to stand by the usurper Lady Jane; and thus endeavoring to produce civil war and the death of his sovereign, in order that he might, by treason, be enabled to keep that bishopric which he had obtained by imony, including perjury.

A pretty trio of Protestant "Saints," quite worthy, however, of "Saint" Martin Luther, who says in his own work, that it was by the arguments of the Devil (who, he says, frequently ate, drank, and slept with him) that he was induced to turn Protestant; these worthy followers of that Luther, who is, by his disciple Melancthon, called "a brutal man, void of piety and humanity, one more a Jew than a Christian;" three followers altogether worthy of this great founder of that Protestantism which has split the world into contending sects; but, black as these are, they bleach the moment Cranmer appears in his true colors. But, alas! where is the pen or tongue to give us those colours!

THE CHARACTER OF CRANMER, THE FIRST PROTESTANT ARCHBISHOP, AND AUTHOR OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, THE LITURGY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH.

Of the sixty-five years that he (Cranmer) lived, and of the thirty-five years of his manhood, twenty-nine years were spent in the commission of a series of acts which, for wickedness in their nature and for mischief in their consequences, are absolutely without anything approaching to a parallel in the annals of human infamy. Being a fellow of a college at Cambridge, and having, of course, made an engagement (as the fellows do to this day) not to marry while he was a fellow, he married secretly, and still enjoyed his fellowship. While a married man he became a priest, and took the oath of celibacy; and going to Germany, he married another wife, the daughter of a Protestant "saint"; so that he had now two wives at one time, though his oath bound him to have no wife at all. He, as Archbishop, enforced the law of celibacy, while he himself secretly kept his German frow in the Palace at Canterbury, having imported her in a chest. He, as Ecclesiastical Judge, divorced Henry VIII. from three wives, the grounds of his decision in two of the cases being directly the contrary of those which he himself had laid down when he declared the marriages to be valid; and, in the case of Anna Boleyn, he, as Ecclesiastical Judge, pronounced that Anna had never been the King's wife, while, as a member of the House of Peers, he voted for her death as having been an adulteress, and thereby guilty of treason to her husband. As Archbishop under Henry (which office he entered upon with a premeditated false oath on his lips) he sent men and women to the stake because they were not Catholics, and he sent Catholics to the stake because they would not acknowledge the King's supremacy, and thereby perjure themselves as he had so often done. Become openly a Protestant in Edward's reign, and openly professing those very principles for the professing of which he had burnt others, he now burnt his fellow Protestants because their grounds for protesting were different from his. As executor for the will of his old master, Henry, which gave the crown (after Edward) to his daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, he conspired with others to rob those two daughters of their right, and to give the crown to Lady Jane, that Queen of nine days, whom he, with others, ordered to be proclaimed. Confined, notwithstanding his many monstrous crimes, merely to the Palace of Lambeth, he, in requital of the Queen's lenity, plotted with traitors in the pay of France to overthrow her government. Brought at last to trial and to condemnation as a heretic, he professed himself ready to recant. He was respited for six weeks, during which time he signed six different forms of recantation each more ample than the former. He declared that the Protestant religion was false; that the Catholic religion was the only true one; that he now believed in all the doctrines of the Catholic Church; that he had been a horrid blasphemer against the sacrament; that he was unworthy of forgiveness; that he prayed the people, the Queen, and the Pope, to have pity on and to pray for his wretched soul; and that he had made and signed this declaration without fear, and without hope of favor, and for the discharge of his conscience, and as a warning to others. It was a question in the Queen's council, whether he should be pardoned, as other recanters had been; but it was resolved, that his crimes were so enormous that it would be unjust to let him escape; to which might have been added, that it could have done to the Catholic Church no honor to see reconciled to it a wretch covered with robberies, perjuries, treasons, and bloodshed. Brought, therefore, to the reading of his recantation on his way to the stake; seeing the pile ready; now finding that he must die and carrying in his breast all his malignity undiminished, he recanted his recantation, thrust into the fire the hand that had signed, and thus expired, protesting against that very religion in which only nine hours before he had called God to witness that he firmly believed!

And Mary is to be called "the Bloody," because she put to death monsters of iniquity like this! It is, surely, time to do justice to the memory of this calumniated Queen; and not to do it by halves, I must, contrary to my intention, employ part of the next number in giving the remainder of her history.—William Cobbett's History of the Reformation.

CRANMER'S CHARACTER, DRAWN BY THOMAS BABINGTON MACAGLAW, M. P.

As his admirers challenge for him a place in the noble army of martyrs, his claims require fuller discussion.

The origin of his greatness, common enough in the scandalous chronicles of courts, seems strangely out of place in a hagiology. Cranmer rose in favor by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce. He promoted the marriage of Anna Boleyn with the King. On a frivolous pretence he pronounced that marriage null and void. On a pretence, if possible, still more frivolous, he dissolved the ties which bound the shameless tyrant to Anne of Cleves. He attached himself to Cromwell while the fortunes of Cromwell flourished. He voted for cutting off Cromwell's head without a trial, when the tide of royal favour turned. He conformed backwards, and forwards, as the King changed his mind. He assisted, while Henry lived, in condemning to the flames those who denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He found out, as soon as Henry was dead, that the doctrine was false. He was, however, not at a loss for people to burn. The authority of his station and of his grey hairs was employed to overcome the disgust with which an intelligent and virtuous child regarded persecution. Intolerance is always bad; but the sanguinary intolerance of a man who thus wavered in his creed excites a loathing to which it is difficult to give vent without calling foul names. Equally false to political and to religious obligations, the Primate was first the tool of Somerset, and then the tool of Northumberland. When the Protector wished to put his own brother to death, without even the semblance of a trial, he found a ready instrument in Cranmer. In spite of the canon law which forbade a church-man to take any part in matters of blood, the Archbishop had signed the warrant for the atrocious sentence. When Somerset had been in his turn destroyed his destroyer received the support of Cranmer to a wicked attempt to change the course of the succession.

The apology made for him by his admirers only renders his conduct more contemptible. He complied, it is said, against his better judgment, because he could not resist the entreaties of Edward. A holy prelate of sixty, one would think, might be better employed by the bed side of a dying child than in committing crimes at the request of the young disciple. If Cranmer had shown half as much firmness when Edward told him to commit treason as he had before shown when Edward requested him not to commit murder, he might have saved the country from one of the greatest misfortunes that it ever underwent. He became from whatever motive the accomplice of the worthless Dudley. The virtuous scruples of another young and amiable mind were to be overcome. As Edward had been forced into persecution, Jane was to be seduced into treason. No transaction in our annals is more unjustifiable than this. If a hereditary title were to be respected, Mary possessed it. If a parliamentary title were preferable, Mary possessed that also. If the interest of the Protestant religion required a departure from the ordinary rule of succession, that interest would have been best served by raising Elizabeth to the throne. If the foreign relations of the kingdom were considered, still stronger reasons might be found for preferring Elizabeth to Jane. There was great doubt whether Jane or the Queen of Scotland had the better claim; and that doubt would, in all probability, have produced a war both with Scotland and with France, if the project of Northumberland had not been blasted in its infancy. That Elizabeth had a better claim than the Queen of Scotland was indisputable. To the part which Cranmer, and unfortunately some better men than Cranmer, took in this most reprehensible scheme, much of the severity with which the Protestants were afterwards treated must in fairness be ascribed.

The plot failed; Popery triumphed; and Cranmer recanted. Most people look on his recantation as a single blemish on an honorable life, the frailty of an unguarded moment. But, in fact, his recantation was in strict accordance with the regular habit. It was not the first recantation that he had made; and, in all probability, if it had answered its purpose, it would not have been the last. We do not blame him for not choosing to be burned alive. It is no very severe reproach to any person that he does not possess heroic fortitude. But surely a man who liked the fire so little should have had some sympathy for others. A persecutor who inflicts nothing which he is not ready to endure deserves some respect. But when a man who loves his doctrines more than the lives of his neighbors, loves