

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 10. — OCTOBER, 1889.

I. THE NEGRO IN ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS.

THE negro question, as it is called, presents one of the most perplexing problems of our age. Every phase of it, social, political, and ecclesiastical, involves difficulties sufficient to tax the wisdom and philanthropy of the most enlightened. The difficulty is increased by the malign influence of sectionalism. Both sections of our common country essay the attempt, and each embarrasses the other. The North would speedily settle it were it not for the South; and the South would have settled it long ago but for the North. The conscientious convictions of each party stand in the way of the best intentions of the other, so that the well meant efforts of both fail, to the scandal of religion and the sorrow of philanthropy. Two opposing policies are presented by the two sections. This want of harmony was at first explained and excused by the heat of passion lingering like smoke around the recent battle fields, and there was confident prophecy of its speedy disappearance. The passions of war, however, have long since subsided, and the hostiles have "shaken hands across the bloody chasm," and the lines of opposition, like those of breastwork and battle-field, have been long ago obliterated, while this conflict still rages. These policies have confronted each other now for a quarter of a century, and they are as unreconciled if not as irreconcilable in 1889 as in 1865. There is something very significant in this.

Moreover, whatever suggestion is offered by either fails of influence on the other, each being discounted—the South by the North upon the allegation of prejudice, the North by the South upon that of ignorance.

IV. PAPAL POLICY.

WHILST we gladly realize the fact that many members of the Roman Catholic Church, especially among the laity, evince a sincere Christian piety, and an honesty which is above suspicion, we cannot avoid the belief that the hierarchy of that church is engaged in a deadly conspiracy against the conscience-rights of Protestants, and the civil liberties of Americans. Our reasons for so believing are drawn not only from past history but from current facts. In spite of charity, of magnanimity, and the social qualities which often mark the intercourse of the priesthood with their Protestant cotemporaries, we are compelled to embrace a conviction which an ignorant public, always superficial in its judgments, may denounce as bigotry, but which would command the assent of any enlightened and unbiased audience listening to the evidence.

It is impossible, in a brief paper, to cover the entire ground, and in a case like the present it is altogether unnecessary. To follow Romish casuists through the tortuous paths of verbal mysticism in which they delight, would consume a lifetime very unprofitably, as always appears in a controversy with them. We have never known them to face an issue in an honest, direct and candid spirit. To mystify the question, to quibble about terms, to tease or fret an antagonist, to arouse temper by shameful personalities—in short, to do a little skillful fencing for the delusion of the public, and retire from a nominally drawn battle with an air of triumph—seems to be the peculiar ambition of these Jesuitical polemics. We have been mortified frequently at the obtuseness of the American citizen of the frivolous type, in accepting such displays of skill as proof of innocence. The political demagogue is unconsciously exposing himself to the contempt of many Protestant Christians when he announces his confidence in the patriotism of the Romish priesthood and the safety of our country in their hands. The ignorance of such politicians is just enough to render them pliable in the manipulating power of the most

crafty and unscrupulous association of designing men the world has ever known.

Our arraignment is exceedingly simple. We fearlessly affirm that the significant words of representative Romanists are in direct conflict with the great mass of historical and cotemporaneous facts. It is well-known that, in the United States, the bishops of that church make positive assurances to the American public of their admiration for, and cordial support of, our political system. No Protestant patriot could surpass the gush of these servants of a foreign prince in the expression of devotion to the principles of our government. These proclamations have been in recent years repeated, by various spokesmen of the church, with so much emphasis that the moral sense of our own people has been shocked at the audacity of their authors. The world has long been accustomed to unscrupulous dodging by this class of controversialists, but it has been reserved for our day and country to hear from Romish bishops the astounding statement that church and state are happily united under our constitution and laws, in the very sense which their church prefers! There is no lack of boldness in such an assertion. The man who could write it down and publish it must have been desperately anxious to satisfy the jealous vigilance of the American people by verbal guarantees in the face of overwhelming proofs that the statement cannot be true. We have often heard of men voluntarily sacrificing *life* for the truth or for their native land, and there is always a responsive chord in the human breast that sounds in unison with the recorded deed. But the sacrifice of *reputation* for the sake of impressing a gross falsehood upon a community, is a novel style of heroism, and a suspicious display of virtue in the eyes even of an infidel world.

That such is the bold proposition of eminent and representative men of the Romish Church is now beyond dispute, unless Talleyrand was right in affirming that language is an expedient for the concealment of ideas. A bishop of that church in the United States, some time since, had an exchange of shots with some Protestant ministers in a political paper, the *Dispatch*, of Richmond, Va., and one of his paragraphs, now lying in print before our eyes, reads as follows, with italics just as we find them:

"I should be pleased to have Rev. Dr. Pollard give the public his definition of union of Church and State. I am certain that I but voice the unanimous sentiment of American Catholics, lay and clerical, when I assert that were we in a numerical ascendancy we could not wish to do more than perpetuate the existing order of things, and for this very good reason—that, as Dr. Brownson wrote years ago, 'the Church has here nearly all the rights guaranteed to her, and in some respects more freedom than she secures by her most advantageous *concordats* with the Catholic Powers of Europe or America. She is freer and more independent here, and is more effectually protected by the Constitution of the American republic than she has ever been in France since Philip the Fair; in Germany since the extinction of the Carlovingian Emperors; in England since the Norman conquest; or in Spain since the death of Isabella the Catholic; although she is not once recognized by name in the Constitution, and the fathers of the republic very likely had no intention of recognizing or protecting her at all, for they regarded her as dead and no longer a danger to their protestantism or infidelity. *There is here a real union of Church and State in our sense of the term; and though not perfect, yet almost as perfect as has ever existed anywhere.*' (No. 1, New Series, *Brownson's Review*.) I fancy Dr. Pollard considers the support of the Church and her ministers as the very essence of union between the two orders—spiritual and temporal. Were this true, there is just as much union of the Protestant churches with the State in France, Austria, and other Catholic countries as there is with the Catholic Church, since Protestant ministers receive even larger salaries in those countries from the government than do Catholic priests."

There could not possibly be a more explicit declaration than this here made by the Bishop of Wheeling, that he, and his fellow-Catholics of the United States, regard the union of church and state as constitutionally established in our country; that is to say, no union at all, and as almost the best union ever devised. If a loyal subject of the Turkish Sultan should write and print the opinion that the American Executive office is about the best form of monarchical government ever seen, indeed "almost perfect," the reading world would stare with unutterable amazement. And yet such a sentiment on the lips of a Turk would be quite as consistent as the one here emanating from a high dignitary of the Church of Rome! Such an attempt to throw dust into the eyes of millions of our people strikes us as no less conspicuous for its absurdity than for its hardihood. For surely even the most ignorant political demagogue must know that if there is a union of church and state in our country, even the Mormon Church is established, not to refer to other monstrous delusions, because polygamy has been condemned as an *immorality*, and not as a heresy. According to the sapient dignitary of Wheeling, the Mormon *religion*

and that of the Jews, and even of Buddhism, are all included in the church which is here "united" with the state, and are but an insignificant imperfection in the glorious system. But, soberly speaking, it appears from his own express words that the *absence* of all union between the two is the perfection of union; for there is no other response to the insane proposition than to say, in the name of the American people, that no union between church and state exists in the United States.

But, in whatever relation the civil and ecclesiastical authorities stand to one another here, it is plainly signified to be such as would satisfy the Romish hierarchy *in every other part of the world*. They would, forsooth, gladly see such a state of things in the different kingdoms and republics of southern Europe! They would rejoice to see all legal restrictions withdrawn from Protestants in the Spanish and Portuguese communities of the Western Hemisphere! And this lovely spirit of regard for the conscience comes from a church whose head insists upon being again invested with the *temporal power at Rome*, and would immediately suppress every Protestant church and mission in that city! An affectation of saintly piety by Satan himself could hardly be more incongruous than such a mockery of spiritual freedom on the lips of a thorough-going papist. A few years ago the pope was a petty despot over the States of the Church, of the type of Philip the Second of Spain, and Louis the Fourteenth of France. If he was a dear lover of liberty, as those spiritual slaves of the infallible pontiff are trying to make us believe, why in the world did not the pope introduce our admirable institutions into his dominions, and remove all their disabilities from his Protestant subjects? And if the Bishop of Wheeling, who prates about honesty, is sincere in his professions, why do not he and the other members of the hierarchy in the United States openly and earnestly implore their master to use his authority and influence to secure the same degree of religious liberty which Catholics enjoy in the United States, for the Protestants of Spain, of Cuba, of Belgium, of Brazil, and of Spanish America?

Mere words are nothing. "Beware of false prophets." "By their fruits ye shall know them." The "wolf in sheep's clothing"

was not peculiar to our Saviour's times. He reappears now in a subtle priesthood, which pretends to love the free institutions and principles of the United States, but has shown itself the staunch supporter of despotism, and the enemy of equal rights, in every modern state where the two principles have been in conflict.

If we had similar evidence that the Episcopal bishops in the United States regarded the *separation* of church and state in our country as a better *union* of the two than their denomination enjoys in England, we might well understand how the English bishops might differ from them *in toto*. The two bodies are not bound together by an infallible head. But it is the boast of the Romish Church that its principles are *the same all over the world*. It follows, then, that their church has no fixed principle on that subject; for if it had, its priesthood would not be ardent advocates of opposite principles in different lands. Americans, worthy of the name, contend for the equality of all sects of Christians before the law, not only in the United States, but in every nominally Christian country on the globe. They maintain, on principle, that a Catholic Christian has a sacred right to enjoy and extend his faith without restraint in England and Prussia as fully as Protestants. And they consistently insist that a Protestant shall possess equal privileges in Rome, in Vienna, and in Madrid. But the entire world knows that the disabilities and restraints imposed upon Protestants in countries most intensely Catholic have never been contrived by the civil powers *in opposition* to the objections of the papal authority. History rises to her feet and solemnly swears that all such restraints would have ceased centuries ago to stain the annals of many Catholic nations, if the Romish Church had only spoken out distinctly in favor of liberty of conscience.

The half-educated and self-seeking demagogue in the United States exposes himself to the scorn of the cultivated and patriotic Christian when he confides in the hollow professions of the Jesuit that his church is American to the core. That these claims are the devices of a conscious conspiracy must appear obvious from their very extravagance. The political views conveyed in the paragraph we have copied are but a part of the monstrous display. We find the same hierarchy figuring in the van of moral reform,

and eclipsing the zeal of many descendants of the Puritans in their ardent advocacy of the sanctity of the Sabbath, the temperance agitation, the purification of popular amusements, the spirituality of public education, and, the suppression of divorce. Truly the *role* of reform has been taken up in this country by a body never known on any other theatre to manifest a similar ardor in that line! But the strongest card employed in this game of skill is the assumed championship of a pure and permanent union of the sexes. The sanctity of the marriage tie has no more pretentious defenders than the same hierarchy which has crimsoned its history with *dispensations* allowing the marriage of royal persons within the bounds of what it calls *incest*. Two years have scarcely elapsed since uncle and niece were thus permitted by the present pope to enter into this relation, which ordinary mortals do not dare to assume.

But still these very conscientious ecclesiastics are the most pronounced opponents of these unnatural alliances, and wish to impress Americans with a conviction that no church can compare with their own in zeal for the purest and most sacred relations between man and woman! Their abhorrence of Mormonism is beyond words, and one would think, from their efforts to express it, that chastity is the darling virtue of the Catholic priesthood. In fact, we know of no reason to impute to them a failure in this point *in the United States*. Their clergy are socially as reputable as any; but what gives us pause is the unanimity of the testimony of Protestant missionaries in *popish* countries that the Catholic priests in several of them are often found living in concubinage, whilst others, though unincumbered, are shamefully licentious. If we are not grossly misled by voluminous statements of missionaries and travellers, large numbers of priests in Mexico are frequenters of the gaming table and the cock-pit, and are degraded by other vices; and the Brazilian parish priests are often so sunk in debauchery as to be the scorn of the better classes of the people. Such facts, if true, raise the question, *Why* the Catholic Church, a boasted unit in orthodoxy and morals, is so different under the eyes of Protestant communities? Why is His Holiness of Rome so tolerant of immorality and indecency in Mexico and South Americaa, mong

his own commissioned servants, and so intolerant towards the efforts of Protestant missionaries to distribute the Scriptures and inculcate virtue among his late Roman subjects? Alas! it appears too evident that in the judgment of this church, to dissent from its arbitrary dogmas is a grosser crime than habitual contempt for the moral law of God; to think and speak otherwise than the pope allows is an offence far blacker in enormity than a life of profligacy, debauchery, sacrilege and shame!

Let the words used in the foregoing paragraph be particularly noticed: "There is here a *real* union of church and state in one sense of the term." The Catholic sense of the term is equal freedom of all denominations to disseminate the faith they hold among mankind, whether that faith be true or false! It is to be supposed, therefore, that the hierarchy cordially accepts as good and true in principle the explicit language of Jefferson and Madison in the celebrated Act of Religious Freedom, adopted by the Legislature of Virginia, in words following, to-wit:

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

The laws of almost every one of the States, and the Federal constitution itself, all correspond in unequivocal language with this act of Virginia of 1785. The Federal instrument expressly forbids the passage of any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The people of the United States are thus fully committed *against* the union of church and state, any form of establishment, and any restraint upon religious freedom. And now we have the Romish Church, by its representative men, professing to regard all this as a "real union," and a most satisfactory establishment, closely approximating perfection! We deliberately pronounce such a declaration as furnishing irresistible internal proof that the policy of that church in the United States is one of intentional deception, cunningly devised to mislead the unsuspecting citizen.

In every sense imaginable the statement we have quoted from the Bishop of Wheeling is as directly opposite to the truth as the east is to the west. Is there "a real union" of church and state in our country in the Catholic sense? If so, that church uses language in a way that Protestants cannot possibly understand. When the constitution of the United States *prohibits* an establishment of religion, the Romish Church understands the words in the opposite sense of *permitting* an establishment. When a State law with the utmost precision forbids a union of church and state, the Catholic Church regards this very law as an act allowing such a union, and glories in it. It is "a *real* union in our sense of the term." Yes, and not in the *public* sense. The language of history, of science, and of legislation requires to be reversed and invested with the opposite meaning, as if by a white rose one should understand a black one!

The witness whom we are examining admits that, in the earlier history of his church, there was a very beneficial union between it and various states, but he does not mean a *real* union, such as he finds here. It was, however, a literal union in the non-Catholic sense. And this brings us to a most important point in our present investigation. The authorities of the Church of Rome cannot deny that it was firmly united with many European states in the middle ages, and they proclaim that this union was according to their mind. It received papal sanction in countless instances, and is often referred to as a sort of golden age for the church, which was not yet broken by the Reformation. If this union was then approved and enjoyed by infallible popes, the question arises, what guarantees can Protestants have that such a union may not be again sought after and secured on these shores of ours? We ask the question, not of Jesuits who would resort to verbal *finesse* in the answer, but of American patriots who do not choose to hazard their liberties on the bare word of parties bent upon their destruction.

The case is this. A man who habitually boasts of his own uprightness, and can recognize little virtue in others, spends a large portion of his life in adultery. He finally seeks his fortune elsewhere, and proposes "a real union" with another woman. In-

quiry is made for his antecedents, and he thinks it ought to suffice that his present conduct and his present professions are irreproachable. A neighbor assists his suit by testifying negatively to his apparent innocence. But the family of the lady are not satisfied. They want more information, and beg to know if the stranger bears a good character in the community where his previous life was spent. Still no satisfaction can be obtained. The suitor protests that his offer is honorable and so absolutely pure as to be well-nigh angelic!

Now we put this question to the Protestant Americans, Is it wise to confide in such an individual? If not, how can it be wise to trust in the professions of the Church of Rome, when she cannot dare to respond to our inquiries into her recorded past? All other sects are free to confess their errors in other ages. The Presbyterians never dream of justifying their alleged single atrocity, the execution of Servetus. No Episcopalian in America will now vindicate the persecutions under the Protestant Tudors and the Stuarts. No New England Puritan will say that Roger Williams and the Quakers and witches were justly treated. The only sect that refuses to purge itself of such abominable atrocities is the Church of Rome. She never confesses that she did wrong in the past. The massacres in France and Ireland, the dragonnades against the Huguenots, the persistent efforts to extirpate the Waldenses, the burning of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and of Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer in England, as well as innumerable other crimes at which the modern blood runs cold—all these are as justly chargeable to her account as are the persecutions attributed to Protestants chargeable to other churches. But the wrong of her many cruelties she still refuses to confess and deplore. At this moment Protestant missionaries are exposed in several Catholic lands to popular violence by Romish mobs instigated by priests, in one sense all the meaner and more cowardly because generally bloodless. The governments are, for the most part, in the hands of educated unbelievers, and the laws are copied from the most enlightened nations. In Mexico and Brazil Protestants are, to a great extent, protected by infidels from the violence of the papists, whose weapons now are stones, brick-bats, and rotten eggs. The

occurrences are so frequent that in many places Protestants cannot address the people on religious subjects without an armed guard. We never hear of rescripts or any other form of message from the pope being sent out publicly, enjoining Catholics in such regions to treat Protestant missionaries as their own are treated here.

We have thus abundantly shown that the papacy, as a witness in its own case, is altogether unworthy of credit, and that those politicians and demagogues in our midst who treat such unblushing evidence as if it were true are either wilful enemies of their country and its Protestant interests, or the shallowest and most benighted sons of a free and enlightened land. The ignorance of such people is like the darkness of Egypt, so dense as to be felt. It is felt in pity for the unborn millions whose welfare is thus desperately staked upon the present apparent harmlessness of a power which elsewhere and in other times has been infamously associated with the oppressors of mankind, and has never repented of its crimes.

Confession is a duty which Rome everywhere exacts of her subjects and her enemies, but has never practiced herself. Her policy is to transfer the responsibility of her enormities to others, or to deny their turpitude. She would have us believe that the cruelties of the Inquisition in some countries and of the temporal authorities in others against heretics, were committed in opposition to her urgent protests. The zeal of Bloody Mary and haughty Louis XIV., and of the sanguinary Duke of Alva, was indulged, in her own behalf, in spite of her pleadings for mercy! She could do nothing to restrain the ferocious loyalty of her own son Torquemada! This most compassionate mother wept and implored in vain for the sparing of her enemies, but could not induce her faithful children to abate their love of blood and their delight in torture and fire! But the world is beyond measure puzzled by the strange phenomenon, because this infallible spiritual mother has so utterly failed in the use of her spiritual influence, and has trained up at her knees such an intractable brood of tyrants and persecutors; and when they were indulging their bloody appetites upon poor heretics, she could find no means whatever to rid herself of them. Charles IX. of France and Louis XIV. were her

dear sons; so were Philip II. and the Emperor Charles V.; so was James II. of England, the royal gentleman who enjoyed scenes of torture more than a banquet. All the most sanguinary monsters whose names are embalmed in the abhorrence of history were the progeny of this very gentle and considerate mother. Their atrocious cruelties were practiced to please her; but whilst disapproving of them, as her historians affirm, she was absolutely impotent to arrest their course! She seems to have forgotten the warning contained in the Scriptures, where Eli the highpriest was so signally rebuked by Jehovah because he restrained not the iniquity of his children.

All confidence in such a system disappears in the light of her own apologies, and this renders it unnecessary to dwell upon the abundant proofs at hand that the Church of Rome connived at and abetted many of the most horrible persecutions ever suffered for heresy in modern times.

The superficial and inconsiderate Protestant is apt to refer us to the *charities* of the Church of Rome, and the heroism and self-denial of many of her members. Such facts cannot be denied, and ought never to be overlooked in our searching for truth. That church was not originally evil. It is a perversion of Christianity as it came from the hands of Christ. Many of the best features of its original may still be found in its modern form, as it is known in Protestant lands. The principle of true piety may actuate many of her sons and daughters to lives of sacrifice and trial for the good of others; but it cannot be forgotten that a false principle mingles extensively with the true, and that many of the ascetics in that communion seek suffering in her service from motives very similar to the self-inflicted misery of Hindoo devotees. In both religions the doctrines of self-justification and supererogation are widely prevalent, and the Hindoo and the Romanist torture themselves alike for the purpose of purchasing the favor of the gods or the saints.

Still we are prepared to recognize a genuine Christian spirit in many of the more enlightened servants of the Catholic Church. Virtue is heavenly wherever it springs from a pure motive. Grace is divine whenever it manifests itself in a Christ-like devotion to

the welfare of others. But our Protestant apologist for Rome totally ignores the influence of what scientists call the environment. We venture to claim that the best specimens of Catholic piety are ever to be found in communities where Protestant principles have a free development.

It is the system, however, that we aim to expose, and not individuals. This system is a unit in its intentional and premeditated adaptation to different nations. It is a high compliment to the United States that it is compelled to wear its most spotless robes in our favored land. It is on trial here, and is conscious of the inspection of millions of intelligent eyes. It appears before them as an angel of light, compared with its manifestations in many other portions of the world.

There are degrees in the confidence which Americans can entertain towards this hoary system of error. One extreme is witnessed when popular fury is invoked against its subjects, and brutal mobs, in disregard of every religious restraint, wreak their lawless vengeance upon the persons, families and homes of our Catholic fellow-citizens. The true religious sentiment of all American Protestants revolts universally at such occasional outrages. On the other hand, an equally unjustifiable extreme is embraced when Protestants bend the bow backwards, and insist upon encouraging the increase of that class of our population, not only by immigration *en masse*, but by patronizing their schools, and heaping honors on the hierarchy which no other sect can ever receive.

The middle path is the one of wisdom. *In medio tutissimus ibis*. Equality before the law should be amply secured and cordially conceded to the Catholics throughout our country. But when the flippant and uninformed young American, who has perhaps no knowledge of ecclesiastical differences, and has thoughtlessly leaped to the silly conclusion that one church is as nearly right as another, insists upon fostering and sustaining the institutions of that church as so many supports of our free government and popular interests, we protest with all possible earnestness against the stupendous folly. It is too bad for such rash experimenters to seize the reins of state or national policy, and plunge our country into irremediable ruin. It is our chief aim in this paper

to impress our fellow-Protestants in this democratic republic with the necessity of a vigilant and discriminating view of the Romish Church, resolving to preserve its just rights, but equally determined to withhold from it an unadvised confidence.

This system has no analogue in history, unless that of Mahomet may be so used. But the latter religion is open and explicit in assuming that it may be consistently propagated by force. The Romish Church has long ago been obliged, and now hypocritically professes to prefer, to extend its influence by moral means in certain countries farthest advanced in civilization. But it differs from Protestant denominations found in the United States in claiming unity of principle everywhere, and yet practicing opposite principles in different nations. And we cannot be mistaken in this charge, because no amount of reproach from Protestant critics ever suffices to stimulate its infallible head to plant the principles it advocates in the United States in countries where his influence predominates. Who ever heard of papal interposition in such states in favor of equal privileges for Protestants?

A considerable portion of the nominally Protestant population of the United States has been won over by the flattering language of this cunning hierarchy, not to its communion, but to a shameful subserviency to its cause. It is very common for uneducated parents who have acquired wealth, to pass by all Protestant institutions of learning, and place their children in the hands of Romish teachers, from whose precept or example they soon learn the beauties of idolatry. It is also common for moneyed *parvenus* to subscribe heavily for the founding of their sectarian colleges and universities, designed to pervert the youth of our country, and flood it with a celibate priesthood. In one of our most respected Protestant churches we are pained to find a considerable body of its accredited ministers persistently aping the symbolical and pictorial methods of worship which the Church of Rome has retained in its ceremonies for the purpose of enticing the æsthetic sentiment of our people, whilst the grosser forms of dramatic representation are reserved for the semi-pagan populations of Mexico and South America. If these Anglican imitators are honest, they betray great ignorance of Catholic duplicity; if they are not

true Protestants, their own duplicity is all the more conspicuous from their equivocal position.

The moral of our argument is not hard to state. The Romish Church is entitled to all the equal privileges accorded to her by our Protestant fathers. She is not entitled to a particle more of popular respect than her consistency warrants. Were several millions of Turks introduced into our country, with the Koran and the mosque and the exponents of their religion, it would be gross folly for Americans to felicitate one another on such an addition to the population. Would mere verbal assurances suffice to quiet our fears? Could we imagine their spiritual guides to be sincere in their professions of devotion to the free principles of our country? Could we feel confident of their patriotism so long as we should find them still tenacious, in Turkey and Arabia, of the old despotic and arbitrary principles which their religion has everywhere else sustained as far as possible?

Our moral is, No! the papacy cannot be safely trusted. One thing is still wanting to inspire us with confidence. The chief spiritual authorities of that church must deal fairly with mankind, and put themselves on record as the friends and advocates of religious freedom in every part of the world. It is clear from all modern evidence that those who know the priesthood best are the slowest to entrust themselves into their hands. A very small minority of the Protestant ministers of Ireland has been found willing to sustain Mr. Parnell's scheme of Home Rule in Ireland, notwithstanding the immense influence of Mr. Gladstone in its favor. We thus see a strange development. The great body of Protestant dissenters, contrary to all their antecedents, are now arrayed with singular unanimity in support of the conservative administration of England. The Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and Episcopalians of Ireland, are afraid to trust the Catholics with its government.

Our chief concern now is to forewarn American Protestants against the extreme of liberality which many of them affect. There is no call whatever for us to go so far as to foster and encourage the Roman Catholics rather than our own people. It is easy to be kind and just and considerate, without being patronizing or

subservient. There is a principle in the way of such excesses. It is *wrong* to act in such a manner as to manifest indifference for the fundamental truths of the Christian religion. Dr. H. M. Field, of the New York *Evangelist*, in his controversy with Col. Ingersoll, made a good defence of our faith, but in our judgment went beyond the line of duty in his social relations with his antagonist. This overdone courtesy seems to us equivalent to a verbal declaration that religious feeling ought to yield to worldly friendship. We have not so learned Christ. A bold blasphemer, a habitual jester with gospel themes, an uncompromising enemy of our sovereign Lord and bleeding Redeemer, may be the subject of our prayers and the object of our spiritual concern, but should never be so met in the social scene as to indicate our own want of feeling in reference to his conduct.

But the same principle applies to others besides Ingersoll. We may by our course towards the Romanists proclaim to the world through actions, which always speak louder than words, that we regard their system as an insignificant error; that it is a small matter to pray to creatures, to buy masses for the dead, to burn Bibles, and to maltreat heretics. Besides this, we may thus express our confidence in the aims and efforts of a hierarchy which professes to be very democratic in the United States, and very earnest in favor of full equality of all Christian churches before the law in this part of the world, but is uniformly found resisting the same sort of equality in almost every country where it is safe to do so.

The popes have been for centuries, until a recent date, petty despots over a miserable population inhabiting what were called the "States of the Church" in Italy. The equality before the law, which Catholics so fully enjoy in this country, was a thing which the papal government never tolerated in its own dominions. Since the temporal power of the pope was overthrown and his Italian subjects were united with the rest of the nation under a free constitutional government, initiated by the great statesman, Cavour, this ecclesiastical tyrant has been fretting, like a spoiled child, over his dethronement and the liberation of the people. There is not a bishop of that church in our republic, so far as we

know, who does not advocate his restoration. There is not one, in our opinion, who would sign a paper advocating an equality before the law of Protestants and Catholics as a fundamental condition of such a restoration. And yet Americans, nominally Protestant, are found in abundance who suffer themselves to be blindfolded by the hierarchy, and to disgrace their own intelligence by contending that the Romish Church is as harmless as a fangless serpent, in the United States. That it professes to be so is not denied. But we insist that the *fangs* are still there, and the boasted harmlessness is an affectation for a purpose.

There is another class of American Protestants whom it is difficult to reach. We mean those sentimental religionists whose special tastes incline them to a form of Christianity as far removed from its primitive simplicity as possible. They are ritualists by nature and culture, and nothing is more objectionable to them than a worship such as may be inferred from the language of the New Testament. According to them, the best model in sculpture and painting, the refinements of the drama and the opera, gorgeous robing and artistic attitudinizing of the priesthood, the intonation of Latin litanies, and the delicious strains of artistic, vocal, and instrumental melodies, are far more essential elements of an inspiring service than psalm-singing, scripture reading and gospel sermonizing. Such persons may linger long in the Anglican communion, but their hearts are constantly attracted to the will-worship of the Mass. In the matter of doctrine they are so indifferent that they readily embrace the most monstrous superstitions and the grossest perversions of Christian dogmas for the sake of indulging themselves in sensational exhibitions at the altar.

Many of our young women are influenced by romances and the flattering suggestions of a venal press to a warm admiration for conventual life, and fondly dream of fancied enjoyments in the cloister, and of many tranquil years to be spent in holy seclusion, meditation, and devotion before crucifixes and madonnas, under the pious care of a Mother Superior and the spiritual guidance of a Father Confessor. They have found little satisfaction in their Bibles and on their knees before the one appointed Mediator and Saviour, and, unbelieving and disappointed, turn away from the

spiritual cross to a visible representation—from a living, all-sufficient Christ, to the Virgin Mary and Holy Church.

It is impossible to reason effectually with people who have conceived a loathing for the simple piety of the gospel, and been fascinated by the meretricious charms of the Romish ritual. Prevention is in such cases better than cure. Protestant parents are false to their own principles when they suffer their children to acquire a distaste for spiritual religion, under impressions derived from fictitious reading and improper associations. Conscience ever longs for repose, and when our young people fail to find peace in believing, they may readily fall as willing victims into the arms of a church which proposes to satisfy conscience with ascetic austerities, and to provide enjoyment for the mind by the devices of art. To such susceptible natures the overtures of the Church of Rome come with a peculiar charm. The lot of a vestal who has assumed the veil is imagined to be not only full of peace, but eminently pure and holy, and the life of the nun is deemed to be more like heaven than any sphere of usefulness a Protestant lady can occupy.

It is owing to the opportunities afforded by our free institutions for the employment of such proselyting methods, applicable to ambitious and ill-informed demagogues on the one hand, and romantic youth on the other, that the priesthood of the Church of Rome is so extravagantly landatory of our political system. Nowhere else in the wide world do they find so many advantages for their favorite employment—the enticement of weak Protestants from their inherited faith. Thanks be to God, the over-acted farce is likely to bear very different fruit from that which the actors hope to gather.

JAMES A. WADDELL.