

FREEDOM OF EDUCATION:

WHAT IT MEANS.

BY

JAMES LOWRY WHITTLE, A. B.,

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

SECOND EDITION.

Je ne fais point ici de théorie ni surtout de théologie. * * * Je ne réponds pas par des arguments dogmatiques aux dogmatiseurs qui me condamnent et que je recuse.

DE MONTALEMBERT, *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre.*

DUBLIN :

HODGES, SMITH AND CO., GRAFTON STREET,

PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

LONDON : RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

1866.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

I TAKE the opportunity afforded me by a second edition, to thank the press for the attention that has been bestowed upon this pamphlet. I should except from this acknowledgment the clerical section of the Irish press. It gives me matter of regret that I have not hitherto, so far as I am aware, had the advantage of any criticism from that section. Perhaps I may be justified in drawing from this silence the flattering inference, that the Ultramontane press think it easier to suppress the pamphlet, than to answer it.

J. L. W.

FREEDOM OF EDUCATION.

ABOUT six months ago, a short debate at the close of the late Parliament, excited much criticism here and throughout the public press. The O'Donoghue originated the debate by a motion on the subject of the Catholic University.

A motion on that subject was no matter of surprise. The Catholic University had long been a project dear to the hearts of the Irish hierarchy, and a certain number of gentlemen had long obtained impunity for a dubious political creed, on the ground, that on the question of education, they supported, without reserve, the demands of the Catholic bishops.

Among politicians this question had come to be looked upon as very much like that of the temporal power. A Roman Catholic candidate for political honours, if he was not troubled by any nice notions of personal independence, could secure a seat by pledging himself to echo the Church on these subjects, and his fellow-citizens felt no alarm that

he would thereby be called on to do much mischief. It was only natural that, at the approach of a general election, such a class of politicians should be anxious to show their zeal for the cause. It was the way the motion was met that excited surprise and alarm.

The demand of the Bishops had hitherto been a Charter for the Catholic College, founded some years ago in this city, and known as the Catholic University.

On this occasion The O'Donoghue moved:

“That an address be presented to Her Majesty, representing to
 “Her Majesty that conscientious objections to the present system
 “of University education in Ireland, prevent a large number of
 “Her Majesty’s subjects from enjoying the advantage of Univer-
 “sity education, and praying that such steps be taken as will
 “remedy this grievance.”*

The Ministry met this by a counter-proposition, the exact meaning of which it is difficult to determine. It bid The O'Donoghue’s friends hope much, while it promised nothing definitely.

But the Ministry must be taken to suggest as desirable either of two courses; either making the Catholic University, sectarian as it is, a Queen’s College, and adding it as such, as a fourth College, to the Queen’s University of Ireland, established in 1851,—or introducing such a change in the character of that latter body as

* Hansard, Third Series, vol. 186, p. 541.

should make it a mere board of Examiners, conferring its degrees on all comers, without reference to the place of their education. The latter seems to have been the plan the Government were disposed to adopt.*

I shall not enter on the discussion of that plan now, further than to remark, first, that it involves the separation of the University from the Queen's Colleges ; second, that to satisfy the authorities of the new College, a denominational element must necessarily be introduced on the Board of Examiners of the University ; third, that it changes the whole character of a University degree, and opens up the question, how far a degree is to be the sign of a University education ; and, fourth, that such a change in the character of a University degree, is repudiated by the very men, to satisfy whose demands the change is to be adopted.†

Many other solutions of the mysterious utterances of the Ministry in June last, have been suggested ; I shall not discuss them separately. They all imply this, that the Roman Catholic College now existing here, or some similar institution under ecclesiastical management shall receive recognition from the State. The few observations I have to make, are directed against this broad

* See "University Education in Ireland : " Dublin, 1865, by Dr. Corrigan, now Sir D. Corrigan.

† See "Notes on University Education in Ireland," p. 41, and see further on this pamphlet, *infra*, p. 54.

proposition. This is the important question that has been at issue for some years.

The State determined, many years ago, to leave Trinity College to the effect of time and good sense, and to establish, meanwhile, a University which should not only be open to all without religious distinction, for *that* Trinity College was already, but one that should be independent of all religious sects, and totally uncontrolled by any of them.

In 1851, the Roman Catholic bishops rejected this proposal with much strong language, and proceeded to establish a College which should supply the want they affected to think their flock were labouring under, viz., a University education superintended by the Roman Catholic clergy. The Queen's Colleges, however, have flourished notwithstanding the opposition of the Bishops, and have afforded education to a large body of Roman Catholics.

What made the course taken by the Government in this debate so startling was, that it implied an abandonment of that great principle of secular education, which had been emulously cherished by both the political parties, as the hope of Ireland. To have accepted the original demand of the bishops, would have been a humiliating acknowledgment of the power of Ultramontaniam,—a confession of the weakness of free opinion in Ireland ; but it might have been said, we have still the

antidote to the clerical system ; we have a free University quite untainted with denominationalism ; priestly rule will infallibly disgust its votaries, and the principle of intellectual freedom will triumph after all.

That plausible apology for concession is not applicable to the present case. For if the declarations of last June are now acted on, Ultramontanism is accepted as the principle of the State dealing with education in Ireland. It is *recognised* ; and all the Government can do, is to try to bring it to terms, to make a treaty with a power whose *raison d'être* is to make war upon everything that it cannot subject to Church authority.

The course taken by the Government excited surprise, for it was popularly supposed that the Ultramontanes had no chance of concessions from the Palmerstonian party. Hitherto, the Government, by a liberal distribution of Irish patronage among the nominees of the bishops, were able to prevent their votes becoming troublesome, without conceding anything important. Nor did it seem likely that Ultramontanism would gain much for the future in political strength. It was well known that in Ireland the educated Catholics, even if they were unwilling to break with Ultramontanism, chafed under its yoke, and felt no zeal in its cause.

True, the masses of the people were to be found under the Ultramontane standard ; but this subjection

of the people to their spiritual guides, was a relation existing anterior to the birth of Ultramontanism. The masses were too ignorant to comprehend the change that had been wrought in the opinions of their chiefs. There was, therefore, much reason to hope that, when, in the bracing atmosphere of a British community, the extravagance of Ultramontanism became more apparent, the better educated laity would be enabled to recall their less enlightened brethren from the Ultramontane camp. Independent Catholics, therefore, trusted that the current of events would render the exertions of their clerical foes innoxious.

The arguments put forward for a Catholic University may be reduced to two ; first, that Catholics do without University education, rather than take it as now offered ; second, that on the principle of freedom of education, every sect is entitled to have a University of its own. As to the latter argument, I shall endeavour to show that the principle in question does not apply to the present case. But before proceeding to this, the most important part of the controversy, it will be necessary to dispose briefly of the first argument. That is the argument put forward by The O'Donoghue's motion, and it is clearly the stronger of the two.

If the present system stopped education, it might be difficult to defend it. But is the statement true ? The O'Donoghue professed to prove it by certain figures, which have been since

shown to be totally inaccurate. He states that the numbers of the students in the Queen's Colleges, and in Trinity College, amount, respectively, to 837 and 1,000, making a total of 1837. Of these 837 in the Queen's Colleges, 223 were Roman Catholics, and he adds 45 from Trinity College, making a total of 268 Roman Catholics receiving University Education in Ireland.* To show the disproportion between this state of things and the number of Roman Catholics who would take degrees if they had things all their own way, he alleges that the number of pupils at intermediate schools, is 14,000, of whom 7,000 are Roman Catholics, and thence draws the conclusion, that the proportion of University students of the Roman Catholic communion, ought to be as large as that of Protestants. How The O'Donoghue got these latter figures, I cannot imagine. By the last Census,† the numbers attending superior schools in Ireland are, Roman Catholics, 5,792; Protestants of all denominations, 6,993, making a total of 12,785, and not of 14,000.

Professor Cairnes has pointed out‡ a great omission in considering these facts: that the students from Trinity College include all those intended for

* Even with these figures, the number of Roman Catholic students receiving University education, has been enormously increased since 1845, when it was stated in the House of Commons, that the number then was 100 only. See "Letter" by a Member of the Queen's University in *The Daily News*, 10th July, 1865.

† Report, Part iv., p. 44.

‡ "The Economist," August 19, 1865.

the ministry of the Established Church, while the Roman Catholic students at Maynooth and elsewhere, studying for the Roman Catholic priesthood, have been omitted.

The Census Report estimates the number of Roman Catholic students attending seven Colleges, not Universities, at 1161.* Three of these, Maynooth, All Hallows, and Holycross, are purely ecclesiastical, and the number attending them is 770, which, added to the 268 Roman Catholic students mentioned by The O'Donoghue, makes a total of 1018.

Deducting this 770 above, from the 1161 Roman Catholic students attending the Colleges, not Universities, we have 391, to be distributed among four other Colleges, all of which are primarily ecclesiastical. The greater part of the students in them are intended for the priesthood: what the exact proportion is we know not, but, suppose it 200, we have 1,218 Roman Catholics receiving University education, and not 268. The balance of the 1161 consists rather of school-boys than students. These Colleges are in reality schools for the youth of the neighbourhood, with an ecclesiastical course of reading for young lads preparing for the priesthood. Most of the lay pupils would be unable to afford going to a University at a distance.

Nor are The O'Donoghue's figures with respect

* Report, part iv., p. 48.

to Trinity College more correct. On reference to the books of the University, I find that we must add 50 to the 45 Catholic students he mentions, making a general total of 1268.*

But even these figures do not represent all the Roman Catholics who take University Degrees under the present system, for many Irish Priests still go to graduate at Continental Universities. And, since Oxford and Cambridge have been opened, some of the Roman Catholic gentry send their sons to these places of education, instead of to Trinity College. If we take the Roman Catholic students whom the present system cannot be said to deprive of University education—that is, those who do graduate at the existing Universities,—and the Divinity students whom it is not proposed to send to the new University, we have 1268, against 1569 Protestants of all denominations. And when we consider the difference in wealth and social position of the Roman Catholic and Protestant elements in Ireland, we can easily explain this difference.

In fact, *à priori*, one would expect the difference to be much greater. The Universities are naturally resorted to by those who are seeking admission to the professions. If we turn to the Census Report† and exclude the clerical profession, and also that of teachers, in which latter profession the Roman Catholics naturally have a preponderance, on account of the mass of the people being of that

* See note, *infra*, p. 70.

† Part iv., p. 63.

religion; we find that the other professions give the following result : Protestants of all denominations, 31,163 ; Roman Catholics, 26,200.

The only one of the professions included in this calculation in which Catholics have a majority, is the Civil Service, in which the numbers are, Roman Catholics, 13,022 ; Protestants, 8,520 ; and the Civil Service is just that profession for which a University degree is least usually taken.

We cannot, in fact, do any justice to this question if we ignore the facts, that in all the references to figures, the Roman Catholics represent a less wealthy class, and that the majority of University students always represents people of tolerably easy circumstances. All through the Census tables, as you ascend from the humblest class, the proportion between Protestants and Catholics gradually alters. It is enormously in favour of the Roman Catholics in the numerical total of mere population. It is in their favour in the primary schools. It is so still in the farming and commercial classes. The change begins in the superior schools, where the proportion is *against* the Catholics; it is still more so in the professional classes; and, if we could go into minute division of these latter, we would find the proportion to rise against the Roman Catholics in every successive grade. The fact that the Roman Catholics as a body are less wealthy in proportion to their numbers, is the real explanation why they do

not take so much University education as The O'Donoghue would give them.

This disproportion between wealth and numbers will, perhaps, mend in time, but, while it exists, we cannot assume that Roman Catholics are deprived of University education from "conscientious objections to the present system." So far indeed from the laity having any feeling of the kind, the Catholic College in Dublin has long been a feeding school for Trinity College ; and many of the diocesan seminaries perform the same office for the Queen's Colleges. It is quite true that the laity have been told often enough that it was better to leave their sons without any University education than send them to a non-Catholic University ; but figures show that the laity do not believe all this, and the argument of The O'Donoghue and Mr. Monsell proceeds on the assumption that they do.

Having dealt with the argument derived from the supposed check given to education by the present system, and which I may call the education argument, I proceed to consider what truth there is in the other, which is represented by the cry for freedom of education. This is the argument which I believe has weighed most in England, and has induced such a paper as the *Daily News* to accept the ministerial announcement with complacency. It has been said, after all we shall have a Catholic University in Ireland. Why should we

not ? Why should not the Irish Catholics have what they think best for themselves ? They have suffered much in old times. If they are content to give up Ribbonism, Fenianism, and other treasonable proclivities, let them have their own way about education. It is this class of easy-going reasoners whom the perseverance of the Roman Catholic hierarchy has worked upon. I quite agree with such philosophers that the State should put far from it the old spirit of suspicion towards the Catholic people, and that it should make some sacrifices to convince Catholics that it has done so. But to take the Catholic body and, ere it has half shaken off the misery, the ignorance, the prejudices, the suspicions of by-gone ages, to hand it over bodily to the emissaries of Italian fanaticism would be wilfully to defer the resurrection of this country, and, as regards the empire at large, to strengthen a system pregnant with disorder and mischief to our social organization.

The reasoners I have referred to ignore the following facts, that this is the demand, not of the Catholic laity, but of a clerical faction ; that this faction professes tenets utterly opposed to British law and civilization ; that there exists within the Catholic body a dissentient element, which, and which alone, gives promise that that body will one day be fully qualified for the duties of British citizens ; that it is for the purpose of crushing this dissentient element

that the bishops ask for a Catholic University, and, lastly, that in the peculiar existing conditions of this country, and of the Catholic body, if the Ultramontanes succeed in their demand, it is only too likely that by an extreme exercise of authority, they will succeed also in crushing that dissentient element, or in so reducing it by persecution as to make it quite useless as a check on Ultramontanism. It is upon the existence of these facts I rely to show that freedom of education does not apply to the present case.

As to the first point, no one who knows anything of Irish elections will contend that the Ultramontane members of Parliament represent the laity; they are the mere tenants at will of the bishops. Moreover, the English Catholic laity have actually protested against the condemnation of Oxford and Cambridge, and in Ireland the laity have long practically adopted mixed education. Their sentiments are still those of their ancestors, who protested against exclusive education in 1795.*

Irish Catholics may be now divided into three broad classes, 1st, the Ultramontanes. This consists of the Bishops and their political mouth-pieces in the press and in Parliament. I do not mention the clergy as a distinct element, for they do not

* The Catholic laity in their petition to Parliament say, "If the youth of both religions were instructed together in those branches of classical education which are the same for all, their peculiar tenets would in all probability be no hindrance to a friendly and liberal intercourse through life."—Ir. House of Coms. Jour., 1795, p. 112.

deserve to be so considered. Church discipline, unchecked by any considerable body of lay opinion, has reduced them—a hard-working, conscientious, partially educated class of men—to unlimited submission to their Bishops. Neither are the country voters a separate element. They give the Bishops their political strength; but what with their poverty and ignorance on the one hand, and on the other their distrust of the Government and the higher classes, they are ready to follow the bishops without reserve. In England there is a certain section of the Catholic laity who have a predilection for the more subtle forms of Ultramontanism, but in Ireland such a party has no existence. 2ndly, there are the dissentient opponents of Ultramontanism. This class embraces the Catholic gentry, the professional and literary classes, and the leading Catholic merchants. At present their bond of union is chiefly the natural repugnance of free citizens to the destructive theories Ultramontanism now openly professes. 3rdly, there is the great mass of the Catholic people who are too busy or too ignorant to understand the struggle going on within the Church. It is this mass of practical Catholicism that the example of the educated members of their own faith, and the current of events, are preparing every day to accept sound constitutional opinions. It is to check this process that the Ultramontanes are bestirring themselves, and it is against the Government assisting

them, that, on behalf of independent Roman Catholics, I now protest. I shall endeavour to shew, not merely the hardship such action on the part of the Government will be to us, educated Catholics, but the mischief and danger it will occasion to Ireland, and the empire at large.

In proceeding to my next argument, the peculiar nature of Ultramontanism, it will be necessary to consider briefly the origin of this party in the Church, the circumstances under which it exists abroad and its advent in England and in this country. The term Ultramontanism originated in the old quarrel with the French Bishops, but does not mean now, as then, the doctrine of extreme Papal authority. That is still one of its most precious articles of belief, but only as a means to an end; only because that principle gives the clerical body an organisation, a unity of action, an independence of popular sentiment, which is of paramount importance to the present purposes of its rulers. The real principle of nineteenth century Ultramontanism is, that the Church is the heaven-appointed ruler of the earth and all that it contains. The supreme law of Society is the voice of the living Church. Law, liberty, philosophy, anything else you wish, the Ultramontane will tell you, you may have, but you must accept them at the hand of the Church. Nay, he will go further, and tell you, that you can

have none of these things from any other source than from the Church. What men call law, liberty, philosophy, are but the creatures of their own licentious imaginations. "Civilization," says an English Ultramontane writer, "is the natural and spontaneous product of the Church, and of the Church alone;"* and he proceeds to prove that what ordinary men call civilization, is mere barbarism. For proof of all this, Ultramontanism takes refuge in logic. Logic is the Ultramontane's *cheval de bataille*,—he is always talking about it. By it he is always ready to prove all of his favourite theories, if only you allow him to assume both premises.

That this form of opinion may be traced in the Church in earlier times, is undoubted. But it existed merely as a sentiment with fanatical or visionary minds. It is only since the French Revolution that this sentiment has been fostered and developed, and brought out into actual life and action. The party who now maintain these views, refer to a portion of Church history as exhibiting this theory in its fullest development. They affect to draw their maxims and examples from the contests of the Church and the Civil Power in the middle ages. Then the Church was struggling against the State as the sole representative of moral force opposed to brute force. It was

* Dublin Review, N. S. i., p. 581.

right against might. Then civilization and philosophy had no existence amongst the laity. The night of ignorance covered the earth, and it was only within the sanctuary was to be found a lingering memory of the brightness that had been. Then the Church did work, and noble work, for humanity—not in virtue of her commission to save souls, but as the sole depository of intellectual life, of moral power then existing upon earth. The Church then represented literature, philosophy, art, the press—in a word, public opinion. But the worldly power which this contest gave her, produced corruption and forgetfulness of her real function—the saving of individual souls. That corruption lasted many ages, and has caused much misery to man. It has driven many souls into the deserts of infidelity; but, under the guiding hand of Providence, even that corruption produced good fruit. A great Catholic theologian, the hope of the Church in our time, has said of the period of the Reformation :

“We must all acknowledge that here also God has caused much good, as well as evil to proceed from the errors of men, from the contests and passions of the sixteenth century. We must, too, admit, that the anxiety of the German nation to see the intolerable abuses and scandals of the Church removed, was fully justified, and that it sprang from the better qualities of our people, and from their moral indignation at the desecration and corruption of holy things, which were degraded to selfish and hypocritical purposes.”*

* Dollinger's "Church and the Churches," p. 17.

Not the least valuable lesson we derive from those times is, that the great economic principle of the division of labour is applicable to the Church, as to other things; that if we would see religion existing among us, we must not apply its machinery to earthly purposes. There is no royal road over the difficulties which beset a man in civil society. He must take for his guide his own conscience, enlightened and purified by religion, nor throw the responsibility of his actions on an institution whose special function is to prepare man for the next world, not to deal with the difficulties and problems of this.

After the Reformation, a spirit of discreet diplomacy ruled the Church. She was pretty well reformed in morals. She retained her worldly possessions, and her political status, if not her political power, in a large portion of Europe. She was utterly extirpated in the North of Europe. But in the South, down to the French Revolution, her wealth was enormous, and her political influence not inconsiderable. It has been often asked, with reference to this period, and asked most pertinently; if she felt that her peculiar mission was to take charge of education, why during those 250 years did she not set about teaching the populations of Spain, and Italy, and Southern Germany. She gave those countries religion, music, art, such as it was during that

period, professorial and classical learning, and that only of a very limited kind ; for the great classical scholars of the seventeenth century, were the Huguenots in France, and the Calvinistic Dutch. But popular education she gave them none. It is only since the French Revolution that the bishops have found out that it was their mission to preside over education. Is the Church only to execute this trust when an angry democracy threatens to execute it without the Church ? Or, has the Church only discovered the value of popular education from the ideas of 1789. The truth is, the clerical party is, and always has been, afraid of educating the masses. Human reason this party regards as the great *ignis fatuus* of man. That education tends to develope. When nobody thought of educating, all went well. Now that education must be given, the only chance of preventing man going astray is, for the clergy to undertake the task, and they profanely interpret the text, "go, and in my name teach all nations," by adding the words, reading, writing, arithmetic, and the use of the globes.

The richest endowments held by the Church in this century were in what constituted the kingdom of Naples. And it appeared in the Census of 1864, that there the percentage of those who could neither read nor write, reached the figure 80. In Ireland it is only 49.

The utter overthrow of the French Church at the Revolution seems to have bewildered the clerical party, and even after the fall of Napoleon, the terror of that period seems to cling to them still. In the abject condition to which Pius VII. was reduced, Napoleon obtained many concessions which are a great scandal to the Ultramontane party at this day. By the Concordat of 1801, Pius accepted the separation of Church and State ; by that of 1813, he implicitly surrendered his temporal power.

The apology made for him by the Ultramontanes now is, the necessity of the times. He had no choice between submitting and the destruction of Catholicism in France. That is, where infidelity exists in such activity as to imperil the very existence of the Catholic body, there, and there only, these "royal rights," as the Dublin Review calls them, may be lawfully given up. Where then, as in Belgium, the Church has to contend with an independent Catholic nationality, which cannot afford to renounce Catholicity, the Church, according to this Canon, cannot yield, but is obliged to hold to "her royal rights," as if they were essential matters of faith.

From the time of the Pope's restoration in 1814 the Papal Court has had two duties. It has had, as formerly, to maintain its sway over the religious mind of Europe in foreign countries. But it has

had in addition to combat for its own existence at home. To see the Church of France overwhelmed by the tide of revolution was in itself enough to fill the clerical mind with terror at the new state of things, at the novel ideas which had got possession of men's minds. But the Papal Court had the present effect of these principles brought home to their own doors. Ever since 1814 the history of the Roman Court is a series of convulsive struggles for existence.

Previous to the Revolution it was a deplorable example of government, but still it had justly a reputation for mildness.* The pressure of more recent troubles has deprived it even of that virtue, and many acts of oppression and blood mark its later career. That the Father of Christendom should be reduced to adopt the measures of tyrannical rulers, was truly melancholy. But the mischief of such a state of things did not end here. Catholics throughout the world have been called upon to enter into this miserable conflict between the Pope and his subjects. To take an instance :—A few years since the massacre of Perugia had just taken place. The Papal government required money ; and the clergy here undertook a collection at the chapel doors. Here were the ordinary inhabitants of this city proceeding to their Sunday devotions at their respective churches, and they were stopped on their way to

* Dollinger's " Church and the Churches," 372.

the foot of God's altar, and obliged to take upon themselves responsibility for the political acts of a foreign government on the shores of the Mediterranean. When we consider all the doubts, and difficulties, and afflictions that beset us in every-day life, and how necessary are the consolations of religion to enable us to pass through them unscathed, it does seem terrible that those consolations should only be permitted us on condition of our making up our minds on such questions as these.

The history of the Papal government is important, because it is to the present perilous condition of that very institution, that much of the present activity of Ultramontanism is due. And the history of this government is in many ways instructive, for it is there that Ultramontanism finds the model for the state of society it would establish throughout Europe. We see in the temporal power only an attempt to carry out practically the very doctrines that are preached here. For this reason therefore it is useful to remember such a combination of wickedness and folly, as the *precetto-politico*,* the

* "The person on whom this punishment was imposed was compelled to reside at his birth-place; he must be in his house at a certain hour in the morning; every fourteen days he must present himself before the police inspector; and every month go to confession, and he must show by witnesses that the priest with whom he has been at confession was a father confessor approved by the police; and then, every year he must make a spiritual retreat of three days in a monastery appointed for him by the bishop. Neglect of any of these regulations becomes punishable with three years of compulsory labour."—Dollinger's "Church and the Churches," p. 394.

State lotteries, the ecclesiastical tribunals, the case of the boy Mortara, and the massacre of Perugia.

But many other circumstances besides the danger of the Papacy contributed to spread Ultramontane views. The effect of the French Revolution was to create throughout all Europe a mass of non-clerical opinion. And it is the combat with this new element of European Society that has given Ultramontanism its peculiar features. It has developed in this struggle a new theory of action, and a new organisation.

Ultramontanism was only felt in all its rigour in 1849. Not that many of the later acts of Pius IX. might not be paralleled by those of Gregory XVI.; but the proceedings of the latter were of only partial application, adapted to the peculiar circumstances of each locality. The Papal Court had not pledged itself to pure unadulterated Ultramontanism. The *mirari vos* of Gregory XVI. in 1831, condemned the doctrine of religious toleration, but the letter of the Propaganda, in reply to the Irish Bishops ten years later accepted mixed education. The efforts of the present Pope to put the Church on the side of liberalism are well known, and their utter failure. I am right then in dating the Ultramontane regime proper from 1849. We have had since that a series of singular acts of great importance, which seem to shew that

the Roman Court is anxious to manifest distinctly its conflict with modern opinion, and is ready to employ all its spiritual resources in the struggle: the declaration of the Synod of Thurles, 1851; the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, 1854; the *Eximiam tuam*, June 15, 1857; the Canonization of the Japanese Martyrs, 1862; the discussions at Malines, 1863; the Encyclical *Quantâ Curâ*, Dec. 8, 1864. As if it were a kind of atonement for past errors and weaknesses, Pius IX. would make manifest to all the world that between the Church, as the Papal Court represents it, and modern opinion there is an impassable gulf. In dealing with Protestantism it had been the pride of the Roman Church to boast of her antiquity. A dignified distrust of what was modern, as ephemeral and worthless, characterised the Church and her champions. But since 1849 the Ultramontane policy is to grasp at everything modern and mould it to the uses of the Church. The new born theocratic system is taught as the Divine counterpoise of the ideas of 1789. Thus the Dublin Review boasts that "the Church's whole doctrine on her civil principedom has been commenced, matured, and perfected by" Pius IX.* Such expressions contrast singularly with the old boast of the Church, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Many of the Papal acts I have enumerated

* Dublin Review, New Series, iv., p. 441.

have been professedly calls on the supernatural powers of the Church, with the view of aiding the clerical party in its struggle with modern civilization. We have in this fact terrible evidence of the extremities to which Ultramontaniam may go.

I have said the French Revolution produced a great mass of non-clerical opinion. But it was of a peculiar character and exhibited little of that hostility to Christianity that marked the philosophy previous to the Revolution. A reaction had set in in the educated classes which lasts even to our times. Infidelity was no longer fashionable. The earnestness of mind which that wonderful crisis of humanity awakened adopted Christian morality, and to some extent, even Christian revelation. If it had been possible for the Church to swim with the tide which flowed after the appearance of "*La Genie du Christianisme*," how much religious scandal might have been saved. But the Church did then as she does in England now. She accepted the popularity which such writings as Chateaubriand's gave her ; she adopted Le Maistre as her guide in action.

There has existed in France for many years, the class called *libres penseurs*, who are not to be confounded with the philosophers of the Voltairian period. All their most distinguished leaders accept Christian morality, many of them Christian revela-

tion in one degree or another. They are a class who have been immensely influenced for good by the genius of Lamennais. No one can listen to the noble eloquence of a Jules Simon, without feeling how much of the true fire of Christian charity animates his bosom, and without regretting that the crazes of fanaticism should repel so noble a spirit from the fold of Christ. These are the men who have devoted themselves to philanthropy and social science on the Continent, and have taken the foremost places in literature and philosophy. They are not of the Church, and the Church makes war upon them ; yet, practically, there is little to quarrel about, if not with them, at least with their disciples. It is for this reason that the clerical party delight to give prominence to those odious, repugnant doctrines of Ultramontanism, that they may be as it were the battle-cries of party. Moreover, the *libres penseurs* of the Continent being the leaders in everything connected with intellectual progress, the Catholic youth necessarily received much of their education from such men. And such men, without trenching on Catholic doctrine, were a living protest, not against Catholic doctrine, but against Ultramontanism. That men who had studied science and history under Protestants, or *libres penseurs*, should be brought to accept the doctrine that it was the duty of the State to repress heresy, that it was a crime for the State to appoint non-

Catholics to public office,* was extremely improbable, and hence the necessity arose for getting the education of all Europe into the hands of the Church.

The pretext of this is the danger to faith and morals from an education without religious supervision ; but this is acknowledged now to mean that there is no other chance of men being got to accept the monstrous principles of Ultramontanism, unless they have, to make use of the favorite metaphor, inhaled them from the surrounding atmosphere. How strange must be the principles that find no acceptance with intelligent, earnest minds of moral tendency, unless these minds have been trained to them from their earliest youth ! Nor is this enough ; but so fragile a thing is faith in Ultramontanism, that it must never for a moment be brought in contact with the non-ultramontane world. Occasionally, by the permission of the Church, some few may be permitted to go forth and do battle for its principles in the intellectual arena against Protestantism, infidelity, or, worst of all, “ disloyal Catholicism ;” but this is the only contact with the enemy permissible to the orthodox. An English Catholic clergyman, writing on the subject of University Education, says :—

* Modern civilization “ favours every non-Catholic worship and does not keep back the very infidels from filling public offices.” Extract from the *Jamdudum cernimus*, in the Dublin Review, N. S., iv., p. 492.

"All writers on spiritual science agree that intercourse with Protestants, except for the purpose of converting them, is hurtful to the soul. No one can court Protestant society, and live much in it, without losing the brightness of his spiritual vision, and in a great measure the instincts and sympathies of his faith."*

Such is the spirit of the clerical party; but, as I have said, their principles were not professedly adopted by the Pope till 1849. Then the Roman Court threw itself into the arms of Ultramontanism, which it fancied afforded the only security for its moral supremacy and material possessions. Pius IX. had washed his hands of liberalism. Thenceforth the utmost powers of the Church were strained to propagate Ultramontanism all over the world and the pressure is still increasing. Satan, it was agreed, was the author of the French Revolution, and everything that flowed therefrom, was his work—freedom of thought, freedom of action, were new and terrible inventions which the Church could not depend on her purity and truth alone to resist. She must step forth and combat with the evil one for the possession, not of souls, as of old, but for that of the earth itself. Modern ideas had so darkened the human understanding that Christian truth could make no impression on the minds of men, by its intrinsic strength. Men must be got hold of, and undergo an adaptive process to prepare them to accept

* *Cui Bono University Education?* by the Rev. C. Rawes, p.21. Longman: 1864. What gives significance to this production is the eulogy passed on it in the "Dublin Review,"—*Dublin Review*, N. S. iv., (1865), p. 136.

the tidings of salvation. The Church must permeate the State, be present in literature and art, guiding and controlling wayward mortality. This was the only chance, or truth itself would be swept away in the general ruin. Such is Ultramontanism on the Continent.

In England, previous to Emancipation, the natural object of Roman Catholics was to show their fellow-countrymen how much there was in common between themselves and their adversaries; that however much they differed in religious matters, religion did not interfere with their duties as good citizens; that, except in matters of faith, they entered into the ordinary opinions and feelings of Englishmen. Accordingly, when the Catholic Committee issued their manifesto in 1787, they declared it to be "the duty of Christians to make the discipline of the Church to conform as near as may be to the laws of their country." If you ask an Ultramontane whether this would still be accepted as a principle of the Catholic party, he will perhaps say, Yes; but if he is candid, he will add that it would be very liable to be misinterpreted, and require much corrective teaching. If, however, he is outspoken, like the *Dublin Review*, he will admit that the true sentiment would be, it is "the duty of Christians to make the laws of their country conform as near as may be to the discipline of the Church." The liberal sentiments of those times contributed

much to remove the prejudices which deferred Emancipation, and the Irish Roman Catholics were not behind their English brethren in the frank profession of constitutional views, and independent Catholicism. No one can read the debates on "the Catholic question," without perceiving what influence this had on the public mind. Emancipation was not here what toleration has been on the Continent, a concession demanded by the principles of the party who made it, irrespective of the feelings of the body to whom it was made. It was granted in England on the faith that Roman Catholics were willing frankly to accept the responsibilities and the duties of citizenship; that, though differing ever so widely on the all-important question of religious opinion, they could become one with the mass of the nation in every other respect.

The national feeling evinced by Catholics at that time, was the only thing that made Emancipation reasonable. It may be true that there is still much bad feeling among their adversaries; that in the conflict of religious parties, cases of severe individual hardship have occurred; but for all that, since Emancipation, with the exception of the foolish outburst in 1851, the treatment of the Roman Catholic body in England has been just and considerate, and this is the more meritorious, when we consider how much the Ultramontane party have done to prejudice Catholicism.

In Ireland the similarity of the position of the Catholic body to that in England ceased at Emancipation. In England Roman Catholicism was insignificant in its numbers, though distinguished in the rank, and birth, and learning of its members. Still it was a small sect, and could not pretend as such to any national life. Here Catholicism was the religion of the nation. It was the religion of an ancient race, who had been long persecuted for religion's sake. Many questions made the position of the Catholic laity one of extreme difficulty. The people were miserably poor and ignorant, contemptuous towards Protestantism, discontented with British rule, hostile to the English name, without a gentry to lead them, devoted to a clergy who had sprung from themselves, and were their traditional guides and protectors. The clergy shared, as a general rule, the national feeling of the masses; and this, in their intercourse with English liberals, in the course of this struggle for Emancipation, had given them broad liberal views, which seem strange enough when compared with the sentiments of these days.

The leading mind in the Church of Ireland at that time was Dr. Doyle, and so alien were his views to those of the Church party of the present time, that he is frequently said in private to have been led astray by Gallican principles, and in public much pains have been bestowed

to prove that he only adapted himself to the times, and would have been as good an Ultramontane as Archbishop Cullen if he were alive now. Archbishop Cullen himself says, "Those who refer to the opinions of Dr. Doyle, should not forget that things have undergone a great change since his time."* Such reasoning reminds us of two things : first, what was said in 1829, and secondly, that we should be cautious in supposing that Ultramontaniam will consider itself bound on one occasion by the principles laid down by the Church on another. How totally ignorant, or indifferent, Dr. Doyle was on the subjects of "the royal rights" of the Church is indicated by a passage in his letter to Dr. M'Ghee, where he is defending the authority of the Church in matters of faith.

"We are of opinion, that, as in society natural rights if unrestrained would create anarchy, but when regulated by law produce civil liberty—so in the Christian society, certain rights if unrestrained would engender schisms and heresies, but when regulated by Church authority, they produce that evangelical liberty to which civil liberty bears a faint resemblance." †

This juxta-position of society (in the ordinary sense of the word) regulated by law, and the Christian society or the Church regulated by authority would be utterly unintelligible to an Ultramontane. Civil society has no existence for him, unless *it* also is regulated by, and depends upon, Church authority.

* Fitzpatrick's Life of Dr. Doyle, ii. p. 348.

† Ibid. p. 508.

After Emancipation, if the Irish clergy thought it right or necessary to retain a position in politics, one would naturally suppose they would direct their attention to the overthrow of the Established Church in Ireland. That institution represented a rival religion ; and a judicious attack upon it would have received the support of a section of English politicians. But the Ultramontane party have never earnestly taken up the question, because they began to feel how embarrassing were the principles on which the Church had obtained Emancipation. They would be obliged to pledge themselves to certain broad principles that would be applicable to Italy or Belgium, as well as to Ireland. Enough mischief had been done in that way already ; and the mistake of taking up any movement of which the clergy could not keep the entire control, must not be again committed. This question, like the land question, has been played with occasionally to amuse the people ; but what the hierarchy have shown zeal in has been the education question and that of the temporal power.

Up to 1851 the Church had, as a body, accepted the principle of mixed education for the lower classes, and never questioned it for the upper, in these countries. The National Education scheme had been working on the principle of mixed education for many years. In 1835, a Parliamentary Committee had been appointed to report on University Education

in Ireland. This was before Trinity College had founded her open scholarships and studentships. Though not opened till 1849, the Queen's Colleges were the result of the labours of this Committee ; and the Queen's University was established in 1852.

For some time previous to 1850 there had been, at the head of the Irish Church two ecclesiastics distinguished for ability, learning, high character, and gentlemanly bearing towards their own flock and towards their neighbours,—I shall be understood to allude to Dr. Croly and Dr. Murray, both of whom supported the National Board. Dr. Murray was a Commissioner, as was also Dr. Denvir, Bishop of Down and Connor. Unfortunately, however, political circumstances prevented the influence of these men from having its full effect upon their flock. With the lower classes, and the lower tier of the middle classes, hostility to the British Government, as far as talk went, was a point of honor which nothing but a Government place could justify a man's foregoing. The fact that Dr. Murray consented to assist the Government in educating the people, was enough to make the ignorant and prejudiced indifferent to his noble Christian character. The claim of the clergy to the exclusive care of education in this country, was confined at that time to the National-school question ; and the people abused the National system, not because they

cared about or understood the controversies on Church or State education, but simply because the Board was a Government creation, and what came from the British Government, the people and its instructors disliked.

I intend to avoid going into the controversy about primary education, which is the other half of the Ultramontane scheme at present before the country. The supposed necessity for religious instruction in the primary schools, does not bear upon the question I have undertaken to discuss. I sympathise thoroughly with the National system, and shall regret its fall, as throwing additional power and influence into the hands of that faction which is working to crush the freedom of us educated Roman Catholics. But if free university education is preserved to us, that is, *if there be established no model clerical institution* into which Roman Catholics may be driven by an extreme exercise of Church authority,* throwing the lower classes more completely into clerical hands, will do *us no irreparable mischief*. If I refer to the National Board question, it is only to illustrate the rise and progress of the Ultramontane party.

* In reply to a deputation from the General Assembly, the Lord Lieutenant said recently, that the fact that the Catholic students would be withdrawn from the Queen's Colleges if the Catholic University were established, was the strongest argument for so establishing it. His Excellency forgot that this withdrawal would be caused not by the wishes of the Catholic body, but by unscrupulous clerical pressure.—Freeman's Journal, February 14th, 1866.

To return to the history of the education question previous to 1850. The conduct of the two archbishops was commented on with much severity. They were supposed to have foregone their national feelings at the bidding of the Castle. The Court of Rome was supposed, too, to be under the diplomatic influence of England; but what was remarkable was, that these ecclesiastics were not reproached with betraying the interests of the Church in accepting mixed education, only the interests of their country. The keeping the education in the hands of the Government was looked upon as a device for extinguishing national sentiment in Ireland.

In the same year in which the Queen's Colleges were opened, (1849), a remarkable change took place in the Irish hierarchy—Dr. Croly died, and his successor in the See of Armagh was Dr. Cullen, whose special mission it has been to develope, I might almost say to create, Ultramontane opinion in this country. The manner of his election was significant. It had been the immemorial custom, on the death of a bishop, for the clergy of the diocese to meet and choose three names, arranged as *dignissimus*, *dignior*, *dignus*, to be sent to Rome for the Pope to select from among them to fill the vacant See. It was the general rule to select the *dignissimus*, and one never departed from without some cogent personal reason. On this occasion, however, not only was the *dignissimus* passed over,

but none of the three was appointed. An Irish monk, who had spent most of his life at Rome, and had been in personal attendance on the Pope during the troubles of the Roman revolution, was sent as Archbishop of Armagh. His arrival in Ireland was just at that period I have already referred to, when the Papacy, after half-a-century of shifting and changing, had finally adopted Ultramontaniam in its full extent.

After Archbishop Cullen's arrival amongst us, he set about introducing Ultramontane views of education, and in 1851 got the Synod of Thurles to reject formally the teaching of the Queen's Colleges. The next event was the agitation produced in England by the appointment of the English hierarchy. The popular excitement here about the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was intense; it was a matter in which religious and national feeling coalesced, and it did seem at one time as if the civil liberty of Roman Catholics would be seriously endangered. Archbishop Cullen ably availed himself of the crisis, and won so much popularity, that on the death of Dr. Murray in 1852, his name was sent to Rome as *dignissimus*, and he became Archbishop of Dublin. He was also appointed Papal Delegate, an office which gives him controlling power over the whole Church of Ireland. Since this period he has used his immense powers unsparingly to promote the most extreme Ultramontaniam. He is an able admi-

nistrator, and may be taken as the representative of Ultramontaniam in action. He has pursued his course, standing aloof from his flock, whom he ignores; from his clergy, whom he has made his mere machines. If the resolution and energy of fanaticism make a man great, he has certainly some claim to that appellation.

But it has been often said, that however extravagant the views put forth by the Church abroad, there was no chance of their being applied here, or even taught with any consistency. The most enthusiastic votaries of Ultramontaniam would hesitate to disclose their whole system to an incredulous public. The mass of the Roman Catholic laity would treat such dreams with cold indifference. The extreme views of Church authority, or Church influence, would be tacitly put out of sight, until that great event, some centuries hence, when Protestant England should be converted to Roman Catholicism, and so they would work no practical mischief. Until very recent years this seemed a sound view enough, but the pressure of foreign events has given that intensity to Ultramontane feeling, that its followers in England make it now a duty to put forward their peculiar sentiments in the most direct manner. Moreover, in England there arose about thirty years since, a new element of danger in the Tractarian movement. Though many of the leaders of that movement sympathised with the theoretical

principles of Ultramontanism, yet the practical effect of the movement has been this—to develop a cast of thought in sympathy with the religious feelings of earnest Catholics, in union with them on almost every point of dogma, but yet external to the Church. In dealing with such a class the old landmarks of controversy were swept away; Roman Catholics were naturally disposed to ask themselves how far *they* could lower the barriers that separated them from their Anglican brethren. There was danger of the Roman Catholic mind falling into a channel of thought that would make the adoption of Ultramontane views of Papal authority hereafter impossible. Accordingly, as Anglican Catholicism developed itself, we see year by year the Ultramontane tenets put forward more prominently. The danger was much more pressing than the contact with the followers of Lamennais in France, where the Bishop of Poitiers declares that it is necessary for the faith “to inflame the love of doctrine, the passion of truth.”

Almost contemporaneous with the Tractarian movement was the establishment of the “Dublin Review.” It continued many years under the care of Cardinal, then Dr., Wiseman. It became the chief organ of British Catholics. It always professed Ultramontane opinions, and its declarations on these subjects grew stronger and stronger, till of late years they have reached the furthest

extreme of fanaticism. Its pages are worth studying; for though this publication does not happily represent all Catholics, it undoubtedly does represent the ruling party among them. It is the Dublin Reviewers who will triumph in the success of the movement for a Catholic University, and it is in this publication we must seek the opinions that the Catholic University is to be established to teach. In this Review we see abundant proofs of the propagandist spirit of Ultramontaniam in England, and we see proofs also of what is a most important part of my argument against this concession, the existence of a dissentient Roman Catholic element—what the “Dublin” and its party are pleased to call “disloyal” “nominal,” or “tepid” Catholicism.

The “Dublin” candidly explains the object of establishing a Catholic University:—

“Unfortunately there is a large class of Catholics in Germany who tamely acquiesce in the abridgment of the liberties of the Church and of the authority of the Pope, but who cannot for an instant brook any interference with the unlimited freedom of science. All teaching, even theological according to them, suffers from the immediate control of the Church. The Church is the enemy, the State the friend, of intellectual freedom. *Such a disloyal spirit and such a limited intellectual grasp of Catholicism will be corrected, at least in a measure, we confidently hope, by the speedy establishment of the projected German Catholic University.* The progress this scheme has already made, we hope to speak of on a future occasion, as the work is not only interesting in itself, but may show us the way to meet the want so severely felt among ourselves, of a Catholic University in England.”*

* Dublin Review, October, 1865, p. 516.

Let us look at their article on the Pope's allocution against Free Masons, in the last number :—

“In the face of this vast conspiracy against Christianity, the only safe or satisfactory course open to Catholics is, to close their ranks and be in all things of one heart, of one mind, of one will with Rome. Such a unity is a strength peculiar to Catholicism.”*

Or what do the English Dissenters, who are to help the Ultramontanes to carry out the education scheme, say to this in the same number :—

“It is not possible for good Catholics to be the natural allies of the liberal party, for its principles are the utter negation of our principles. Nor, however great the conformity of our leading principles with those of the Conservative party, can any alliance between them and the Catholics be other than one of strict covenant. Our hope, though it be faint, our road, though it be narrow, still lies in the formation of a party absolutely independent of both.”†

The conformity of their principles to those of English Conservatism, or of any other constitutional party, is not very easy to make out. Take another sample of Ultramontane teaching from Mr. Rawes's pamphlet on University Education, which excites the enthusiasm of the “Dublin” :—

“I love and trust the Holy See, not only as to faith and morals, but in all its traditions, judgments, ways. Even in natural things, out of its own immediate order, I love its very shadow, and trust to it for safety. It is the representative of God in the world ; the great barrier against lawlessness of every kind. Both in thought and in action it sets the bounds beyond which no man has a right to go. Freedom of thought is simply a delusion of the devil.”‡

* Dublin Review, p. 176.

† Ibid. 187. See also note A, p. 71.

‡ Cui Bono University Education? p. 70. Longman, 1864. Dublin Review, N. S. iv., p. 138.

Again—

“By unreservedly surrendering themselves to the Church’s influence *in every shape*; . . . by seeking the company of priests and of those laymen who are called abroad, in derision, clericals; by avoiding familiar intimacy, whether with persons of a different religion, or with unsound and disloyal Catholicism; by exercising extreme caution and reserve in all intercourse with Protestants, and all study of Protestant literature,—by these and a thousand other similar methods, all may imbibe that true Catholic spirit which places them in real sympathy with the Church’s mind.”*

We see how loudly Ultramontanes profess their antagonism to our whole social system. It may be reasonable to allow them to do so, but it is surely not reasonable to give them the means of forcing those opinions on their Catholic brethren. The opinions of this sect, and its internal resources, make it an exception to general rules. This is what I want the State to consider in dealing with it.

Nor is there any reason to suppose that if the Church party succeeded in their demands, they would be more moderate in practice than in theory. We can never give them a tithe of what on their own principles they consider their due. That some men of distinguished ability are still to be found in the ranks of the clerical party enunciating moderate views is true. I have often heard men refer to Dr. Russell of Maynooth and Dr. Moriarty the Bishop of Kerry, as instances of reasonable minds still to be found in this party.

* Dublin Review N. S. v., p. 167.

One of the great boasts of this party is Dr. Newman. We can hardly suppose that the extravagant insolence of the "Dublin Review" can be acceptable to a mind like his; so abroad we have the distinguished author of *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*. To understand how Bishop Moriarty and Archbishop Cullen can be found acting together, we must recollect that most of the doctrines of Ultramontanism about subjecting the reason to the voice of the Church, about entering into the spirit of the Church, are held as true by earnest Catholics in matters of religion. Indeed, it is this very element of truth that makes it so essential for us Catholics to draw the distinction between what concerns religion and what does not, if we would escape abject intellectual slavery, and this distinction is our quarrel with Ultramontanism.

Now it has been the traditional policy of the clerical party to encourage men like Chateaubriand, M. De Montalembert, and Dr. Newman, to dwell on the religious side of the question, and refine away the Roman claims in other matters. These men break the shock of the world surging around Ultramontanism. While they are disarming the foe, Ultramontanism stands silently at hand ready to claim the victory as her own.

Owing to the more outspoken spirit which at present actuates the party, there is not the same danger now from this policy as of old; but it must always be

kept in mind, that the fact that traces of dissentient opinion may be discovered within the limits of the clerical party is no guarantee that those opinions will fare according to their truth. For those who accept Ultramontanism, dissent, however slight, has only a permissive existence ; it may at any moment be annihilated for ever, if the practical minds of the party think it desirable. A recent Ultramontane writer on the subject of education says :—

“There is but one safety for us, ‘*sentire cum Ecclesiâ*’ in the whole extent of faith, discipline, worship, customs, and instincts; the most intimate and filial fidelity of intellect, heart, and will, to the living voice of the Church of God.”*

This is the real sentiment of Ultramontanism. M. De Montalembert is a striking instance of the helplessness of those who, accepting Ultramontane opinions, yet endeavour to act according to their reason or conscience. In his beautiful address at Malines in 1863, the orator avoided saying anything that could commit the Church to the reasonable sentiments he enunciated. He was careful, in the first place, to rest his plea for a reconciliation between the Church and modern civilization upon the principle of expediency :—

“J’invoque les faits et j’en tire des enseignements purements pratiques, que je vous propose. J’invoque l’expérience et voici ce qu’elle répond.”†

* “Works and Wants of the Christian Church in England.” Dublin Review, N. S., i., 166.

† L’Eglise libre dans l’Etat libre, p. 12.

M. De Montalembert too had made some sacrifices to stand by the Papal party on the question of the temporal power ; and we might have supposed that gratitude at least would have induced that party to refrain from condemning one, whom I shall not call a member of the party, but who was certainly their most distinguished ally. But M. De Beaulieu having published a reply, styled "*L'Erreur libre dans l'Etat libre*," (1864), the Papal court addressed to him a letter of approval, which was, in fact, a formal condemnation of M. De Montalembert. One sentence in it is worth quoting, as showing what the clerical party think of the position of the Church ; how low an idea they have of the strength of truth ; how terror has possessed their very hearts.

"Let them understand that if the rights of truth and error be placed on a level, *it must necessarily happen*, from man's innate proclivity, that the latter will grow in strength, and the former be oppressed."*

"*Magna est veritas, et prævalebit*," is evidently not the motto of Ultramontanism. It is fatuity to suppose that with such a party, men like the Russells or the Moriartys, will be able to check the extravagance of an Archbishop Cullen.

Again, I have heard it urged, that the mischiev-

* Quoted from *Le Monde*, of November 7th, 1864, in the Dublin Review, New Series, iv. (1865), p. 480.

ous principles of the clerical party apply in their full extent only to a Catholic country, not to one where the Catholics are but in a small minority. That the relation between the Church and the State in a non-Catholic country, is different from that which exists between them in a Catholic country, Ultramontanes certainly admit. Be it so, then, that while numbers remain as they are in England, the Ultramontanes will not hurry their party into a crusade against popular institutions. The Church adopts the principles of non-resistance, and, professing this loudly, hopes to be allowed to employ her other resources with impunity. Be it that a small body of men may be allowed to exist in the State, claiming all the rights of citizenship, and using them only at the bidding of certain hierarchs, and employing all their resources and privileges for purposes alien, if not destructive, to the community at large.

But the Catholic University is not intended for English Catholics merely. It is intended principally for Irish Catholics. None of the arguments that are applicable to a small sect in England, apply to Roman Catholicism in Ireland. Whether the Irish Roman Catholic Church is set up on the ruins of the Establishment, or is salaried by the State, or continues a voluntary institution, it will always claim to be the national Church of this country ; and such a claim will be the more readily

admitted by Irish Roman Catholics, because it flatters their love of Irish nationality.

Ultramontaniam is here, as in England, a foreign importation since Emancipation ; a set of principles which before Emancipation all the leading Catholics scouted. But it has here, what it has not in England, the heart of the nation to work upon. Were the nation contented and prosperous, if the people had been got to accept, and had been in a position to accept frankly British institutions, this national element would have been the strongest safeguard against the dangers of Ultramontaniam ; but unfortunately this was not the case, and that antagonism of race, that dislike of English principles, that estrangement from their Protestant fellow-countrymen, which unhappily still exist among Irish Catholics, is just what makes the progress of Ultramontaniam possible. Ultramontaniam comes in the name of religion to an unhappy people, chafing under British rule, and tells them that that civilization and prosperity which they envy and dislike, are but delusions of the devil, to lull Protestantism into self-content, and that there is no safety for their souls, but in keeping everything English at a distance ; and what the Church demands on behalf of religion, the people accept on behalf of nationality. This is why Ultramontaniam is much more fatal here than it can ever be in England. There a small sect may be allowed to go to any

excess in teaching without affecting the general working of the Commonwealth ; but here Ultramontanism may become the actuating spirit of the nation. How well the Church party can manipulate national sentiments, is illustrated in the case of Belgium. After 1814, the Dutch Government of Belgium proposed a liberal constitution, which the clergy resisted with all their might ; and in this resistance they were supported by the assembly of the notables, out of opposition to the Dutch rulers. When the revolution came in 1830, the clergy had to accept from the nation at large, a much more liberal constitution, which they have been working ever since to overthrow. It is significant of the strength which a national quarrel gives the Church party, that in their attack on the Dutch proposal, which they impugned as trenching on "the royal rights" of the Church, they did not find it necessary to apply any of those epithets they have been so liberal of since in similar cases, as "irreligious," "infidel," "godless;" they called it "*La constitution tolerante*."*

The position the Church is seeking in Ireland is very similar to that which she solemnly accepted in Belgium in 1830 ; and we have two things to remark here—first, the mischief she has been able to do under such free institutions ; and, secondly,

* See Dublin Review, N. S., iv., p. 171.

that the clerical party are not content with the contract of 1830, but repudiate it as being, on the part of the Church, *ultra vires*. The "Dublin" complains that

"The Divine mission of the Catholic Church, placed by God over the Belgian people, had no recognition from the State."*

"There is, it appears to us, but one excuse possible for the sacrifice, in a Catholic country, of *all the royal rights and public duties of the Church*, and that is the plea of necessity."† "The period of thirty years, which has since elapsed, is far too short to give us even the faintest indication of the appalling results which must ultimately flow from that monster evil [the ignoring the Divine mission of the Church], if, which God forbid, it remain unchecked. But even now we can point at . . . the irreconcilable and ever-increasing antagonism between Church and State."‡

Hear the "Dublin" again describing the effect of the struggle since 1830 :—

"The hostility which divides the spiritual and the temporal powers lies across the face of the country, and is written in the hearts of the people in characters so legible as to be mistaken by none."§ "This antagonism is so intense, as to enter into all the relations of life."||

This gives us an idea of the state to which the Church party may bring us ; and we must remember that since 1830 Belgium has been independent, and there has been no element of national antagonism for the Church to foster. The terrible lengths the Church party may go to, was illustrated by a

* Dublin Review, N. S., iv., p. 171.

† Ibid. p. 41.

§ Ibid. p. 186.

‡ Ibid. p. 189.

|| Ibid. p. 174.

pamphlet which came out at Brussels during last summer. The author was M. Dechamps, a leading member of the clerical party ; and he points out that the probable fate of Belgium is to lose her independence, unless she set about conciliating his friends. With the present state of national feeling in Ireland, to increase the teaching power of the Church would be still more dangerous. Though at present Fenianism is hostile to the Church, that the Church is not going to give up its hold on the national sympathies, is evidenced by the recent demonstration at the National Association in this city. If in a Catholic country the Government does not recognise the privileges of the Church, Ultramontane opinion regards the civil power as an impious child that has laid violent hands on its holy mother, and the Church's duty requires her to watch the first opportunity of re-asserting her authority. In a Catholic nation one of "the royal rights" of the Church is the repression of heresy. Were it possible to extirpate Protestants or independent Catholics here by extreme measures, the Church would be bound to proceed, if necessary, to the persecutions of the Inquisition. Protestant England might reasonably object to an *auto da fe* in College-green ; and our poor country, which is, alas ! too often disposed to dwell on sentimental grievances rather than real ones, would find in this interference with Ultramontane logic a new act of Saxon oppression.

This illustration may seem extravagant, but a slight examination of Ultramontane doctrine will show that such violence is the logical, though not the probable, result of its teachings.

The "Dublin" says—

"Such *ad captandum* arguments as are used by M. De Montalembert in support of universal toleration, and of the perfect equality of all religious systems, as well as that for the surrender of the exclusive rights of the Church, *where they may be justly put in force*, may catch, indeed, the momentary approbation of ill-judging or inexperienced politicians, but at once fall to the ground before the inexorable testimony of facts."*

If we look to see where these "exclusive rights" may justly be put in force, we find it is in a Catholic country. If we have any doubt whether Ireland comes within the Ultramontane formula, and is to be exposed to all the rigour of Ultramontane doctrine, let us turn to the recent pamphlet on University Education. It is written by one of the authorities of the Catholic University, in reply to the pamphlet of Sir D. Corrigan on University Education. The writer, in the first place, reproves his opponent for calling the proposed Catholic University "sectarian," as nothing connected with the Catholic Church can be sectarian; and he continues:—

"Moreover, no one has a right to designate a nation's religion as a 'sect,' when speaking of that nation. Ireland is by excel-

* Dublin Review, N. S., iv., p. 188.

lence a Catholic nation ; it is, then, doubly absurd to call any Catholic institution in Ireland 'sectarian.'**

Returning to the "Dublin Review" we find the doctrine of non-resistance explained and qualified ; that doctrine, as I have already pointed out, is the only ground on which such a body as the Ultramon-
tanes can ask to be tolerated themselves.

"Considering the great tendency of civil rulers to selfishness and oppression, the doctrine of non-resistance may well appear to give society an inadequate protection against such evils, unless you take into account that salutary influence spoken of by the Encyclical which the Christian Church, according to the institution and command of her Divine Author, should freely exercise to the end of the world over nations and their rulers ; but if thinkers would but suppose the Church permitted freely to exercise these her divinely given prerogatives, they might learn to see that no more perfect security could well be imagined against tyranny and despotism."†

The doctrine, then, of non-resistance would only seem to apply where the Church "is freely permitted to exercise her divinely given prerogatives." Elsewhere the "Dublin" complains that "disloyal Catholics" denounce "that intolerance which happily exists in Spain."‡

* Notes on University Education in Ireland. Fowler : Dublin, 1865. It is very significant of the Ultramontane spirit that always shuns the light, that this pamphlet is printed for private circulation only. I cannot explain my use of it in better words than those in which Professor Cairnes has spoken of it :—"It is, unquestionably, intended to influence public opinion on a matter of the gravest importance. We do not feel ourselves bound to connive at what we must regard as an unfair artifice for evading the ordinary liability to legitimate criticism, which is the proper condition attaching to such attempts in a free country." Cairnes : University Education in Ireland, page 39. London : Macmillan, 1866.

† Dublin Review, N. S., iv. p. 476.

‡ Ibid. p. 491.

The great opening for mischief which it would afford, if a body holding such opinions were invested with the charge of higher class education in this country must be apparent at once. The difficulty of getting any large section of Englishmen or Irishmen to accept such doctrines as Ultramontanes now profess, is happily very great; and it is to obviate that difficulty that Ultramontanes find it necessary to keep education entirely in their own hands. That many English Roman Catholics feel strong repugnance for such doctrines, has been acknowledged by the "Dublin" over and over again in no very complimentary language:—

"And we here encounter the keenest grief of our time; that there should be a number of worldly and tepid Catholics, who choose to reject a large and important portion of the Church's infallible teaching, because it is not introduced in actual definitions of faith; and because it clashes with their whole evil habits of thought."*

Furthermore, the same writer complains that—

"Men who are among the Church's most zealous and disinterested defenders have been unfaithful to her teaching" on liberty of conscience and liberty of the press.†

The Encyclical *Quantâ curâ* was itself a testimony how much the Papal court feared the spread of non-Ultramontane opinion in the Catholic body, and the indignation of the "Dublin" at all Catholics who ventured to question whether this announcement came under the class of infallible declarations knew no

* Dublin Review, N. S., iv., 475.

† Ibid.

bounds. When Mr. Oxenham questioned the infallibility of the Encyclicals, and doubted if their infallibility was held by the apostles, he was told—

“That it probably never occurred to any of them [the apostles], as even imaginable that among the members of the Church in future ages, an opinion would ever be found so indocile, so disloyal, and so unreasonable.”*

The “Home and Foreign Review” was started in 1862, to represent that section of British Catholicism which rejected Ultramontanism. “It was,” says the “Dublin,” “animated throughout by profoundly anti-Catholic principles;”† of course, by anti-Catholic the writer means non-Ultramontane. After the appearance of the Munich Brief in 1863, the publication was discontinued, not as the “Dublin” implies, because “respectful silence” was the least required by the Brief, but because, as the editor tells us in his last number, he thought it undesirable to provoke the Papal Court to a conflict that might place the Church in still greater antagonism to modern science. The “Dublin Review” has represented the discontinuance of the publication as an admission on the part of the editor, that no Catholic was at liberty to express for the future any views in conflict with Ultramontane tenets.‡

I need not dwell further on the existence of this dissentient element. Everyone who knows

* Dublin Review, Jan. 1866, p. 277.

† Ibid., N. S., iii., p. 65.

‡ See Dublin Review, N. S., iii., p. 78; and iv., p. 121.

anything of Catholic society is aware of the fact. I may refer to one public proof of its existence in Ireland, the lecture delivered by Mr. Justice Keogh on Milton, at the Afternoon Lectures in May 1865, and the storm of indignation with which it was received by the clerical party, Archbishop Cullen himself leading the assailants of the learned judge. Much of the future of Catholicism depends upon this element not being driven out of the Catholic body before its strength is properly developed for the struggle with Ultramontanism. Such a party has a much better chance of developing itself in Great Britain than in most of the Continental countries. On the Continent generally, all outside the Church is so opposed to dogmatic belief, that independent Roman Catholics are much more separated in principle from the external element than they are here from English Protestants, who, for the most part, accept what they would have considered a fixed creed, though they may have a very different way of arriving at it. It is natural, therefore, to look to the dissentient element amongst Irish and English Roman Catholics to play a very important part in rescuing the Church from Ultramontane extravagance.

Nor are Protestants justified in complaining that this element is not more active in its opposition to the clerical party. Ultramontanism, as an active organization, was formed since the French Revolu-

tion, out of the floating mass of sentiment and opinion that came to the surface after that great social deluge. Its antagonistic power has not yet been consolidated. In the history of the Church fifty years is but a short space ; and, indeed, the present decided character of Ultramontanism, especially in this country, is only a few years old. Nor is it to be expected that without much time, and labour, and suffering, Catholics can hope to form that great party that shall solve the problems which the progress of the world has evolved, and which Ultramontanism so clumsily and ignorantly attempts to deal with.

The position of independent Catholics at the present time is a very difficult one, and they ought not yet to be exposed to the alternative of a direct breach with the Church. That Ultramontanism will not scruple to push this dissentient feeling home is quite plain ; indeed, in its doing so, consists its only chance of success. For if the non-Ultramontane element has time to mature its plans and develop its principles ; if it is able to build up a suitably adjusted system to protect itself from its foes ; if it finds leaders of learning and discretion, then Ultramontanism will speedily pass away. But, at present, when as yet its principles are negative, rather than positive, its foes blatant and triumphant, its friends silent, what can it be expected to do in the way of effectual

resistance against such a body of men as the Irish hierarchy? In the case of the national schools we have seen frequent examples of the extent to which the Bishops would go. In several cases, where they established schools which they thought it desirable to substitute for the National Schools, they required the parents to withdraw the children from the National Schools, threatening them with the deprivation of the sacraments if they refused. This autocratic mode of dealing with the peasantry was unfortunately too common in Ireland. But it remained for a northern bishop to carry this to a still more terrible extent. There had existed in Belfast a literary society and news-room, called the Roman Catholic Institute. It was supported by a company of shareholders, consisting of the merchants, tradesmen, and shop-keepers of the town. There being a surplus of funds, a question arose as to their disposition. Dr. Dorrian, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Down, proposed certain resolutions which were rejected, and subsequently he addressed to the shareholders a circular letter, from which I take the following extract. Having referred to the Pope's late Encyclical, he says :—

“The following, as conditions of recommendation and approval I cannot, therefore, forego. They are essential to my sanction being given to this, or any new company into which the Institute may be transformed.

“1st. The approval by the bishop of such articles of association

as he shall judge satisfactory, and their adoption as the basis of any new company to be formed.

“2nd. The same right on the part of the bishop of approving the rules of management of lecture hall, library, and news-room.

“3rd. A veto by the bishop on any member acting on the Directory, whose morals, *religious principles, and habits of life* the bishop may object to.

“4th. The approval by the bishop, or one appointed by him, of all books and newspapers to be admitted for reading into the news-room or library, and the like approval of any lecturer to be invited to lecture for the members.

“If these conditions be not made the basis of the Institute, I wish to give fair notice that by whatsoever name the new association be called, and to change the name, if such be in contemplation, is not a very hopeful sign, *I shall consider it my duty for the protection of my people, to debar from the sacraments all and every one who may become a member, or aid in its construction; these securities for its proper management not being provided.*”*

The result of this circular was that the Belfast Catholic Institute was dissolved. It has been often thought that the presence of a Protestant public would make even the most Ultramontane Churchmen hesitate to have recourse to any extreme exercise of authority. But this case occurred, not in a Catholic neighbourhood, but in the most Protestant part of Ireland, in a great commercial community. The blow was struck, not against illiterate peasants, but men of education and respectability, while a large Protestant community looked on in astonishment and derision at the abject condition to which they beheld their fellow-citizens reduced. It is to give

* Copied from the Belfast News Letter, in Daily Express of Oct. 28, 1865.

larger scope for such assumption of authority that the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to legalise the Catholic degrees. Hear how the "Dublin" intends to fill the Catholic University:—

"Our author raises the question whether Catholic gentlemen would be deterred from sending their sons to Oxford, however strong might be the warning against such a course put forth by the Holy Father and the bishops. We do not think so ill of them as to doubt that on such a matter the great majority would be docile to the Church's guidance; and we also believe that the few youths who might be sent to Oxford in the teeth of such authoritative warning, would have a *life-long brand* fixed to their name, and would be ever regarded with suspicion as having received an education dangerous to faith and morals."*

Now this brings me to a question I have been often asked in discussing this matter with Protestants:—Will the gentry, the professional men, the educated Catholics of England and Ireland, submit to be dictated to in this insolent way? That all the bishops would follow the example of the Bishop of Down seems very horrible, but is not impossible. Many Roman Catholics might endure the milder course of persecution the "Dublin" suggests rather than forego the dictates of their conscience and their manhood; but that mass of undecided Catholic opinion which I have mentioned as the third element in the Catholic body, would fall under clerical sway, and the more readily because the distinction would be broadly marked at each man's entrance into life;

* Dublin Review, N. S., iv., p. 132.

between those who supported, and those who opposed Ultramontanism. Estrangement would probably result, and the liberal leaven would be worked out of the Catholic body.

At present Roman Catholics are all educated at Dublin, or some other mixed university ; and those of them who choose to adopt clerical opinions have no start of their bolder brethren. They may say that others have too recklessly encountered the Protestant atmosphere, while they have always worn a respirator ; but they must discuss the point. They cannot condemn their opponents by a name, as a Dublin man or an Oxonian, for the misfortune of such unholy education is common to all. But once give a Catholic university, and the line is drawn at once between the supporters of the clerical party and its foes.

There is this further consideration against authorizing Roman Catholic degrees, that Ultramontan-ism, from its very nature, labours under a total incapacity to undertake the care of education. All religious men feel that in cultivating science and literature, they are contributing to the glory of God ; but the Ultramontane only cultivates them for this purpose, and this alone ; not from any abstract love of truth and beauty. He would prefer to count his beads and remain in ignorance ; for intellectual knowledge begets pride and leads to danger ; but he is obliged to arm himself and

his brethren with a little worldly lore, for worldly lore exists, and non-Catholics will be pitching pieces of it at his head ; so he must get a share of it in self-defence. If it could be got rid of altogether, no doubt it would be for the best. Are these a body of men who should be allowed to found a propagandist college under the pretence of a seat of learning ? Their great resource against all danger of innovation is the scholastic philosophy, the revival of which is due, the "Dublin" tells us, to that enlightened part of Europe, the late Neapolitan kingdom.* All attempts at progress beyond the schoolmen are futile :—

"Instead of torturing our brains with the fruitless and often pernicious attempts to create new sciences and new philosophies, we cannot do better than recur to the *Summa Theologia*, and *Summa contra Gentiles* of St. Thomas."†

Again, writing on Galileo, the "Dublin" says:—

"We must be excused for thinking true principles of Scriptural interpretation immeasurably a more precious possession even than scientific truth."‡

No doubt this is true in a sense, but how would it work in an ecclesiastical university ? There are no books in the language that the student can be allowed to peruse if Mr. Rawes is an authority :—

"Nothing shews the Church's divine care and watchfulness more than the *Index Expurgatorius*. Divinely watchful for souls, she examines the literature of the world ; and, divinely guided in her

* Dublin Review, N. S., iv., p. 220.

† Ibid. 226.

‡ Ibid. v., 419.

judgments, she proscribes the books that have evil in them: I glory in the Church's Index of these poisonous books, that would bring peril to her children."*

Sir J. D. Acton describes the operation of the *Index*:—

"Through it" (the *Index*) "an effort had been made to keep the knowledge of ecclesiastical history from the faithful, and to give currency to a fabulous and fictitious picture of the progress and action of the Church."†

There is hardly a work of any merit in the English language that has not found its way into the *Index*. But one of the Irish Parliamentary champions of "Freedom of Education" has told us his opinion of English literature. Mr. Dillon, M.P., some time since, addressing a meeting presided over by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, said:

"His very reverend friend had referred to a passage which he took from one of the speeches of the late Lord Macaulay, . . . but he (Mr. Dillon) could not find a better illustration of the danger to which the Catholics of this country were exposed by being brought into contact with English literature, than by referring to that very writer."‡

He then proceeded to quote a passage, and urged that a Catholic university was necessary to keep Irish Catholics from being contaminated by the

* Rawes' "Cui Bono University Education?" p. 71, quoted in the *Dublin Review*, N. S. iv.

† *Home and Foreign Review*, vol. iv., p. 674.

‡ *Freeman's Journal*, Dec. 15, 1865.

study of English literature. The Archbishop followed on the same theme.

But this party may do worse than exclude these authors: they may mutilate or interpolate them. This disregard of the sacredness of an author's text is very common in clerical publications; examples of it may be found in all quarters. Dr. Newman mentioned his meeting with an authorised English translation of St. Liguori's Sermons, which he searched in vain for certain passages he had seen quoted about the Blessed Virgin. The translator had adapted the work to the requirements of an English Catholic public, without making any mention of the omissions.* So in the case of many great Gallican divines, their works have been put into the hands of Ultramontane editors, who have published handsome new editions, quietly excising everything that indicated the objectionable tenets. Sir J. Acton has told us how the Church attempted to deal with ecclesiastical history, but indeed his words are applicable to history in general. One of the most elaborate achievements of the clerical party, is its ingenious falsification of history. Accordingly, the study of history in Protestant writers, or under non-clerical teachers, is one of the things Ultramontanes most perseveringly object to; and so Sir D. Corrigan, when

* History of my Religious Opinions, p. 194.

he is endeavouring to modify the Queen's College system, so as to make it acceptable to his Ultramontane friends, coolly proposes to abolish the course of history :—

“There is one subject in the course of the Queen's Colleges, ‘history,’ which should, I think, be abolished. It is a fruitful *source of discord*, and, in my opinion, an absurdity.”*

A genuine Ultramontane will admit no historical fact without qualification upon qualification, till the mind gets weary ; and one is glad to give up the point at any price. The controversy about Galileo is a good example of the clerical mode of dealing with history. The “Dublin” has had several curious articles on the subject in its recent numbers. I shall, however, take an instance of clerical teaching from another publication.

All reasonable men will admit, that the fact that the scientific opinions of one of the great fathers of modern science brought him into collision with the Church, and exposed him to personal suffering, is the important feature in Galileo's case. Let us see how this chapter of history is presented to minds educated in Ultramontane schools. One of the bodies that the Church party has put forward in Ireland in

* University Education in Ireland, p. 44. Compare this with the observation of a recent thoughtful writer on Ireland :—“How much of heart-burning, even among the better educated classes of Roman Catholics, would a true version of English history serve to allay.”—Letter to the Archbishop of Dublin, by an Irish Peer, p. 24. Hodges, Smith & Co. Dublin, 1865.

opposition to the National system is the Christian Brothers. They have published a series of school books which have met with high approval, and most deservedly, were it not particularly desirable to keep such lessons as the case of Galileo affords before the mind of a Catholic people. In their manual of geography, which is one of the best books of the kind I have ever met with, I find the following note about Galileo.

The writer takes up several pages to show how improbable Galileo's views must have appeared, and says—

“Such, then, as opposed the Copernican system at its introduction, should not be harshly censured for hesitating to adopt a new opinion in preference to one which had received the universal sanction of mankind for centuries ; nor should the Catholic Church be denounced as the enemy of science and literature, because *some of her theologians* opposed the opinions of Galileo.”

What reasonable men object to is, not theologians differing in opinion with Galileo, but their having any opinion at all on the subject. The writer continues—

“Some writers, and these even of a recent date, and in works, too, professedly intended for the instruction of youth, have not hesitated to assert, that the system of Copernicus drew down upon its professors the vengeance of the Church ; that Galileo was denounced as a heretic ; that the Pope himself became his persecutor ; that his system was denounced as a detestable heresy ; and that, on account of it, he was sentenced to be immured for life in a prison of the Inquisition. Nothing could be more contrary to fact. The Church never pronounced an opinion on the matter. The

system of Copernicus was not declared heretical, nor was Galileo condemned, or persecuted, or even arraigned on account of the astronomical opinions he propagated. *He was once arraigned for his disobedience and obstinacy, but never for his science or religion.**

To compare this account of the Galileo question with the recent article on the same subject in the "Dublin," would take too much space, though the comparison would be instructive; for the Christian Brothers rely chiefly on the ignorance of their readers, while the Review appeals to fully developed Ultramontane opinion.

Now one word as to myself. I am not writing as a theologian, to *prove* that Ultramontanism is untrue. That I assume, and proceed to express an opinion as a citizen on what I consider a question of great importance to this country. If some of my Catholic brethren should think it a scandal that I express myself openly in opposition to the hierarchy, I would say to such critics, that I have always thought it a greater scandal to allow it to pass uncontradicted that Ultramontanism is Catholicism. However, I do not enter into the question of the fallibility of Encyclicals and so forth. I speak as a member of the British community, and in that capacity alone.

I must now conclude these remarks; and in doing so I will quote one passage from Mr. Glad-

* See "Treatise on Geography," by the Christian Brothers, p. 320, 3rd edition, Dublin, 1849.

stone's speech on The O'Donoghue's motion in June last:—

“I would wish, as far as possible, to remove all tendency to look with favour on such propositions” (those of the Syllabus) “by endeavouring to attach our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects more distinctly and more closely to Englishmen generally, and to the interests and habits of this country. The more harsh, rigid, and restrictive our measures may be, the more we leave them under the direct influence of Rome, and throw them into the hands of those in the Roman Catholic Church who profess extreme opinions.”

These are very noble words, and indicate a knowledge of the wants of the Roman Catholic body, and the dangers to which it is liable. But that the Government policy, as shadowed forth in this debate, will carry out these sentiments, I deny. On this very subject we have a Minister of State conferring with the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, thus ignoring at once the very existence of the Catholic laity. Let everything be done to remove invidious distinctions between Roman Catholic laymen and Protestants. Let Parliament do away with the obnoxious oaths, and even endow the Catholic clergy, if such things seem good. But in the matter of education, I would ask the public to observe, on the one hand, the subtlety of Ultramontaniam, and the charm it possesses for some minds ; on the other, its ruthless fanaticism, its implacable hostility to everything that Englishmen and Irishmen have learned to think noble, and

beautiful, and true ; to observe this power settling like a black cloud over this unhappy country ; that the masses of this country have always exhibited deep-seated repugnance to English or Protestant sentiment, and seem only inclined to reject Ultramontanism for Continental infidelity ; that, moreover, there is struggling in the Catholic body a current of thought, which may yet cleanse and purify the whole ; that a Catholic university is sought expressly to dam up this current for ever, and I would ask the public, keeping this state of things in view, to consider whether the proposed policy of the Government is likely to attach Roman Catholics "more distinctly and more closely to Englishmen generally, and to the interests and habits of this country."*

KILDARE-STREET, DUBLIN,

February, 1866.

* I have not entered into any details as to the amount of education afforded to Roman Catholics in Trinity College. By reference to the books of the University I have been enabled to correct The O'Donoghue's statement, as to the actual number of Catholic students. I have ascertained over ninety names of Roman Catholics as actually attending the College courses. But I have not had time to ascertain the full number, which amounts, I believe, to about 100. Excluding students coming from the colonies and from abroad, the proportion of Irish Roman Catholics to Irish Protestants is 10 per cent. The proportion of honor-men and medallists among the Catholic students is very remarkable. Three of the fourteen studentships, and twelve out of twenty-eight non-foundation scholarships, have been held by Roman Catholics. I may add that many of the authorities of the University have told me, that the Roman Catholics are, as a body, exceedingly well-conducted and amenable to discipline—a fact to be remembered, when we hear it so often stated that Catholic students, at mixed Universities, lose all notions of religion or morality.

NOTE A.

We have an instance from the *Dublin Evening Post* (the organ of the National Association in this city, of the way the Ultramontane party propose to use their parliamentary influence. The writer complains of the English liberals having shown a disposition to thwart the Government on the University question, and continues :—"The latter body [the liberal Irish representatives] have been sent into Parliament by their constituents, to take part, no doubt, in the carriage of a reform bill, but not primarily by any means for that purpose. *Neither they nor their constituents [i. e., the Bishops] take the smallest interest in the abstract question of parliamentary reform, or care anything about it for its own sake.*" "The principal strength of the opposition to Mr. Gladstone's educational scheme will come, it is anticipated, from the Scotch members ; and we may as well apprise them at once, that, *if they set any value on reform*, they would be well advised to abstain from interference in purely Irish questions ; and that should their interference in the present case prove, what they may think successful, it shall not be allowed to pass unpunished."* Here is one of the most important questions affecting the future of the community that has ever arisen, and the Ultramontanes regard their voice in the matter only as a means of extorting support for their own peculiar policy.

* Dub. Ev. Post., Feb. 26, 1866.

