

## WILL THE POPE LEAVE ROME?

“IT is rumored that the Pope will leave Rome.” Such has been the text of a good many leading articles in the anti-Catholic journals of our time. The explanation of the rumor is its improbability. Because it is unlikely that the Pope will leave Rome, his enemies try to console themselves with false reports. The Italian revolutionists, like most of the free-thinkers all over the world, have an instinct that the Pope ought to remain in Rome, and have therefore a passionate desire that he should quit it. We do them no injustice in attributing to them this dual attitude, since they admit it in all their writings and speeches. They tell us that the harmonies of the Catholic religion require the Pope's presence in his own city; but since it is desirable to get rid of the Catholic religion, it is desirable to get rid of the Pope's presence. Sometimes the journalists will cloak their adherence to this opinion by professions which are meant to seem as if they were friendly. We had an instance of this kind of writing in the London *Fall Mall Gazette*, at the beginning of the month of August of this year. The writer said: “If the Papacy is still to be a world-power, the Pope ought to leave Rome, or rather to be driven out of it. The one thing which would shake our skepticism in the providential mission of the Holy See would be the establishment of the Papal throne in the English-speaking world. It is about time that the Catholic Church was occidentalized. It has been Romanized too long for the adequate realization of its cosmopolitan pretensions.” Now here we have a complete misapprehension—we do not like to say a wilful misstatement—of the theory and the fact of Catholicity, which should seem to be absolutely impossible in this nineteenth century. “It is about time that the Catholic Church was occidentalized!” So that the writers and the readers of the *Pall Mall Gazette* must be presumed to be of opinion that the western Church—which most sane people are accustomed to regard as an established fact—is purely mythical, or at the most but a shadowy branch of a small sect which is declared to be “Romanized.” It would not be worth while to notice such writing, were it not that a misconception of the whole structure of the Catholic Church underlies the geographical inaccuracy. We may be pardoned if we dwell for a moment on that misconception before speaking of our duties to the present Pope. The *Pall Mall Gazette* writer thinks that Rome is much too “local.” He considers that the Roman Pontiff ought to travel. Very briefly let us consider what was the idea of the Papal

throne, in its bearings on the pagan capital of the Roman world ; or, to put it differently, what was the apparent design of divine providence in supplanting the imperial Rome by the Pontifical ?

The idea of the Christian empire was to "carry out" the Roman *civitas*; to create the right of Catholic citizenship in the Catholic Church—a right from which no human being would be excluded. St. Augustine, in his *De Civitate Dei*, exquisitely worked out this idea ; and, having before him the experience, the observation, of the Church's infancy, he was able to do this experimentally. The question for the whole world was : which should succeed, the pagan or the Christian dominion ? The answer was : the new Christian *civitas* took the place of the old Roman *imperium*. But the point of points, in the realization of the idea, was that the "City of God" should be wholly independent of the dominion of the city of the world. Whereas, in the pagan city,—as Bossuet expressed it, "*tout était Dieu excepté Dieu lui-même,*" in the Catholic city nothing that was not divine could have any place in the building up of the dominion. The pagan Romans knew this. *Deletum nomen Christianum* meant that two names, two dominions, could not possibly co-exist in the same idea. The idea of Catholicity was God's city. The idea of paganism was the city of the world. The two ideas were to be henceforth at deadly feud. So far as the principles of truth and justice were concerned, the world must never again dictate to the Church ; it must, on the contrary, obey it. "We have no king but Cæsar" must now be changed into the formula, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." "We will not do it," said the unconverted Roman world. And ten bloody persecutions showed they meant it. For nearly three centuries the city of God and the city of the world were in a conflict which meant death to one of the two. The Church conquered. And it conquered *because* it would not permit any compromise between two standards which had nothing in common ; between the city of the moral power of truth and the city of the material power of the world.

But let us speak more particularly of the city of Rome, as being the capital of the new "City of God." Rome was ; Rome is ; but the idea of the "City of God" was that it should supplant, should occupy the place of, the empire which had been the great power of polytheism. We all know that the *Civitas Dei*, in the beautiful sense of St. Augustine, was comprehensive of all the members of the Christian Church ; yet just as Rome had been the centre of a false religion, so Rome must be the centre of the true. The "city set on a hill"—to keep to the sense of St. Augustine—must be a city which every human intelligence could contemplate as the most obvious, the most conspicuous, of facts. And so, too, the

Christian capital of the new world, the new centre of what was henceforth to be Christendom, must be conspicuous as was the old pagan Rome, though in senses which should be as spiritual as appreciable. And a man must be blind not to see that Almighty God chose Rome for the new centre of the new struggle. As a matter of fact, it was the centre—it is the centre; yet in point of analogy, and of the clearest divine intimation; as a beautiful and luminous teaching of divine providence, which even the pagans understood in a negative sense; the placing of the centre of unity on the ruins of the world's city; the making that centre to be the very identical centre of which it was said "all roads lead to Rome," was a teaching so striking that all mankind must acknowledge it as being impossible to mere accident or chance.

"Will the Pope leave Rome?" is, therefore, a question which must be answered by appeal to eighteen centuries of Catholic belief. He may leave the city of Rome, as the Popes have often left it,—at one period for a long absence of seventy-three years,—but if he leaves it, he will return to it; or, being absent, he will still rule it, as the Supreme Pontiff who must be always subject to persecution. But it is strange that, in this 19th century, even Protestants cannot understand that the centre of unity is liable *only* to be persecuted. It is not liable to be obliterated; it is not liable to be conquered; no weapon that is formed against it can prosper; yet it can be harassed and gravely afflicted by a thousand mortal weapons, whose ugly sharpness is sure to be turned against their framers. And here let a distinction be drawn between Rome and what is called United Italy. Italy is not Rome, nor Rome Italy. True, as Leo the Thirteenth has expressed it: "In Italy God has placed the home of His vicar, the chair of truth, and the centre of Catholic unity,"—a fact which the immense majority of living Italians recognize as their most glorious national privilege,—but the home, the chair, the centre, are in the once pagan capital of the pagan world, and in the now Christian capital of the *Civitas Dei*. They are placed there because Rome was the centre of that world which the *Civitas Dei* was meant to conquer. Surrounded by a thousand pagan monuments, the Christian churches in Christian Rome stand in triumph. And even in the ancient catacombs it is now nearly two thousand years since the first Christian emblems effaced pagan emblems; since the first Christian inscription in honor of a martyred Pope was written on the back of a pagan marble, which had been set up in honor of a "divine emperor."

To force the Pope, therefore, to quit Rome is one thing; that the Pope should voluntarily quit Rome is another. To force the Pope to quit Rome is only the continuance of the same hostilities which imprisoned the first Pope, St. Peter; and it must issue in the same

greater freedom. Persecution is not conquest, but probation. If the ten persecutions, backed by imperial hosts, could not obliterate the *nomen Christianum* in the days when the Church was in its infancy, we may fairly argue that Masonic sects, backed only by heresy and schism, cannot in these days do more than court defeat. But the point we have to consider is the fact of the *Civitas Dei* being centred, in point of authority, in the Roman Pontiff. It is a fact which is always admitted by adversaries; it is only attenuated or travestied. Authority is Pontifical. Nor is it an accident that the chair of Peter is in Rome; it has been so from the beginning, and must be so. In the older dispensation Jerusalem and its Temple were the centre of the idea of the Jewish faith; and not until the veil of the Temple was rent could the idea be made to yield to a higher idea. What may be called the historic aspects of Judaism, as well as the historic aspects of Christianity, are inseparably associated with place. We live in a material world, though our faith in spiritual truths must be spiritual; the body of the Church, like the body of the soul, requiring the fitness of symmetry or presentation. The city set on a hill must be symmetrical; nor would it be conceivable that the *Civitas Dei*, which supplanted the city of the world, should not present easily appreciable characteristics. Divine authority is a fact, not a dream; it claims obedience, not mere sentiment or opinion; and to be obeyed it must be known, must be seen, must be realized, even more than are ordinary judicial tribunals. When our Divine Lord "went up to Jerusalem" to be crucified, the Jews *knew* that He went up to their holy city. Was it an accident that our Divine Lord went up to Jerusalem? And if it was not an accident, but, on the contrary, a grave lesson, of which the fitness of place was a chief feature, then, as Jerusalem was destroyed because it tried to destroy its Lord, so must Rome deserve to be punished when it outrages God's vicar, whose See has been divinely placed there, and kept there. Divine authority is not local,—no such idea could be sustained,—but it is central, so that the obedient can gather round it as one family, and so that all men may recognize what Leo the Thirteenth calls its "home," its "chair," the "centre of Catholic unity." And Catholics have always recognized this centre. Authority and the Holy See are one idea. The source of authority and the streams which flow from it are not different ideas, but are one idea. "Rome" has always meant this idea. In the early and middle ages a Papal Rescript was spoken of by the very simple title, *auctoritas*. "Rome has spoken," or "authority has spoken," were, and still are, the same thing. We read how Pope St. Zozimus sent "an authority" to the bishops of France; how Pope St. Leo sent "an authority" to the bishops of Spain; how the Em-

peror Marcian asked for "an authority" from Rome; and how St. Isidore expressed his belief that a Pontifical "authority" was equal to a definition by an ecumenical council. Now the "idea" of all such belief is that of the central authority; and it would be difficult for the human reason to conceive of a central authority which should have no fixedness of see or of throne, but which, like the opinionativeness of the sectaries, should look up to the clouds for its inspirations, and look down upon itself for their interpretation.

History has furnished us with such abundant repetition of wicked conflicts with Pontifical Rome that we are crowded with illustrations of the world-admitted fact that "Rome" means the centre of the *Civitas Dei*. We may glance at a very few illustrations. What is called the "Reformation" was a recognition throughout Europe that the Roman Pontiff and Authority were identical; Protestants, so-called, making their admission of the authority to be the reason of the obligation of resisting it. It was against authority itself, as "cramping the human mind,"—not against this or that teaching of it,—that the Protestant "philosophy" was most hostile. The word Rome to the Protestant mind, as indeed to the Catholic mind, meant the centre of the institution, the Teaching Church; the immovable, unchanging rock of power, round which the *Civitas Dei* dwelt in peace. It was *because* Rome was the citadel of doctrinal peace that the insurgent mind rebelled frantically against its doctrines; the citadel being impossible to be destroyed, but the doctrines being possible to be repudiated. Now this idea of unity—the true Christian idea—was and must be inseparable from the Holy See; just as the idea of the old Roman empire was inseparable from the idea of pagan Rome. We all know that Almighty God *could* have placed the centre of unity in any country or in any village of the world; but He placed it where the greatest of all worldly powers had centred its worldliness and its paganism. It is the fact which gives the force to the idea. And against that fact, that idea, all anti-Christian rebellion has been levelled for nearly two thousand years.

The "Reformation was really decentralization," and was therefore the principle of disunion. The lesser conflicts between the world and the Popes have been conducted on precisely the same principle. And here we may allude to what must be called an historic fallacy, though it is highly popular with most of the enemies of the Papacy. No one would wish to affirm that all the Popes have acted wisely under every circumstance of trial or irritation. "I have not understood the world, and the world has not understood me," were the last words of Pope Gregory, who died in 1417, after a turbulence which seemed to shake even the *Civitas Dei*. In an age when both

the Pope and the anti-Popes were asked to submit their claims to a general council, there was enough of havoc to shake the serenity of the wisest men, in both the political and religious spheres of thought. When kings and emperors wanted, practically, to be Popes themselves, and therefore tried to set up their vassal anti-Popes; when Pope after Pope was threatened and insulted by tyrants, by robber soldiers, by depraved mobs, it would have been strange if the voice of Peter could have been always clearly heard in Christendom, above a tumult which was confounding to the best Christians. During the seventy-three years when the Popes ruled from Avignon,—seven French Popes, and all men of fair ability,—was there not enough in the very fact of their being at Avignon to disturb the ideal harmonies of the Papacy? There is no need to be apologetic for feeble Popes—assuming that any of the Popes could be called feeble—any more than to be apologetic for our Lord's Apostles, because perfection was not the stamp of the whole number; the Church has not ruled that every Pope must be impeccable; there is no rule even of personal celebrity or of rare saintliness; all objections which are personal are but the cavillings of wilful enemies, who will not distinguish between the office and the man. Yet we may go so far as to say that in the whole history of the world, for ability, for discretion, and for personal virtue, the line of Popes can stand comparison with the greatest ones of the earth, to their own now happily recognized advantage. But such reflections are only congruous in this way, that they serve to show that the centre of divine authority, the Holy See, placed by God in the city of Rome, is in harmony with even such natural requirements as men of the world would desire to insist upon. More than this cannot be looked for in a sinful world. There was no promise of personal perfection to the Popes. The promise was that, as teachers, they should be preserved from teaching errors in whatsoever appertained to the Catholic faith.

The person and the office of the Pope have been ever divinely associated with the Holy See; and the Holy See has been divinely placed in Rome; so that "Rome" stands for person, office, see. Now, in all the great contests of the world with the Holy See, the world has fully recognized this idea of the centre of unity, this fact of the Roman Pontiff being God's vicar. The Church itself has not recognized it more fully, though of course in a totally different spirit, than have the enemies of religion and of unity. Gallicanism recognized it and disliked it. Protestant England has recently recognized it in the Irish controversy, and has even sent its own emissary to Rome.

A century ago, when Pius VI. was Pope, Mr. Pitt, who was Prime Minister, boldly recognized it, and the British nation even approved

the recognition. Mr. Pitt wrote to Pius VI. to say that if His Holiness would consent to publish a bull of coalition, so as to oppose the anarchical dangers of the period, England would send a fleet to protect the Roman states, and an ambassador to honor the rule of the Supreme Pontiff. What was this but the recognition of the central power? And so again, to speak of Prussia, which within the last quarter of a century has made "Rome" the supreme object of its antagonism. The Prussian Kulturkampf was at once a sort of savage recognition and a sort of savage repudiation of the centre of unity. Prince Bismarck sought to make the Catholic Church the slave of (his own) Protestant state, and received this answer from the Prussian bishops: "The Church cannot recognize or allow the pagan principle, that the state is the source of all power, and that the Church has a claim to those rights only which are conceded to her by the state." Prince Bismarck's idea was to make the Catholic clergy his nominees, and so to separate them from the centre of unity, which was Rome. Brutal and uncivilized were his methods for transferring the Papal authority to himself. Berlin was to become the seat of the new antagonism, and Prince Bismarck the new pontiff of German Protestantism; the laws which were to accomplish this end would have disgraced even the worst Roman emperors; the clergy who obeyed "Rome" rather than Prince Bismarck were to be "subject to restrictions as to their place of abode, such as, had hitherto been binding upon persons who had been imprisoned, and who had to be subject to the surveillance of the police." No insult was too deep or too spiteful to accomplish the one end in view: the breaking up of the centre of unity, which centre all the world knew to be Rome. And what has been the issue of the contest? Leo the Thirteenth became master of the situation. And whereas Prince Bismarck is now regarded by the whole world as having failed, with all his hosts and his "iron heel," to make Berlin the new centre of disunion, the vicar of God is *more* recognized in the present day than he has been at any time since the "Reformation," as the guardian of the centre of unity of the Christian Church. "Rome" was the fortress to be attacked, because Rome was the acknowledged centre of unity; but the *Civitas Dei*, which knows that Rome is its own, had no fear for the ultimate issue of the conflict. The Supreme Pontiff may have lost the Papal states, but it is impossible that he should ever lose the Holy See. And to refer now for one moment to other countries. Catholic Belgium, which is ruled by a Masonic conspiracy, has been forced to accept a "neutral" system of education; the object being to prevent "Rome" from exercising that authority which, because it was central, must preserve unity. In France, also, the suppression of the congregations with other

iniquitous warfares against "Rome," have been intended to work the destruction of the central power, and to transfer the supreme rule to the state. In Italy, at the present day, the efforts of the civil government are being directed to legalize what is anti-Catholic; marriage without religious rites, education without Christianity, and the state suppression of Catholic properties or institutions, being the weapons which are fondly used by the revolutionists.

In all such cases we have the spirit of decentralization, which is another word for rebellion against "Rome." Let us speak, however, of what are called "historic" incidents. Perhaps the most remarkable of the modern instances of "decentralization" was the first Napoleon's personal warfare against Pius VII. The whole story was a wondrous homily on its own folly. An humble and retiring Benedictine monk had been raised to the supreme office of God's vicar; and against him were arrayed the forces of the greatest conqueror of modern times, who naturally "compelled the Pope to leave Rome." The motive for the hostility was simply this, that Napoleon had ordered that all the sea-ports in Europe should be closed against his then enemy, the English; and the Pope had answered him that the Roman states were his own, and that he did not allow even the mighty Napoleon to dictate to him. Napoleon, losing his temper, had the Pope dragged from his capital, and then proceeded to annex the Roman states. The Pope was Pope still at Savona; but Napoleon called Rome the second city of the French empire, and his son he afterwards called King of Rome. And how ended this conflict of the unequals? Did the weak Pope yield to the strong emperor, or the strong emperor to the weak Pope? The Pope returned in triumph to the Eternal City, and his captor died a prisoner at St. Helena. Volumes have been written on this episode in ecclesiastical history, but the "moral" is sufficiently voluminous in itself. It is perfectly true that Napoleon, so soon as he was made first consul, had "restored" the Catholic religion to Catholic France; just as it is perfectly true that he wished the Pope—Pius the Seventh, whom he had de-throned,—to come to Paris and reign with him in Papal glory; Napoleon's idea being that, if the Pope would rule from Paris, his Holiness would be simply the emperor's superb chaplain. How feeble, if how cunning, a presumption! Napoleon knew that Rome was the Pope's city; he knew that where the Pope was there was the centre; and he imagined that by simply changing the centre of unity, he could make himself its master, almost its Pontiff. Pius the Seventh only answered: "*Non possumus.*" And it would have been well for Napoleon if he had thought the same. In a few years the Vicar of God was back in Rome. Poor Napoleon wished he had never made him quit it. Yet the answer to the question,



“Will the Pope leave Rome,” was in Napoleon’s day precisely what it is now, and what it was when Garibaldi besieged Rome: “The Pope will not leave Rome; he may be driven from it; but if he should be, he will return; for it is his See.”

## II.

But the idea of the centre of unity is not solely ecclesiastical, though “the ecclesiastical” gives the tone to the whole idea. It would be impossible in such a city as Rome, where the old world has still its grandest monuments, to dissociate the ideas of every branch of education from the primary idea, which is unity. A scattered Rome, a removed Rome, is an impossibility. A usurped Rome jars enough on the sense of fitness. A merely royal Rome, or a republican Rome, is also incongruous. The idea of Rome is the central combination of everything which the Christian world accounts civilized. Education, and therefore the arts and sciences, must necessarily gather round the Supreme Pontiff. They must do so, because religion must tone and purify all that is true, as well as direct all studies in a Christian groove. For such reasons Christian Rome has been for centuries the natural home of what may be called the Christian intellect of the world. The temporal power is thus proved to be a necessity, if in the sense only of the peaceful pursuits of the intellectual. Every one who lived in Rome when Pius the Ninth was Pope-King will remember with what serenity all Christian studies could be pursued, and this, too, equally by non-Catholics and Catholics. Not in the whole world was there any place where intellectual cultivation could be conducted under such favorable circumstances. The place itself was an education; while the institutions, almost countless, and perfectly organized, all ministered to the educational idea. The fine arts were simply homed in the Eternal City. And this of itself is a most important consideration. The temporal power guaranteed peaceful study. The Popes have for centuries affirmed this. It has been said—and there is some truth in the assertion—that “Pope Nicholas the Fifth was the first Pope to make Rome the centre of Christendom, in the sense both of the fine arts and religion.” His idea was that Rome had been too dependent on worldly sovereigns, who had “used” Rome as they used their armies or navies. In the earlier and fighting ages, when even ecclesiastics were sometimes martial, there was a rudeness which has now passed out of civilization. Rome could not be the home of all that was honored by the human intellect, unless it could be the home-city of the Popes, independent of external influences or ambitions. It became so. For centuries, art, science and literature have been as much at home in Rome as have the schools of

theologians or the religious orders. To this day the same spirit breathes in Rome. Not even revolutionary municipalities can quench it with their painfully modern ideas. And this is a point which should enter largely into the calculations of "men of the world," who sit in judgment on the Papacy. Is it nothing to have a centre of civilization, where religion and the fine arts can flourish in perfect harmony? where the students in every branch of education can combine their natural and supernatural aspirations? Catholics, of course, admit this; but would not all Protestants admit it also, if they would allow reason, not prejudice, to be their guide. Not only is it obvious that, for the unity of education, in every branch which can even remotely touch religion, the Supreme Pontiff should gather round him "schools of thought"; it is also obvious that in the most artistic city in the world—indeed the one city which is past and present at the same time—there should be that intellectual freedom which is impossible to revolution—which is possible only under the rule of the Pontiff-King.

And to take yet one more instance of the same fitness. The "Christian world" now wholly recognizes that it is time that *arbitration*,—of some sort,—which has not been fully determined, should take the place of hasty rushing into wars. In the words of Count Kamarowski: "If there existed in the midst of Europe a tribunal that could judge, in the name of God, nations and sovereigns, and which could prevent wars and revolutions, this tribunal would be the masterpiece of political wisdom, and the last degree of social perfection." And the world has recently applauded the common sense of this opinion, by actually appealing, in two instances, to the Sovereign Pontiff, to settle quarrels which were on the point of begetting war. It was a curious spectacle, when Spain and Germany were brandishing swords on the question of the possession of the Carolinas Islands, to see Prince Bismarck not only willing to appeal to the Pope, but willing to respect his judgment when unfavorable to him. "If," said Prince Bismarck, "the Pope decides that our pretensions with regard to the Carolinas Islands are not just, I shall not contest with Spain the possession of the Carolinas." So that the head of the Church, who has no army, and only a few acres of garden for his whole territory, has been acknowledged by the master of armies to be the most fitting power to decide questions which involve Christian principles of right and wrong. Now at this point may be urged the objection that, had the Pope been at, say, New York, he would have been equally fit to be consulted on points of morals. Perfectly true—so far as his divine office is concerned. But there are a good many other weighty considerations. Be it remembered that, in the difficult science of the "law of nations,"—now sought to be re-studied

by the civilized world,—there is the necessity of a profound knowledge of lofty subjects, and of taking counsel with the wisest jurists. It was with this conviction that Mr. Urquhart, an earnest Protestant, wrote to the Sovereign Pontiff many years ago, and said: "I beseech you, most Holy Father, that you call forth the lofty and all-pervading intelligence of the Roman Church for the purpose of cultivating this science (of supernatural law), which the ancients denominated 'the science concerned about things human and divine,' and which made pagan Rome so great, so noble, and so venerable." It was at the time of the Vatican Council that the Catholic bishops had urged the establishment of a great school of supernatural law in the city of Rome; and Mr. Urquhart was only expressing, from a Protestant country, the strong desires which the bishops had reported from Catholic countries. Now how could it be possible for such a "school" to be established, under the paternal care and governance of the Supreme Pontiff in any city save only in his own city, or even in that city, unless he were its ruler? Mr. Urquhart's allusion to "pagan Rome" was singularly happy in many ways. It was because in pagan Rome there were thoroughly established schools—"holy institutions," as Bossuet called them, for the consideration of what constituted just wars,—that "the college of *Feciales*" was equally competent and free in the performance of its international obligations. The *jus feciale* in pagan Rome was the fruit of the peaceful labors of the wisest heads. And the same spirit of justice which fathered it, tempered only by loftier Christian ethics, was the spirit of the middle age of Christendom, when the Popes were the acknowledged arbiters of the world's quarrels. But how is international law to be studied, "as an auxiliary to the practice of the Roman Pontiff's mediatorial and judicial office," unless Rome be under the rule of the Pontiff, in all senses in which we use the word "rule"? The fitness of things requires that the Roman Pontiff dwell securely and independently in his own centre. He has to superintend such a variety of institutions, all "auxiliary" to what may be called the Christian science, that his dependence on the caprice of a hostile government must be not only hampering, but fatal. It is fatal. It has been proved so during the last quarter of a century. *A fortiori* must the Pope's banishment from Rome be the banishment of that supreme, vigilant ruler, who has at heart the temporal welfare of the world, only in secondary degree to its spiritual? The Pope needs his counsellors, his assessors, his means of free communication with the whole world. Therefore his "imprisonment" must be injurious to his free action, and his banishment injurious to civilization.

We have only hinted at a few reasons why it must be an offence against Christianity, and an offence against the intellectual sense of fitness, that the Supreme Pastor should dwell anywhere than in his own city, or in that city save only as its sovereign. It has been well suggested that God united the spiritual and the temporal powers in the Sovereign Pontiff, chiefly because they should be disunited in every one else. As long as this great truth was recognized, the civil powers had their best support at Rome, their best defender *because* he taught justice. It is perfectly true that in the Middle Ages, when feudalism was normal, there was a certain rudeness and barbarism in making war (though no one who has studied the modern wars of "enlightened" Europe can call them anything but barbarous in their pretexts, and barbarous in their disregard of just preliminaries), yet since in these days the world is more "armed" than it ever was, more ready for instant onslaught and destruction, there is really *more* reason for the recognition of a supreme arbiter than when fighting was less mechanical and more troublesome. But how can justice appeal to the Supreme Pontiff, when injustice has deprived him of his independence? "*We* are your judges," say the modern revolutionists to the Pontiff whom they have deprived of his sovereignty, "as to your moral rights over the states we have taken from you; how, then, can we ask you to be *our* judge as to our own moral rights or other people's." The world sees this. There is some sign that it will soon act on its conviction. Meanwhile the question is uppermost in the minds of all virtuous statesmen, "How shall peace be best assured in this most military age; and how shall we reconcile the fact that we *must* have a supreme arbiter, with the fact that we are dishonoring Him whom we would all select?"

"Rome," therefore, being the idea of stability, in all senses which any Christian would care to recognize, must be necessarily a fixed, changeless centre, from what may be called "the very nature of things." "Rome" means fixedness. It is the Mount Zion of the Christian dispensation. We cannot remove mountains; and the Holy See is that mountain which God has placed in the Christian world to be its fortress. Has any good ever come to the world from the Pope's leaving Rome? Or has any good ever come to the world from the Pope's being persecuted, from his being treated as a political item or inconvenience? Yet, though we all know that to compel the Pope to leave Rome is both the biggest political and religious blunder, we go to sleep over the monster scandal of contemplating it, or shrug our shoulders at what we mildly call "a mistake." Leo the Thirteenth has rebuked us for so thinking. Six years ago His Holiness wrote: "Let all who love Christendom

understand that it is now time to *begin something* ; it is not a time for indifference and sloth." Such was the Pope's answer to the foolish question : " Will the Pope leave Rome ? " The Pope will never " leave " Rome, though he may be driven out of it ; and Rome, as it is now, is perpetually asking itself the question : " Shall we, Romans, restore to the Pope his own city, which is his by every divine and natural right ? Or shall we go on piling up the curses of revolution, to our own injury and that of the whole of Christendom ? "

---

#### THE COLUMBUS CENTENARY OF 1892.

**T**HAT we are to celebrate in this country the discovery of the New World by Christopher Columbus, four hundred years ago, seems settled and determined. New York is apparently to be the spot where the celebration is to be held, and a managing committee of capable, influential men has already been appointed.

The claims for the long prior discovery by the Northmen are swept aside, and there is a general desire to do honor to Christopher Columbus and the results, greater even than he dreamed of, which followed from the memorable voyage, planned and proposed after years of scientific study. The Irish and Northmen, groping along in the Hyperborean seas, discovered the Faroë islands, Iceland, Greenland, and finally land further south, the Vinland and Irland it Mikla. They had no idea that a new continent had been reached ; they were simply extending the limits of Europe, and the earliest maps show their fortuitous discoveries as part of that continent. After the time of the Irish monk Dicuil, no one in the north seems to have made any scientific use of these early discoveries.

Columbus had applied the geographical knowledge acquired up to his time to the study of a route to the Indies by sailing westward. The sphericity of the globe was known and understood, but longitudes were vague ; and his calculation of the distance between the western shores of Europe and the eastern shores of China and farther India was fortunately incorrect. Had he not underrated the distance, he would never have undertaken the voyage or found any to join him. Utterly unconscious of the existence of another continent, he described the lands he discovered