

MARRIAGE.

Irvine-Blaney.—On the 5th August, 1903, at St. Joseph's Cathedral, Dunedin, by the Very Rev. Father Murphy, Adm., Matthew, eldest son of James Irvine, of Christchurch, to Rose, eldest daughter of John Blaney, of Dunedin.

DEATH.

Mackin.—On the 11th July, at Lurganreagh, Kilkeel, County Down, Ireland, Nicholas Mackin, only brother to Dr. Mackin, of Wellington, aged 45 years.—R.I.P.



To promote the cause of Religion and Justice by the ways of Truth and Peace.

LEO XIII. to the N.Z. TABLET.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1903.

PIUS X. AND THE TEMPORAL POWER



HE following cable message appeared in last Saturday's daily papers: 'The Pope's reply to an address from the Catholic Congress at Cologne is purely of a religious character, and makes no reference to the loss of the temporal power, which was a prominent feature in the address.' In dealing with the Vatican the cable demon is commonly a miser of truth. Even when he records a fact it is

usually

'Dash'd and brew'd with lies
To please the fools and puzzle all the wise.'

We will, however, assume that, in the present instance, he has, by way of variety, told a plain, unvarnished tale. It is a big assumption. But the improbable and the unusual sometimes come to pass. And the address of the Cologne Catholic Congress and the reply of Pius X. may, after all, have been represented with sufficient fidelity to fact by the descendant of Ananias who plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven in the Eternal City. 'Wisely and slow'—so runs the Shakesperian motto; 'they stumble that run fast.' In his over-eager haste to announce a new papal policy, the cableman rushed to the inference which lies on the face of his message and is clearly intended to be suggested to the general reader: namely that Pope Pius X. acquiesces in the present relations between the Vatican and the Quirinal, accepts the doctrine of 'accomplished facts,' and withdraws all claim for the temporal independence of the Holy See.

Nothing could be more unwarranted than such an inference. The first public utterance of Leo XIII. as Pope, and even his first encyclical, conveyed no statement of policy as far as it concerned his relations with the new kingdom of Italy. And yet Pius IX. was never a more strenuous assertor of the outraged rights and liberties of the Holy See than was his next successor in the Chair of St. Peter. The measure or extent of temporal power which would adequately secure the independence of the Papacy, and the nature of the guarantees for its permanency, are matters on which Catholics—and, among them, persons holding positions of high responsibility in the Church—have manifested a moderate divergence of opinion. The Papacy remains entitled in simple justice to a full restoration of that temporal dominion which was taken from it by force

and fraud—by a series of the most hypocritical and scandalous violations of natural right and international law of which history bears a record. It is for the Pope and his counsellors to determine what minimum of justice, in respect of temporal power, would be accepted in the interests of peace and to end a situation that has long been a blister to the Church and a menace to the State in Italy. All this is, to a great extent, a matter of policy. But there is one thing that neither Pius X. nor any Roman Pontiff can ever sacrifice: the right to such a measure of temporal independence as would give him full and perfect freedom in the exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction. The Catholic Church is essentially a sovereign and complete society. It possesses its own organisation, its own laws. Its business is with the spiritual interests of mankind. The Pope, as its visible head on earth, is the universal Teacher of the Christian world. He is, in things that pertain to the kingdom of God, the spiritual ruler of many nations. As such, he must be independent of political control. He must be the subject, puppet, or vassal of no man. 'Independence,' as some one has rightly said, 'is the very breath of life of a moral power.' 'Let the very enemies of the temporal power of the Apostolic See,' said Pius IX., 'say with what confidence and respect they would receive the exhortations, advice, orders, and decrees of the Sovereign Pontiff if they beheld him subject to the will of a prince or government.' The Pope, in this respect, like Caesar's wife in another, must be above suspicion. If he were a subject of the King of Italy, 'he would ere long,' says a recent writer, 'be regarded as the instrument of a government, and his decrees would be scanned for evidences of Quirinal diplomacy.' Other nations would cease to turn to him with unquestioning confidence, and, sooner or later, his position would be little better than that of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the heads of the Russian and schismatic Greek Churches, who are the obedient servants of the various States in which they dwell, and are entirely under the control of the secular authority.

This principle of the independence of the Holy See has time and again found expression not alone from practising Catholics, but from statesmen who were by no means favorably disposed towards the Papacy. It found advocates even among such prominent leaders of the Italian Revolution as Gioberti, Cesare Balbo, and Durando. In 1848, when Rome was in the hands of the Garibaldians and Pius IX. was an exile at Gaeta, Lord Brougham said in the British House of Lords:—

'My opinion is that it will not do to say that the Pope is all very well as a spiritual prince, but we ought not to restore his temporal power. For what would be the consequence? Stripped of that secular dominion, he would become the slave, now of one Power, then of another: one day the slave of Spain, another of Austria, another of France; or, worst of all, as the Pope has recently been, the slave of his own factious and rebellious subjects. His temporal power is an European question, not a local or religious one; and the Pope's authority should be maintained for the peace and the interests of Europe.'

Lords Lansdowne and Palmerston gave expression to similar views. So, at a much later date, did Bismarck, the shrewdest and keenest statesman of the nineteenth century. 'The Papacy,' said Bismarck, 'is not simply a foreign, but a universal, institution, and because it is a universal institution, it is a German institution and for German Catholics.' It is no merely national institution, and it has a present, living interest in every part of the wide earth where a Catholic is to be found.

It is, then, a matter of international interest that the world-wide power vested in the Papacy should be wholly and permanently withdrawn from the possibility of political interference or control. The so-called 'Law of Guarantees,' passed by the Italian Parliament, professes to secure the personal inviolability of the Pope and provides him a yearly pension which, of course, he