

## DIPLOMATIC MOTIVES.

A STATESMAN may be quite without principles, but he is generally presumed to have motives. When Tallyrand was told of the death of a statesman who had been remarkable for subtlety of purpose, he said, "Has he died? I wonder what could have been his motive?" It may be assumed of Prince Bismarck that he is a man of much motive, if not of superfluous principle. Speculation has been busy as to his Excellency's motive in wishing to destroy the Religious Orders. It may be easy to say what that motive is not, and perhaps as easy to say what it is. Money has certainly nothing to do with it—as it had to do with the "suppressions" by Thomas Cromwell. A distinguished Protestant has hazarded the opinion that "piety" is the only real motive. This may be admitted on diplomatic principles, but only by a forced kind of reasoning. Thus, assuming that a diplomatist is supposed to veil his real purpose and to imply the exact opposite of fact; assuming further that a diplomatist's private character must be inversely estimated from his public; then we may conclude that Prince Bismarck must be pious because no one supposes him to be so.

Waving speculation, we would institute for a moment a comparison between Prince Bismarck and Cromwell. Thomas Cromwell, as everybody is aware, was Henry VIII.'s "visitor" of monasteries. He was the son of a blacksmith at Putney, and in this respect was unlike the Prince Chancellor. But he subsequently became Vicar-General, and even presided at the meetings of Convocation as head over Bishops and priests. Now this gentleman was commissioned by King Henry to sell all the poorer religious houses, "of the value of £200 and under;" but as money was the sole object in view his Majesty was pleased to acknowledge the merits of those whom he turned out of home. Nothing could be more flattering than the language of King Henry in his apology for "realizing" on religion. "Considering that divers great and solemn monasteries of this realm, wherein, thanks to God, religion is right well kept and observed, be destitute of such number of religious persons as they may and should support in their houses," &c., &c.; therefore his Majesty transferred to such houses the monks whom he banished from the lesser. But Thomas Cromwell, who appreciated his master, and knew that more money must be found, conceived it better to create some better excuse for "suppressing" the wealthier monasteries. So he kept a "Black Book" in which he made a careful entry of the "enormities" in all the monasteries he coveted; and in the preparation of the desirableness of appropriating any monastery grew the "enormities" that were practised within it. Dugale, in his "Antiquities of Warwickshire," says that the favourite method was to threaten the monks with the imputation of some detestable crime unless they would plead guilty to small faults; and by such menace he generally managed to find excuse for converting the monastery into money. The first spoliation, of minor monasteries only, comprehended 376 houses, whose value, including the land which was attached to them, was about £36,000 a year. But within a couple of years Henry VIII. had "suppressed"—to use Cromwell's ingenious euphemism—645 convents, 90 colleges, 110 hospitals, and 2,474 charities and chapels; total, 3,219. Burke says that the amount of the grants which were made to the auxiliaries in plunder, whether as hush money or with still more immoral object, "staggered credulity." Nor was Cromwell himself badly paid. Thirty estates, belonging to the "suppressed" monasteries, were conceded to him in the way of reward; and he was also created Earl of Essex, so to ennoble the office of plunderer. But we know that his end was unhappy. He was made to restore all the Church lands allotted to him, and was even decapitated for "heresy." He had himself been instrumental in the death of More and of Fisher, and of the mother of Cardinal Pole; and by an irony of fate was beheaded in turn for what his enemies were pleased to call "heresy."

We have recalled these few facts because they are interesting in the comparison of Thomas Cromwell with the plunderer of to-day. It does not appear that Prince Bismarck takes objection to the morals or devotedness of the Religious. He keeps no "Black Book." He serves not a royal master whose enfeebled exchequer demands sacrilegious resource. His royal master, moreover, is not a Catholic, but a Protestant, and never knew what it was to have the faith. If money is no object, religion is perhaps less. Cromwell served a King whose behests must be obeyed, or the "head" would be taken for the deficit. No such danger awaits the Prince Chancellor. If Prince Bismarck were, to-morrow to recant his opinions on the subject of turning out the Religious not a hair of his head would fall, probably not even his prestige.

There seems to be but one motive underlying this plunder, and it is quite as unreasonable as unjust. That motive is to prevent the education of the nation being fostered by the Catholic clergy. It is at once the highest compliment to the influence of the Religious, and the most shallow disregard of true policy. Germany is perhaps the most sceptical, if not infidel, of all professedly Christian nations; and to turn out the Religious is to give the sign to the wicked to advance on their wanton career. It has been suggested that the Religious are distasteful to Prince Bismarck because they are opposed to the Empire. This is pretext? Even if the statement were true that the Religious hate the Empire there is no body of men so calculated to preserve it as these great doctors of loyalty and order. Principle, not private feeling, is the impulse of the religious; and their whole weight would be brought to bear on the duty of obedience even to a system they disliked. As to saying that the religious orders are dangerous to the Empire, this could only be true if religion and loyalty to God and to king were dangerous. It would be better for a kingdom, even professedly Protestant, to have its education conducted by Religious than by the ablest of Protestant divines, because the duty of obedience is only thoroughly understood through the inculcation of Catholic principles. And so in every other respect the mission of the Religious is to strengthen and elevate society. They teach submission, humility, and self-sacrifice; they Christianize education, they refine public manners, they ennoble the sciences of the world. They are the

salt of life, both religious and social. Without them there would be no embodiment of the highest principles of faith, no example of the grandest asceticism. They have been, in past times, the arks of society, as all historians of any claim to reputation have ardently and even affectionately urged; and they are now its principal aids and defences, because they keep alive pure ideas. To suppose that Prince Bismarck has read the "Monks of the West," and really regards the Religious as enemies, is to believe him devoid of intelligence. We suppose no such thing. It is the old story of material success becoming jealous of spiritual superiority. Naturally enough the Protestant Chancellor does not approve of Catholic education; but as Catholics must have Catholic education, and as without it they might develop into bad subjects, it is short-sighted policy to try to demoralize Catholics by taking away their instructors. Protestant education for a Catholic is the destruction of all whatsoever; and we all know that in times of real struggle there is nothing like faith to make heroism. Should Prince Bismarck succeed—which we are sure he will not do—in Protestantizing the faith of German Catholics, he will simply be enfeebling the power of the Empire by diluting its spirit and will.

Meanwhile the *fiat* has gone forth, and the Religious are to be wholly suppressed. They will gravitate to more congenial countries. It seems to be a law of "Religion" that what it loses in one country it gains in another; and that it comes back refreshed for the combat to those very countries which formerly ousted it. This has been the case in our own country. What share the Religious Orders may ultimately claim in the conversion of England to the faith is of course a speculative question, but that their example, and their very spectacle, is a perpetual preaching no Christian man can deny. Germany may lose them for a time, but she will be glad to restore them when rationalism and irreligion have produced the consequent ruin.—*Tablet.*

## ENGLISH CARDINALS BEFORE AND SINCE THE REFORMATION.

ROBERT FULLUS, de Poule, or Pulleyn, Archdeacon of Rochester, was made Cardinal and Chancellor by Lucius II. in 1144. He was the author of *Sententiarum libri*, and died in 1150.

Nicolas Breakspeare, Benedictine, Abbot of S. Albans, named Cardinal Bishop of Albano, by Eugenius III. in 1146. In 1148 he was Legate in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and was elected Pope under the name of Adrian IV. in November, 1154. He died in September, 1159, and his tomb is still visible in the crypt of S. Peter's.

Boso Bakespeare was created Cardinal Deacon in 1153 by Anastasius IV., and afterwards Cardinal Priest of the title of S. Pudenciana.

Herbert of Hosham (or Bosanham) was created Cardinal in 1178 by Alexander III., and was Archbishop of Benevento. He was friend and biographer of S. Thomas of Canterbury. (Bosham, anciently Bosanham, was a monastery four miles from Chister).

John Cumming was created Cardinal Priest by Lucius III. in 1183, and was Archbishop of Dublin.

Stephen Langton, of famous memory, was elected Archbishop of Canterbury in 1206, and was created Cardinal Priest of S. Chrysgonus by Pope Innocent III. in 1206 or 1212. He died in 1228.

Robert Curzon was created Cardinal Priest of S. Stephen on the Caelian (Santo Stefano Rotondo), by Innocent III. in 1212, and was sent as Legate *a latere* to France by Honorius III. in 1216.

Robert Somercote was created Cardinal Deacon of S. Adrian by Gregory IX. in 1234, and afterwards of S. Eustachius. He died in 1241.

John of Toledo (so named from his monastery), a Cistercian monk, was created Cardinal Priest of S. Laurence in *Lucina* by Innocent IV. in 1244. He died in 1274.

Robert Kilwardby, Dominican, made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1273, was created Cardinal Bishop of Porta by Nicolas III., in 1273.

William Bray, Archdeacon of Rheims, was created Cardinal by Urban IV., in 1262.

Hugh of Evesham was created Cardinal Priest of S. Laurence in *Lucina* by Martin IV., in 1281.

Thomas Joyce, Dominican, who had studied with S. Thomas Aquinas, and was confessor to Edward II., was created Cardinal Priest of S. Sabina by Clement V. in 1305. He died in 1310.

Simon Langham, Benedictine, of S. Peter's Abbey, Westminster, was Abbot of Westminster in 1349, Bishop of Ely in 1362, Archbishop of Canterbury in 1367, and was made Cardinal Priest of S. Sixtus by Urban V. in 1368. He died 1376.

Adam Easton, Benedictine, Bishop of London, was created Cardinal Priest of S. Cecilia by Urban VI. in 1378. He died in 1398.

Philip Repingdon, Abbot of Leicester, Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1400, Bishop of Lincoln in 1408, was created Cardinal Priest of St. Nereus and Achilleus by Gregory XII. in 1408. He was the founder of Lincoln College, Oxford.

Robert Hallam, Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1403, and Bishop of Salisbury in 1407, was created Cardinal Priest by Pope John XXII. in 1411. He died in 1417 at the Council of Constance.

Henry Beaufort, second son of John of Gaunt Duke of Lancaster, by his third wife, Bishop of Lincoln in 1327, of Winchester in 1403, and Lord High Chancellor, was created Cardinal Priest of St. Eusebius in 1418 by Pope Martin V., and Legate *a latere*. He died in 1447, and is buried in Winchester Cathedral.

John Kempe, born in 1380, of an ancient Kentish family, Fellow of Merton College, Rector of Southwick, Sussex, successively Bishop of Rochester, Chichester, and London (1422), Keeper of the Privy Seal and Grand Justiciary of Normandy; Ambassador to France and Scotland; Archbishop of York (1423), and twice Lord Chancellor, was created Cardinal Priest of S. Balbina by Eugenius IV. in 1439, and Cardinal Bishop of S. Rufina and Legate *a latere* in 1452. In the same year he was translated from York to Canterbury. He died