

SECULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

De l'Éducation. Par Mgr. Dupanloup, Évêque d'Orléans.

La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur. Par Mgr. Dupanloup.

Public Education in the United States. By Hugh Seymour Tre-menheere.

Thoughts selected from the Writings of Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Education Board.

NOBODY reproaches a tree because it sends its branches into the air and its roots into the ground. In doing so it only obeys a natural law. When the Church claims the right to teach her own children she does the same thing. She is a mother, and loves her own, as mothers are apt to do. They need her care, and would perish without it. For this end she was created, that she might secure victory to her children in their conflict with the world and the devil. That is the purpose for which she exists. And she fulfils it chiefly by *teaching* them. When the world says to her, as it begins to do in our day, "Give me your children to educate," it invites her to commit suicide. It might as well say to her, "Cease to exist." But that is a matter in which she has no liberty of choice. She *must* exist. She is not a fabric of human art, much less a product of spontaneous generation, but owes her being to the creative *fiat* of the Almighty. And as she is not the author of her own life, she has no power to lay it down, even if she had the wish. It is her destiny to endure "till the consummation of all things." God will have it so. *Fundavit eam in æternum.* Her children have never known, and never will know, any anxiety on that point; because her Divine Founder, whose word is truth, has said, that no power of earth or hell, separately or in combination, "shall prevail against her." Both men and demons have done what they could, and have given her a troubled life; but even her impenitent adversaries understand, and confess with despair, that they are doomed to perpetual defeat, and she to eternal victory. "When we reflect," said Macaulay, "on the tremendous assaults which she has survived, we find it difficult to conceive in what way she is to perish."

The special function of the Church is to teach: "Go, *teach* all nations." She has, indeed, other duties towards the children of men; being, as St. Paul says, the "dispenser of the mysteries of God," and the sole channel through which the most precious gifts of the Creator are distributed to the creature. "They have not

God for a father," was the language of the saints, "who have not the Church for a mother." But it is on the vigilance with which she discharges her *teaching office* that her life and theirs mainly depend. Vast as is the power delegated to her by her Founder, and the might which comes from her inseparable union with Him, it is with an infirm and unstable race that she has to deal, and she cannot change the conditions of her warfare. She has to protect the weak against the strong, human simplicity against diabolical craft. If her vigilance were not unsleeping, a combat so unequal could have only one issue. Only supernatural armor can resist the deadly thrust which easily pierces through all human defences. The son of Jesse might refuse to wear a coat of mail, but it was because the sling and the stone with which he went to battle were weapons which the Lord of Hosts had lent him. If "the God of the armies of Israel" had so willed it, he could have strangled the Philistine with a silken thread. There is no might nor strength against God. But if we would be invulnerable like David, we must be, as he was, in alliance with God. The God of David enters into covenant with no man except through His Church. "*Deus extra Ecclesiam,*" said St. Anselm, "*inveniri non potest.*" And therefore the Church gives her hand to us at the baptismal font, and from that hour, like a guardian angel, guides our steps, lifting us over every pitfall, driving from our path every seen enemy, and baffling those who are unseen. Woe to us if we go forth to battle without her! It will not be long before the Philistine has his foot on our neck. There is no satanical artifice so transparent, and none so effective, as that which tempts human imbecility to mortal combat without the only ally who can give it even a chance of victory. Yet in our own day the weakest member of the "diabolical trinity" has made an insane compact with the strongest, of which we begin, in more than one land, to see the fruits. "Your fundamental mistake," says the devil to the world, "is allowing the Church to educate your children." "Very true," replies the idiotic world, "but it is not too late to correct the mistake, especially with your valuable co-operation." The result of this conference between the two unequal but sympathetic potentates is a combined resolve to throttle the human race, or as much of it as they can contrive to grasp, with "*secular education.*"

The project is not entirely new, for Julian tried it, not without a certain momentary appearance of success; but God took the apostate away, and the Church went on teaching. "The Christian Church," says Guizot, "saved Christianity." If the world could be induced to reason about such matters, we should ask it what it proposes to gain, even according to its own estimate of gain, by its latest bargain with Satan? But, as the gentle Fénelon said, "the

world has still more need of reason than of faith." If it would reason first, it might end by believing. Let it consider, for example, if it desires to impart even a semblance of reason to its own chaotic proceedings, or to suggest a plausible justification of them, on what grounds it contests the right of the Church to educate her own children, and what are at this hour the ascertained results of attempting to supersede her in that function? The only reason which secularists have ever alleged is demonstrably, as far as the Church is concerned, no reason at all. People are so divided, they say, in their religious opinions, and their differences so envenomed and irreconcilable, that our only chance of making education universal is by altogether excluding religion from our programme. This may be an impressive argument as respects those who do *not* belong to the Church, but how does it apply, however remotely, to those who do? Why should two-thirds of all the Christians in the world, who abide in unity and are subject to authority, be violently mulcted of their most sacred rights and reduced to spiritual famine, because the other third, who are outside the Church, find it easier to suppress religion altogether than to hold the same opinions about it? Cannot sectaries reap what they have sown without obliging Catholics to share their poisoned diet with them? There is only one answer to this question. It is furnished by a candid American Protestant. "Secularism is not religious *neutrality*," he observes, "but public atheism, the most intolerant and oppressive of all sectarianisms that have prevailed on earth."¹ It is intolerable both to the secularist and the sectary that any one should believe more than he does; and as he finds, to his extreme mortification, that what *he* calls reason has no power to quench faith, and what he calls science quite as little, he goes to Parliament, or Congress, or Reichsrath, and says, with a forehead of brass and a face which knows not how to blush: "Oblige me by putting down Christian teachers by force, and count upon my vote and that of my friends to make it worth your while." As all the governments of our day are officially atheistic—except, perhaps, that of Ecuador—and legislate as if there was no God, or none of whom they need take account, they reply: "Prove that your votes outnumber those of the Christians, and we are entirely at your service." The whole science of government, as practiced in the nineteenth century, is epitomized in that response.

Is it unreasonable in Christians to desiderate in a matter of such tremendous gravity,—affecting not only the future destiny, but even the present fortunes of human society,—a little less of brute force, and a little more of rational argument? We are open to convic-

¹ Things Sacred and Secular in American Life, p. 16.

tion; and if the secularist can prove either that the Church has not the power, or has lost it, or has not the will, and is not likely to have it, to educate her own children, and make them good citizens as well as good Christians, we will endeavor to accept School Boards, if not with enthusiasm, at least with resignation. On that hypothesis, the final ruin of modern society may as well be accomplished by secular education as by anything else. If we must be buried, we are not particular about the dimensions of our tomb, the shape of the coffin, or the color of the pall. Let the worms who will feed on us dispute about that. But is it *true* that the Church has lost either the power or the will to do what the Most High appointed her to do? That she had both once, and not long ago, nobody disputes. As late as the seventeenth century, one of the giant intellects of that age confessed her schools were the best ever seen on earth! Bacon, to whom men ascribe the glory of proposing the true method of cultivating science, ought to be an authority with all who quote him in that character. Aristotle was not more truly the father of inductive philosophy, according to contemporary critics, than Bacon of scientific investigation. We might, perhaps, dispute the statement, but have no present motive for doing so. We are content to invite materialists and secularists to listen to their own oracle. "As to the art of instructing youth," said Bacon, "the shortest method would be to say, *consult the schools of the Jesuits*; for, among all that have hitherto existed, there is nothing better."¹ The immense and incontestable superiority of the Catholic schools more than a century after the pretended Reformation was so notorious that Mr. Buckle finds in it the explanation of the famous antithesis of Macaulay: "Fifty years after the Lutheran separation, Catholicism could scarcely maintain itself on the shores of the Mediterranean; a hundred years after the separation, Protestantism could scarcely maintain itself on the shores of the Baltic." "The Protestant clergy," says Mr. Buckle, "destroyed the possibility of free inquiry, and, so far as they were able, put a stop to the acquisition of all real knowledge." They ordered their Synods to "have a watchful eye over those ministers who study chemistry"—what would they have said to the Jesuit missionaries who, as Humboldt remarked, recorded their observations on terrestrial magnetism?—"and grievously reprove and censure them." The result was that many Protestants, "seeing that under such a system it was impossible to educate their families with advantage, sent their children to some of those celebrated Catholic colleges, *where alone a sound education could then be*

¹ "Ad pædagogicam quod attinet, brevissimum foret dictu: Consule scholas Jesuitarum. Nihil enim, quod in usum venit, his melius."—De Augmentis Scientiarum, lib. vi., cap. 4, p. 341. Argentorati, 1635.

obtained."¹ The contrast between the schools of the Church and those of the sects was so fundamental, that a French writer says of one of the Protestant communities of his land: "S'ils avaient vaincu, la France était perdue pour la vraie civilisation."²

But there was nothing new in this unwearied zeal of the Church to impart education, and to do it by the most consummate methods which genius had suggested or keen observation devised. Long ages before Bacon and other Protestant writers had attested her enormous superiority as a teacher in every branch of human knowledge over all her lagging and distanced rivals, she was founding in every part of Europe, and notably in Great Britain, those famous universities which the German Huber frankly styles "a bequest from Catholic to Protestant England." "As early as the *ninth* century," he says, in the very darkest of the so-called dark ages, "Oxford was the seat of a school of the highest intellectual cultivation then existing." The Church did not wait for any impulse from "modern thought" or "modern civilization"—cant words which feebly veil the penury of the one and the degradation of the other—to enforce the principle upon which she has always acted, that the only limit of attainable knowledge is the limit of opportunity. "Most of the Continental universities," continues the Protestant Huber, "originated in entire dependence on the Church," and "her mode of exercising so important a trust is marked by an honorable activity." Nay, more: "The new intellectual impulse sprang up, not only on the domain and under the guidance of the Church, *but out of ecclesiastical schools.*" And the great central authority, to which all Christendom was then happily subject, lent all its energy and influence to sustain this intellectual movement. "From the beginning of the eleventh century," we are still quoting Huber, "the papal bulls and briefs took notes of the most minute details of management, even *superintending* the schools, as far as the age permitted."³ If the Church were really indifferent or hostile to cultivation of mind and the progress of knowledge, as her mendacious detractors affect to believe, her apathy had a curious resemblance to zeal, her repugnance to sympathy, and her hatred to love. She disguised her imaginary aversion to intellectual life with such complete success that even the prejudiced Huber sees only a mournful *contrast* between the present and the earlier condition of our own universities! "There is no question," he says, "that during the Middle Ages the English universities were distinguished *far more*

¹ Buckle's History of Civilization in England, vol. 1, ch. 9, p. 587, 3d edition.

² Services que le Catholicisme a rendus à la France, par M. C. Vte. le Gazan, p. 43.

³ Many examples will be found in the Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ of Wilkins, showing the intimate relations between Oxford and the Holy See, and the confidence felt by the one in the protection of the other.

than ever afterwards by energy and variety of intellect." Such a witness deserves to be heard to the end. He is speaking, let it be observed, of a time when the Holy Apostolic See, which saints and councils called "The Chair of the most blessed Peter," was the supreme arbiter in all human affairs, as God designed it to be, and its authority an essential part of the public law of Europe. The Church was then free, as she had never been before, to mould human society according to her own maxims, and to take the initiative in the whole wide field of thought and conscience, and in all that could contribute to the orderly progress of Christian communities. There were none to accuse and none to instruct her. Her action was spontaneous and unfettered; for she was truly, as Isaias predicted, Queen of the Nations. And how did she use the sovereignty which none disputed? Now is the time to judge her, when she was the beneficent mistress of a world which she had herself civilized. "Later times," is the candid answer of Huber to this capital question, "cannot produce a concentration of men eminent in all the learning and science of the age, *such as Oxford and Cambridge then poured forth*, mightily influencing the intellectual development of all Western Christendom." And it was the very men—let our shameless and ungrateful generation mark the fact—who were most completely identified with the Church, who felt with her heart and thought with her mind, who were the most active and untiring agents both in stimulating the thirst for knowledge, and in satisfying the desire which their own contagious example had created. It was from the sacred cloisters and peaceful monasteries of the Church that the vast host of students of that age, allured by no sordid motive and attracted by no temporal advantage, received both the invitation to aspire to learning, and the direction, equally patient and acute, of the labors to which they were nobly encouraged. It is an emphatic rebuke, says Huber, to the ignorant and sordid libellers of our own age, who can only sneer at what they do not understand, that "most of these worthies were *monks* of the Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, Carmelite, or reformed Augustinian order." It was no languid or intermittent effort which these laborious monks inspired, but a sustained and generous enthusiasm. "In consequence of this surpassing celebrity Oxford became the focus of a prodigious congregation of students,"—amounting in the thirteenth century to thirty thousand! And this amazing concourse, which, as he observes, "eminently testifies intellectual activity in the nation and times," was the more significant of the real character of that triumphal age of the Church, "since the University was as yet very poor, *and had no outward attractions to offer.*"¹ And it was the same

¹ Huber, *The English Universities*, vol. 1, pp. 13, 17, 43, 65, 66; ed. Francis Newman.

in Scotland as in England. "It ought not to be forgotten," said the late James Forbes, "that it is to the Mediæval Church that we are indebted for our universities. Three out of the four universities of Scotland had Catholic bishops for their founders."¹

It would carry us too far if we were to attempt to illustrate by example the vigorous intelligence and supreme good sense of those "monastic missionaries," who, as Montalembert remarks, "were in reality the most direct agents, the most immediate envoys from the Holy See, that had been yet seen in Christendom;" and who, while they exhorted our forefathers to liberal studies, taught them "*self-government*, that is to say, the proud independence of the free man among his fellows in the general commonwealth," and made them at the same time, "a nation of Christians more fervent, more liberal, more docile and attached to the Church, more fruitful in saintly men and women, than any other contemporary nation."² But, if we have no space for such details, we ask permission to give a single specimen, taken from a very early age, of the sagacity and true enlightenment of the old English monks. St. Aldhelm, who in the *seventh* century was able to write both Latin and Greek, though perhaps not the Latin of Cicero nor the Greek of Thucydides, and who was buried with all honor and reverence by St. Dunstan himself, the noble successor of St. Odo, displays in the following remark the acuteness which even the empirical critics of our day, whose "superficial omniscience" would have provoked a kind of jovial disgust in the philosophic saints whom they generally despise, will perhaps consent to applaud. "Apocryphorum enim nœnias," said this recluse of the seventh century, "et incertas frivolorum fabulas, nequaquam Catholica receptat Ecclesia."³ We should like to give other examples of monkish criticism in these remote ages, but the seductive temptation must be resisted. "Modern thought" does not seem to us to have supplied their places, or to be likely to do so. When faith disappears, everything else goes with it; for faith, as St. Augustine said, is "a condition of knowledge," as well as of all true nobility. Proofs are not wanting. The Church of God had enriched England with seminaries of learning, which were at the same time schools of exalted piety; under the withering influence of the new national sect they quickly ceased to be either. In the time of Edward VI., to quote Huber once more, "the universities were made essentially Protestant, . . . and every academician whose conscience forbade him to renounce Catholicism was ejected. Anthony Wood relates that in Oxford fourteen heads of colleges and nearly ninety fellows were expelled, and among

¹ Life of James David Forbes, F.R.S., p. 394.

² Monks of the West, vol. 5, p. 184.

³ St. Aldhelm. De laudibus Virginitatis, Migne.

these were some of the most learned men." The effect was immediate, and by the reign of Elizabeth "the most trustworthy evidence sets it beyond all doubt that intellectual quite as much as moral and religious interests at the universities were at so low an ebb as not to compare with far less favored periods." As to the academical students, few in number compared with the host who flocked thither in Catholic times, "their morals and sentiments are described at the same time as having been in the highest degree wild, selfish, loose, devoid of all earnestness, honor, or piety." The "Catholic bequest to Protestant England" had been in a few years so effectually squandered that, according to the decisive testimony of Anthony Wood, "in Oxford itself you have to search after the Oxford University, so greatly has everything changed for the worse."¹ In our day, to complete the history, while a few become conversant with classical learning for the sake of the pecuniary or social advancement attached to proficiency, the Protestant bishop of Oxford has lately announced that, owing to the growing unbelief of the teaching body, he can only admit fellows of colleges to the ministry with extreme precaution.

Such is the contrast between the work of the Church and the work of the sects. From the seventh to the seventeenth centuries, by the unsuspecting evidence of Bacon and Huber, the Church was at once the most zealous and the most efficient teacher, both of divine and human learning. She made in the same hour scholars and saints. "A sure and unbroken progress of intellectual culture," says the Protestant Ranke, "had been going on within its bosom for a series of ages; all the vital and productive elements of human culture were here united and mingled."² If, then, the Church, as certain sciolists of our day assure us, has renounced her glorious past; abdicated, whether from exhaustion or a sense of incapacity, her teaching office; and resolved, for the first time in her long history, to oppose the progress of true knowledge and discountenance mental culture; we should like to ask, without expecting any reply, what intelligible token she has given of these new dispositions? Wherever she is least fettered in her action, as in England, France, Holland, Ireland, Canada, and the United States, she is busily founding new educational institutions. In the direction of these colleges and universities, for which she desires a constantly wider extension, her bishops, never more worthy of their apostolic office, everywhere invite the co-operation of the highest available talent. Not a question of science, philosophy, history, literature, or art, is proscribed.

¹ Huber, pp. 307, 326.

² History of the Reformation in Germany, by Leopold von Ranke; vol. I, book ii, ch. I, p. 251, ed. Austin.

Every truth is welcome, because every truth is sacred.¹ Without endowments, of which she has been despoiled, she combats enemies whose resources, at least in the Old World, are mainly derived from her own rifled treasury. In every arena of fair competition, it is not her children who occupy the lowest place. A single supernatural virtue is, indeed, more precious in her judgment, than a hundred triumphs of unconsecrated art or a thousand efforts of unhallowed genius; but she is now, as ever, the home of the highest forms of the one, the source of the noblest products of the other. We see no change in her, either in her testimony to revealed truth or her attitude towards the development of human knowledge. In both she remains unalterably the same. Why, then, should she cease to teach the world now, who for so many ages was its *only* teacher? Has she lost her gift? Has He, who gave, transferred it to other hands? Let those who claim to supersede her produce their diploma. If He, who is "without variableness or shadow of change," has divorced His long-cherished spouse, and plucked from her brow the nuptial crown, by what apocryphal court was the decree pronounced, and in what fantastic register shall we find it recorded?

There is little wisdom in proposing bootless questions, to which no reply can be given. It is not the Church, even her enemies admit, who has changed, being constitutionally incapable of meriting that flattering reproach; but the progress of "science" has abolished the supernatural, refuted revelation, and reduced the Bible to the level of an oriental fable. There are people who profess to believe that. If we asked them *which* established truth of science is in formal contradiction with which truth of revelation, we doubt if they would tell us. It is less compromising to say, in vague and general terms, that faith and science are irreconcilable. This formula is at once more imposing and more elastic. It is also, which is perhaps an additional merit, totally and absurdly untrue. The *truths* of science are one thing; its guesses, peradventures, and crude hypotheses are another. It is only the latter which ever did, or ever will, conflict with faith. One truth cannot contradict another; and our self-complacent scientists are not ignorant of the notorious fact that, even in the recent times, the great *discoverers* in the field of science, who have really added to the sum of human knowledge, have all been earnest believers in revelation. "Ask," says Mgr. Dupanloup, "all the great men of the seventeenth century, Leibnitz, Kepler, Newton, Bacon, Descartes, Pascal, who were the fathers of the modern sciences, if faith repudiates science."² Ask in our own day, he adds, Ampère, Biot, Cauchy, with whom we may name

¹ "Si la vérité est Dieu même, il s'ensuit, comme parle St. Augustin, *que toute science est bonne en soi.*"—Ozanam, *Œuvres Choiesies*, p. 312, 1859.

² *La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, p. 23.

Brewster, Whewell, Forbes, Faraday, and Owen. Of Forbes, who was chiefly occupied with physical science, his biographer says: "His scientific habits of thought never disturbed or cast the shadow of a doubt over his faith."¹ It is, in fact, only men of an inferior grade, both morally and intellectually, who would have been equally impious if they had been wholly ignorant of science, who pretend that there is any real conflict between truths of the natural and the supernatural order. "If you say that we are enemies of science," continues Mgr. Dupanloup, "give us back our professional chairs, and we will show you that the genius of Christian *savants* is not an extinguished flame. But you insult us with impunity, while you refuse to untie our hands."

These noble words of the Bishop of Orleans, who has so little respect for ignorance that he has taught his own seminarists to act the plays of Sophocles and Euripides, bring us to the grave topic to which what has been said thus far is only introductory, and reveal the true motive of those pretended votaries of science who wish to expel the Church of God from all share in the work of public education. They are really solicitous—not like Kepler, Leibnitz, and Newton, about truth—but only about their own cynical theories and profane assumptions. Their strongest passion is not love of science, but hatred of religion. This is what Professor Huxley and his school have in view when he says, with petulant insolence and superb contempt of facts, "the Roman Catholic Church is the one great spiritual organization which is able to resist, and must as a matter of life and death resist, the progress of science and modern civilization."² He wants that "nucleated mass of protoplasm" which is called man, and which one of his own sort defined not long ago as "a sarcoïdous peripatetic fungus,"—unfortunate biped, what will they make of him next!—to be free to think and say whatever he pleases, without being subject to the vexatious admonitions of the Church. To be maintained always in the harmony of truth is an odious limitation of liberty! What is the use of being free, if one is not free to err? Happy they who understand that such freedom is the worst kind of slavery, and devoutly bless God who is able to keep them from the horrors of such ignominious bondage. The Church, by His sovereign decree, is the witness and guardian of a certain fixed deposit of revealed truth; and, though she has no special lights about magnetism, chemistry, or biology, she has an infallible test by which she can try each of them, and every other human science. Starting from the principle that one truth cannot contradict another, and that the truths of faith, as even Sir William

¹ Life, p. 453.

² Huxley, Lay Sermons, IV, 61.

Hamilton confessed, are more certain than the truths of sense,¹ because they are never chimeras and rest on a more solid foundation, she arrives at the eminently rational conclusion, that when the doubtful and fluctuating presumes to dictate to the positive and permanent, when the human tries to soar with unsteady wing above the divine, when the nebulous dream of every conceited pedant usurps the function and parodies the authority of all the Prophets and all the Apostles, there is no argument in all this against the salutary interposition of the Church, but rather against the inconceivable folly of those who resent its action and forfeit its help, only to commit that mental *εξαιωρησις* which is the form of suicide most prevalent in our age.

Among the possible eccentricities of "modern thought" there is one which we have not yet encountered. We never met a man, even in the ranks of the most "advanced thinkers," who contended that in the acquisition of a foreign language the use of a grammar and dictionary is a fatal impediment. Yet this would be a rational proposition compared with the delirious popular notion, that the authority which God has given to His Church is adverse to mental freedom. It is, in fact, and was designed to be, its sure defence. It is God's own provision against the aberrations of human reason. If truths of every order were simply axiomatic, and the rational faculty wholly exempt from error, instead of being, as Kant maintains in his essay on *Pure Reason*, "liable to an inevitable delusion," we might evidently dispense with guides and teachers. But this delusion finds so little acceptance, even in our puerile generation, that it is only in the sphere of *spiritual* truths that men claim to ignore authority. Writers like Professor Bain and Sir George Cornwall Lewis concur in the assertion, that "between Authority and Reason there is no opposition;"² and the airy pontiffs of materialism exact from their disciples a submission not less complete than the Church, with better reason, claims from hers. They have no invincible antipathy to popes, provided they grasp the keys and don the tiara themselves. The essential difference between them is, that the one defends the rights of truth, the other the privileges of error. In the Church now, as in all former ages, every speculation is legitimate, in every sphere of thought, subject to this sole restriction, that no conclusion can be admitted which contradicts a revealed truth previously established, and resting upon a fixed and immovable foundation. It is this fruitful and salutary postulate which encourages in Catholics the *widest liberty of thought*, because

¹ Hamilton does not scruple to say that "knowledge is an inferior ground of assurance to natural belief," a statement quoted by the late J. S. Mill with extreme disapprobation.

² Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, ch. iii, p. 64.

it supplies a certain guarantee against its errors and excesses. In the middle ages, when the authority of the Church was supreme in every Christian conscience and dominated every enlightened intellect, there was a riot of speculation *de omni re scibili*. Huber thinks he perceives "an essential similarity between the general movement of mind in the present nineteenth century and that in the *twelfth*;" and adds, that "the Church met the new speculative tendency not altogether in hostility," while "for whatever of the old studies survived, the merit is hers."¹ When a man impudently contends in our day, like Earl Russell and his echo, Mr. Gladstone, that the Church stifles mental freedom, he only proves that dull bigotry has destroyed his own, and contradicts the whole history of human thought. Her office is to secure freedom by truth, which she alone has the power to do, because she alone possesses the eternal copyright of that grammar and dictionary which give the only clue to the divine language of revelation, and the rules by which it is to be interpreted.

And precisely for this reason, as Ranke admits, the course of human thought was "a sure and unbroken *progress* for a series of ages," as long as the authority of the Church was respected. Since the great revolt of the sixteenth century, which "gave to every man," as Goethe said, "the right to judge all things, without giving him the power," the ephemeral products of what is still called "thought" are chiefly remarkable for the voracity with which they devour one another. The truth of to-day is the fable of to-morrow, and will be the jest of the day after. Nothing is stable, nothing permanent. Mists and shadows darken the earth, and realities have faded into night. Our spurious and combative philosophers, who are chiefly occupied in refuting each other, "after denying everything else," as a French ecclesiastical writer lately remarked, "have ended by denying themselves." It is the only service which they have ever rendered to humanity. Like the old pagans, who would have obeyed the authority of the Church if they had known it, their sterile discussions end in a cry of despair, and the last word of their impotent philosophy is the ludicrous confession that all that is worth knowing is unknowable. Hence the grand discovery of our age, by which it hopes to regain all which it has lost,—that religion must be divorced from education, and that the discrowned teacher of nations must be content to veil her face before the rising sun of parochial magnates and district school boards.

It is this discovery which we now propose to examine. We know what the Church has done for the world, and are curious to inquire what it designs to do for itself. If it should turn out that

¹ Huber, vol. 1, pp. 5, 11.

a fundamental error of enormous dimensions lies at the root of the new scheme by which the world aspires to do the work of the Church, it may chance that before long people will be saying of it, in the words of Lord Bacon, "The misery is that the most effectual means are now applied *to the ends least to be desired.*"¹ Evidence in support of that view of the subject accumulates with frightful rapidity. Witnesses of the most opposite character and principles, and of various nationalities, concur in the opinion that the secular education craze is either a delusion or a crime, or both at once. That it is fruitless as a preventive against wickedness, and has not the remotest tendency to operate in that direction, even the prophets of the unknowable emphatically assert. "The time will come," says Mr. Huxley, "when Englishmen will quote our educational maxims as the stock example of the stolid stupidity of their ancestors in the nineteenth century;" and he adds, "If I am a knave or a fool, teaching me to read and write will not make me less of either one or the other."² "We have no evidence," observes Mr. Herbert Spencer, "that education, as commonly understood, is a preventive of crime." Facts look quite the other way; for, as he continues, "did much knowledge and piercing intelligence suffice to make men good, then Bacon should have been honest, and Napoleon should have been just."³ In other words, secular education assumes as the only motive of human action one which is utterly powerless for good, and offers a remedy for human evils which can only augment them. Secular education no more tends to produce virtue in any man, either civic or religious, than teaching a dog to carry a parcel, or an ape to jump through a hoop. "*L'éducation et l'instruction,*" says the Bishop of Orleans, "sont deux choses profondément distinctes."⁴ But that is an elementary truth which has no place in the meagre philosophy of School Boards. Even Professor Max Müller would tell them that "truth is not found by addition and multiplication only;"⁵ a fact which does not easily penetrate the parochial mind. Suggest to our educational satraps, who are the scourge of rate-payers and the Nemesis of washer-women with large families, that something more is wanting, though it were only the *θεῖόν τι* of Aristotle, or the "divine inspiration" of Plato, and you will be like Ovid among the Thracians.

"Barbarus his ego, quia non intelligor illis."

Yet M. Thiers, whose free scope is not limited by any excessive respect for Christian maxims, once told the French Chamber, not

¹ Bacon's Essays, Civil and Moral.

² Lay Sermons, iii, 38, 41.

³ State Education Self-defeating, pp. 13, 15. ⁴ De l'Éducation, t. i, ch. iv, p. 180.

⁵ Lectures on the Science of Language, p. 35.

simply that secular education is an unsubstantial bubble, but that no lay person can really *educate*—he did not say *instruct*—because “*il y faut du prêtre ou du religieux.*” The most eminent of his countrymen, as Mgr. Dupanloup observes, have comprehended the absolute necessity of combining religion with education. Guizot said that education without religion “*is a danger for society.*” Cousin, who was careful to make his own peace with God and the Church before he died, did not fear to add: “It is the duty of families and of the clergy to combat any school where positive religious instruction is not given.”¹

“All that may be very true,” reply our impenitent Secularists, “and if it is we shall probably find it out sooner or later; but what in the world are we to do? If you will quarrel so fiercely about religion, which has become the most active disintegrating force of our time, we have no alternative but to banish that element of combustion from our schools.” The difficulty may be a real one, though it is none of ours; but who does not see that it is revolt against the Church which has introduced this new curse into the world? No one pretends that it ever had, or dreams that it ever will have, any place among Catholics. For them religion is not a fountain of strife, but a bond of supernatural union. “It is certain,” said Lord Bacon, in whose writings we hardly expected to find such a sentiment, “that heresies and schisms are of all others the greatest scandals, yea, worse than corruption of manners.”² This great thinker, who was an ardent supporter of the new Established Church, because his imperious royal mistress was its chief patron, did not consider that his very pert reflection came a little too late. That Church was founded on *the right of revolt*, and could not long refuse to others the agreeable privilege which it had used so largely itself. The example was contagious, and in a few years the *one* religion which had united all Englishmen for a thousand years had become a hundred. “It is true,” said a famous Anglican at a later date, comparing his own raw sect with the Apostolic Church, “there were not so many schisms and divisions then as there are now; but the reason was,” he plaintively adds, “*because the people did not make them*, as many do in our days, who notwithstanding that they are admitted into our Church, are so far from continuing steadfast in communion with it, that they never think they can separate themselves far enough from it.”³ Vain lament! Nobody listens to the sot preaching temperance, nor to the sectary whining about schism. Example in such cases is more potent than precept. “Let Anglicans cease to maunder about schism,” said the philo-

¹ *La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, p. 19.

² *Essays, Civil and Moral.*

³ Beveridge, *Works*, vol. ii, p. 437, 1843.

sophical *Spectator* not long ago, "or cease to be Anglicans." Secular education, as Bacon and Beveridge would perhaps admit if they lived now, with all its cohort of attendant evils, is one of the inevitable results of the so-called Reformation, which has pretty nearly annihilated religion in every country which accepted it, and is now going to extinguish the little that remains by a process which, after being matured in other lands, is at length being adopted in our own.

Holy Scripture says: "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." Not quite in vain! Let the astute bird-catcher keep *himself* out of sight, which he is crafty enough to do, and his net will soon be filled with birds of various plumage. We purpose to illustrate this fact in the natural history of bird-catching chiefly by the example of our kinsmen in the United States. They are an acute and observant people, at least in temporal matters, and see certain things very clearly, provided the range is not too great, and the objects looked at not too far from the ground. So many of them have been caught already in the net, where they lie fluttering in doleful captivity, that things in the air and in the heavens above have become quite invisible to them. But the same thing has happened in a good many other lands, the bird-catcher being everywhere diligent in his calling; and *State Education* in Europe has banished all the songsters from the sky quite as effectually as *Common Schools* in America. It is fair to our transatlantic friends to recognize this fact, if they can derive any consolation from it. They may possibly be gratified to learn, though we wish them purer joys, that a so-called education in which the Church has had no share has produced exactly the same fatal catastrophe in the older communities of France, Germany, and Russia, as in the modern American Union.

The State in France has long had the monopoly of higher education, because, since the foundation of the university and its affiliated institutions by the first Napoleon, every public career was closed to those who sought it from other hands; and Mgr. Dupanloup quotes the observation of M. Le Play, a former senator, who says of Paris, "There is no city in Europe in which corruption has attained the same intensity." Many years ago M. de Cormenin vainly warned his unreflecting countrymen that the State colleges and lyceums had become "*les portes de l'enfer*." It is these nurseries of impiety in which God was ignored and the Church insulted, which have brought France to her present condition. They have destroyed in the chief cities manliness and even patriotism, made revolution permanent, government impossible, and quenched all fraternity but that of crime and sedition. They have deluged the land with an obscene literature, the scandal of our age, which scoffs

at marriage, condones adultery, and has retained of Christian morality, as a living Frenchman bitterly observed, only this cynical reversal of two of its maxims: "Hate your neighbor, and love your neighbor's wife." "Les lettres françaises," we are told, "ont pris un caractère de légèreté à mesure que l'étude de la religion a perdu de son importance; et l'on pourrait suivre les degrés de leur décadence, en suivant les progrès de l'impiété."¹ "Notre littérature," says the Père Caussette, in accounting for the prodigious calamities of his country, "est devenue la plus immorale de l'Europe actuelle."² That is what secular education has done for France. It is to the pupils of a system of public education divorced from religion, and for the most part as void of scholarship as they are of moral dignity, that France owes the malignant ulcer which is gnawing her entrails, and for which her material prosperity is the feeblest kind of compensation. And though a vigorous reaction has at length commenced, and the legislature, taught by intolerable evils, has just conceded to the Church the right of free instruction, in the hope that she may exorcise the unclean spirits who profited by her enforced silence to make France their prey, their incorrigible human confederates, gnashing their teeth at the approach of any deliverer *qui venit in nomine Domini*, still cry with one voice: "Leave us in the mire in which we love to wallow." The Bishop of Orleans quotes from the *Revue de Philosophie Positive*, this characteristic argument: "Observe what is taking place in Belgium. Education is there free or nearly so; the result of which is that the Catholic and religious universities absorb the whole of the youth of that country." Was ever impiety more frank, or tyranny more candid? The moment we give you freedom, these Secularists confess, you beat us out of the field. Therefore no freedom for you; you shall be impious like us, or you shall be nothing. We cannot compete with you in any condition of society in which liberty of the conscience and of the intellect is respected, because in the hearts of fathers and mothers, your voice ever finds a responsive echo; and therefore we invoke the God-State to suppress the instincts of human nature by force, to crush every aspiration of the soul which has no place in ours, to build up an impassable wall between Christians and their God, and to tolerate no right but that which *we* claim, because it is the only one we value,—the right to ruin ourselves and others.

In Germany, the Secularists have got all they asked for, and perhaps a little more. The only unpardonable crime in that country is to be a Christian. The nearest to it in malignity, if we may judge by the Falk code, is to wish to be one. It is liberty enough for

¹ De l'Étude des Lettres, ch. 5, p. 128.

² Dieu et les Malheurs de la France, p. 47. 1871.

Germans, as it is for Chinese, to believe as the State believes. If they prefer, as most of them do, to believe *nothing*, they may please themselves, but the range of their choice lies between those limits. For all who rashly stray into the forbidden domain beyond them there is prompt correction. To such as dare to serve God, as St. Boniface taught their German fathers to do, the Prussian Mandarin has these replies: to-day he says, "fine him;" to-morrow, "incarcerate him;" and the next day, "exile him." If you are a priest, as St. Paul was, you shall starve; and if you are a layman who presumes to feed the priest, you shall starve too. Holy and venerable prelates, dear to God and man, shall languish in German dungeons, because they say to the German Cæsar, as St. Anselm did to the English one: "I will not refuse obedience to the Vicar of Christ." To the furnace, shouts the Prussian rabble of unbelievers, with these obstinate malefactors, who are so senseless that, when they "hear the sound of the sackbut, and psaltery, and all kinds of music," they refuse to "adore the golden statue which the King Nabuchodonosor has set up." That is the way we arrange things in Prussia. How long it will last is quite another question. The Avenger bides his time. It is probable that before long these Prussian Babylonians will be "eating grass like an ox," that they may learn to "glorify the King of Heaven," and know that he "is able to abase them that walk in pride." Meanwhile, jubilant Secularism, happily blended with discriminating "Culture-worship," is improving the work of his Church, which it has gagged and manacled, after this triumphant fashion. A competent witness, Dr. Krummacher, Court Chaplain at Potsdam, thus describes the neopaganism of Berlin, where he had charge of a large parish: "There is an almost total want of any interest in the Church, or connection with it, among the people, and of the population of half a million not more than thirty thousand attend public worship on Sunday, and those mostly women." In the work from which this is an extract, "the author speaks of the foundations of all morality being thoroughly corrupt and decayed, and faith, piety, respect for Divine and human authority *at an end*."² "We are ripe," said the Privy Councillor Eilers, many years ago, "for the coming of Antichrist;" and the rotten maturity advances every hour. Only the other day, the Berlin correspondent of the *Times*, though deeply enamored of the very principles which have wrought this hideous

¹ Daniel, iv: 34. "Dieu, comme l'homme, choisit ses verges parmi les éléments les plus bas de la création, parce qu'il est de la nature des verges d'être brisées quand elles ont servi. C'est ainsi que l'Allemagne, après avoir contribué à la moralisation des autres par les excès de son immoralité même, en recevra le châtement trop mérité."—R. P. Caussette, *ubi supra*, p. 17.

² Saturday Review, October 28th, 1871.

ruin, gave a report of this relapse into worse than pagan barbarism, which, as the *Spectator* observed the next day, "is certainly one to excite very great reflection, both religious and political. The writer tells us that in Prussia, one-sixth of the Protestant benefices, on becoming vacant, will have to remain vacant for want of candidates; that while the population has been increasing, the number of Protestant theological students in the universities of Prussia has been rapidly diminishing, so that there were only 740 in all the eight Prussian universities in 1873, against 2203 in 1831." In other words, while the population has augmented by more than one-third, the candidates for the ministry have diminished by two-thirds. The same journal continues: "If neither the cultivated class care to teach religion, nor the uncultivated to learn it, the natural inference is that, for the time at least, there is likely to be a reign of the purest secularism among the Protestants of that part of Germany where such tendencies prevail." And this is not all. "As we have no belief at all," adds the *Spectator*, with admirable good sense, "in the possibility that there can be any permanent vacuum of religious belief in the mind of a great Western people, we should say that the ground for anxiety which this prospect holds out is not so much fear for the growth of simple worldliness and disbelief in the supernatural, as fear that *some strange and dangerous form of fanaticism* may take its place." After observing that among the acute and more or less educated unbelievers of America, Spiritualism, with its grotesque *diablerie*, "has run like a prairie fire," the *Spectator* concludes: "We should expect to see in Germany some very grim superstitions growing up as soon as the ground recently occupied by German Protestantism has been left fallow for a few years; and we should fear they would be superstitions of a kind likely to give great trouble, not only to the homes of the people, but to the government of the State." We shall presently see that this is exactly what is taking place in Russia, the recoil from human and official religions, and the contemptuous secularism which they engender, being attended everywhere by the same formidable results. Already the Prussian government is asking for new powers against the rising evil; and when it comes to a head, with brutal communism and rabid socialism in its train, the blinded statesmen of Germany will have to go in sorrowful procession to unbar their prison doors, and entreat the captive bishops and priests to come forth, to stay the ruin which they alone could have averted, by the tardy use of remedies which they alone can dispense.

But if liberty is dead and religion dying in Germany, a fate which Bossuet predicted for both in all non-Catholic lands, are not these trifling evils abundantly compensated by the delightful evidences of "culture" in its highly educated population? What evidences?

If there is a people in all Europe distinguished by a total absence of grace and refinement, of all that the French call "charm," and by a coarseness and vulgarity of aspect and manners only matched by their impiety, it is the people of North Germany. Julius Fröebel, though a German, comparing the uneducated Indian natives of Nicaragua, Chili, and Peru with the masses of his own countrymen, frankly confesses that, "in almost every respect," and especially in that dignity of carriage which only true religion gives, "they are superior to our German peasantry."¹ Mr. Henry Mayhew, in his work on *German Life and Manners*,² goes much further. Comparing "the middle classes" of Saxony, the cradle of the so-called Reformation and the nursery of scholars, with the inhabitants of the "darkest dens" of the most abject quarters of London, he reports that, both morally and socially, the latter rank the highest! With a candor which we hardly expect in an English writer, he adds, alluding to "the cant which is extremely consoling to the minds of English clergymen about the social benefits of the Reformation," "We can conscientiously aver that the Rhenish *Catholic* population is by many degrees less squalid and less beggarly in their appearance."³ "It is precisely," says another capable observer, "in the tracts of country which are Catholic to the core, that the peasants are most prosperous;" and further, "In the Catholic half of Westphalia," for the same contrast is apparent in all the German provinces, "they are more like well-to-do farmers than like peasants, in the English sense of the word."⁴ Such are the combined triumphs of Cæsarism and secularism in a country which has ceased to be Protestant without becoming Christian.

The people of Russia, naturally inclined towards religion, and once conspicuous by an inherent docility of character, might have rivalled the Irish in purity, faith, and unity, if they had remained, like them, in communion with God through the Apostolic See. Under the fatal influence of a purely national and political State Church, wholly severed from Christendom, they are split into a hundred sects, and have substituted, as M. de Bonald observed, a formal or frantic superstition for the faith of St. Methodius, and the practice of the ancient Oriental Church as represented by St. Basil, St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, and St. Athanasius. It was the constant apprehension of those majestic doctors of the East, of whom the last three submitted their own affairs to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, that only the supreme authority of the Holy See could keep a region so inclined to heresy in the true faith. As soon as that authority was denied, after being proclaimed by all the Eastern pa-

¹ *Seven Years in Central America*, ch. x, p. 585.

² Vol. I, p. 384.

³ *Ubi supra*.

⁴ Quoted in the *Dublin Review*, October, 1872, p. 341.

triarchs in successive Œcumenical Councils, their worst fears were realized. The world has rarely seen such a monument of the withering effects of schism, as exists at this day in Russia. A hundred contemporary writers, German, French, and English, have described the present religious aspect of that land. Our space will only permit us to cite one, the latest in date, and a Protestant. His testimony will enable us to trace once more the effects of a so-called education not directed by the Church, to whom alone God has assigned the function of teacher of the nations.

"As education spreads," says our informant, "the sectaries multiply." He had good authority for the fact. "'I have never known a peasant learn to read,' said to me a parish priest, 'and think for himself, who did not fall away into dissent.'"¹ Yet it is certain that the ruling power in Russia, for which a fictitious religion is the instrument of an efficacious political unity, did not intend, in conceding to peasants the right of thinking, to promote this result. It is a delusion common to all non-Catholic leaders of men, to imagine that they can loose the spirit of revolt in one direction, and curb it in another. Vain dream! People who have been taught that it is their highest duty to rebel against the Church, are sure to learn, sooner or later, that it is their highest privilege to rebel against everything else. They are learning it so fast in Russia, that the savage measures of repression adopted by the late Czar Nicholas, who predicted that "Russia will perish by her religious divisions," have only accelerated the catastrophe which they were feebly designed to postpone. "The result of thirty years of savage persecution is, that the nonconformists are to-day more numerous, wealthy, concentrated, than they were on the day when Nicholas began his reign." Their formidable numbers are so respectfully estimated, that "already it is felt in governing circles that nothing can be safely done in Russia *unless these Old Believers like it*. Every new suggestion laid before the Council of Ministers is met, I have been told, by the query, 'What will the Old Believers say?'"² "Half the people, even now, are Old Believers, says a priest from Kem, more than three-fourths will be the moment we are free;" and Mr. Dixon adds from his own observation, confirmed by that of "a German who has lived in Russia for thirty years," that "the Old Believers *are the Russian people*, while the Orthodox Believers," who belong to the State Church, "are but a courtly, official, and monastic sect." And all the various sects, many of them holding opinions subversive of social order, who compose what is called the "Popular Church," "are as much the enemies of an official em-

¹ Free Russia, by William Hepworth Dixon, vol. 1, ch. 25, p. 267, 1870.

² *Ib.*, ch. 27, p. 285.

pire as they are of an official church. . . . They refuse to pray for Alexander as a true believer, and they fear he is dead to religion, and lost to God." And while these sects maintain every odious doctrine which heresy can devise or fanaticism propagate, they all profess to derive their religion from the Bible! "Except in some New England homesteads, I have never heard such floods of reference and quotation in my life."¹

Thus far we have seen nothing to shake our conviction that the Church of God was a more successful educator of the people, both in the interests of religion and of the State, of individual sanctification and of collective well-being, than any of the human agencies, secularist or denominational, by which the world has attempted to supply her place. Her superiority is as visible now as it was in the Middle Ages, and will be to the end of time. How should it be otherwise? She alone has a mission from God and the gifts necessary for its effectual accomplishment. She teaches *one* religion, not a hundred, and always teaches the same; and she makes loyalty to the civil power in its own sphere, whether monarchical or democratic, not a sentiment, a legend, or a caprice, but a sacred religious obligation. It is not her children who subvert states and plot conspiracies. "When you pretend," says the eloquent Bishop of Orleans, "that the Church speaks only for herself,—which you all do, whoever you are, if you profess any doctrine at all,—you forget to add that for the last 1800 years the Church lives and adapts herself, over the whole surface of the globe, and at this hour in the United States as in France, to all political systems constructed by the hand of man. She discharges her mission, defends her just rights, accomplishes her duties, and leaves sovereigns and peoples to arrange as they please their ephemeral constitutions. She is the adversary of nothing but iniquity and oppression."² And for this reason, making the law of God her sole rule and guide, and having no aim or purpose but the temporal and eternal welfare of the human race, her instructions tend as directly to civil tranquillity and the stability of states as to the increase of virtue and the perpetuity of the faith. How is it with her human substitutes? In replying to this question our last example shall be taken from the American Union.

There is nothing in which the least reflecting portion of the American public fancy they see more reason for exuberant national self-complacency than their system of *Common Schools*. The opinion is not shared by those, whether Americans or Europeans, who retain the admissible conviction, for which there is a good deal to be said, that man is not a machine, nor eternity a fable.

¹ Free Russia, ch. 33, p. 348; ch. 28, p. 313.

² La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur, p. 9.

Even they, who deprecate any revision of the huge code of Secularism which Americans have made a kind of national gospel, plead, with rare exceptions, that it is not *designed* to exclude religious instruction, which is properly a domestic affair, and is sufficiently provided for in Sunday-schools. That is the sole argument by which the existing system is or can be defended, except by those who deny the immortality of the soul. But "this means," as an intelligent interpreter of American opinion observes, "that thirty hours a week ought to be given to the dictionary and the multiplication table, and one hour to the catechism and the ten commandments." It assumes, that is, that their relative importance is as thirty to one; which is substantially equivalent to the proposition that religion is the least remunerative topic which can engage the attention of man. "Send your children to schools all the week where they will hear nothing whatever of religion, where that most vital of all concerns will be a *forbidden subject*, where the idea will be practically, if not in so many words, impressed upon their tender minds that it is of no consequence whether they are Christians, or Jews, or infidels, so long as they master the various branches of worldly knowledge which promote success in the secular affairs of life; and then get them into the Sunday-school, if you can, for a wild and ineffectual attempt to counteract the evil tendencies of the previous six days' teaching."¹ No one, we think, will be surprised to hear that even this feeble remedy, which would be inadequate, if it were applied over the whole surface of the country, is, in too many cases, not applied at all. "The *theory*," says M. Tremenheere, "on which the whole public school system of the United States is based is, that the religious instruction which is not given in the day-school is given in the Sunday-school;" and he adds, from personal observation, and the testimony of capable witnesses, that this theory "*is not carried out in practice*." The most ardent advocates of Secularism admit that it *ought* to be, and that without this corrective agency the system would be self-condemned; but M. Tremenheere assures us, that "the theory of a complete education, according to the view adopted in the United States, *is not fulfilled*, in relation to a considerable proportion of the children at their schools."² Distinguished Americans, he relates, spoke to him in various parts of the country "in the most distinct and emphatic manner of the visible effect which, in their opinion, the small amount of instruction in the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, and the lax mode of teaching them in the Sunday-schools, were producing on the religious convictions and moral practice of the mass of the people."³

¹ New York Catholic World, January, 1876, p. 477.

² Public Education in the United States, etc., pp. 8, 26.

³ Id. p. 48.

The Rev. Dr. Edson, Rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Anne, Lowell, in the State of Massachusetts, gave him this report, of which the gravity will be equally apparent to observers on both sides of the ocean: "My experience of now nearly thirty years as a pastor has, I am sorry to say, forced upon me the painful conviction that our public school system has undermined already among our population, to a great extent, the doctrines and principles of Christianity." To which some will perhaps reply that it was not intended to do it, and others that they do not care if it does. "I find them generally well grounded in the ordinary elements of what is called common education, and clever and acute as to all worldly matters that concern them, but very lax in their notions of moral obligation and duty, and indisposed to submit to any authority or control whatever, even from a very early age." The Church, it will be admitted, used to form quite other dispositions, and apparently does so still; for whereas Dr. Edson goes on to lament that the Protestant children, as a rule, will not come to the Sunday-school, he admits of the Catholics, with American candor, that "*they* are well looked after by their priests, and I have no doubt that nearly the whole of them attend some Sunday or other catechetical instruction." After describing the general decay of all fixed religious ideas, and the growing contempt for even "parental authority,"—why should they obey the voice of parents, who are taught from the cradle that they may despise that of the Church of God?—he concludes as follows: "I look upon this very prevalent condition of mind with very great apprehension, for all history shows that this is only the first downward step to complete irreligion and infidelity, and thence to a corruption of morals such as was exhibited in the heathen world. I much fear that we are making sure and not very slow strides in that direction; and while I deeply lament it, I am free to confess that I see *no present remedy for it in this country.*"¹

Yet he has himself noticed the contrast, and in his own neighborhood, between the influence of the Catholic Church and the destructive effects of that pagan Secularism which is only one of the poisoned fruits of schism, and a part of that *damnosa hereditas* of which the Protestant world is the opulent legatee. There *is*, then, a remedy, if people would use it. There are Protestants in America who are wise enough to do so. We should like to know how this candid observer would have accounted for the fact, sufficiently notorious in the United States, that so large a proportion of the youth of both sexes, belonging to the more refined classes, are educated in Catholic schools? The present writer has visited

¹ Tremenhoe, pp. 51-53.

many an American convent, in which one-third, and in some cases one-half, of the pupils were Protestant young ladies. The explanation of this fact is furnished by a Protestant witness. Parents who have a care for the purity and dignity of their daughters know that they are safe with the spouses of Christ. "Many well-judging persons, of different religious persuasions, have assured me that the only *really useful and corrective* education is that of the Catholic schools and colleges. So far as I have known, these seminaries are crowded, not only with pupils of their own creed, but with those of other sects. And I have high official authority for saying that the ministers and missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church are at this moment doing more good for the cause of virtue and morality throughout the whole continent of America, than those of any other religious denomination whatever."¹

If some refuse to appropriate blessings which are within their reach, it is probably because they do not value them. When Moses struck the rock in Horeb, the faint and thirsty wanderers in the desert were not so senseless as to refuse to drink because the miraculous fount of water was a gift from God by his prophet; yet there are millions in our day, who have not yet come out of Egypt, who die of thirst, or vainly seek to assuage it at every foul and noxious pool, rather than accept the water of salvation from his Church. Many of them, at least in America, seem to suspect that they have made an evil choice, and often put down the unfinished cup of death to whisper to one another that it tastes of poison. They shudder at the draught, but the next moment put their lips to it again. In clinging to the system of secular education, with a full apprehension of its deadly fruits, men seem to surpass the common measure of human infatuation. "In a considerable number of the many public schools I have visited," says M. Tremeneere, "in different parts of the United States, I have been struck with the entire absence of good manners on the part of the children. . . . There was a marked want of any outward demeanor of deference and respect, and, on the part of the teacher, what appeared to me a most singular submission of himself to the children. Nothing was put to them as from authority, but the most trifling command was conveyed in a tone and in language implying that it was for them to judge whether they would obey it or not."² How different is the character formed by the spirit of faith and the teaching of the Church, is evident from his own generous confession: "The civilization of the New World," he says, "owes something, I think, to the French Canadians, for keeping alive a reflection of '*the best manners of the old.*'"³

¹ The Statesmen of America in 1846, p. 491.

² *Ib.*, p. 148.

³ Reply to the Remarks of Thirty-one Boston Schoolmasters, p. 28.

The language of American writers is still more emphatic. Mr. Horace Mann was Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. He tells us what it proposed to do, and what it actually did. The poles may be said to be in immediate contact compared with the huge interval between the design and its execution. "The *object*," he says, "of the common school of Massachusetts was to give every child in the commonwealth a free, straight, solid pathway by which he could walk directly up from the ignorance of an infant to a knowledge of the primary duties of man, and could acquire a *power and an invincible will to discharge them*."¹ We should have thought our American friends were more practical engineers than to propose to build a bridge, without any materials and without any supports, of which the heart of an infant should be the buttress at one end, and an "invincible" phantom at the other. They would never span their own broad rivers with fairy structures of that kind. We are not surprised, therefore, to hear that the Massachusetts bridge over the infinite is still *à l'état de projet*. Owing to tumultuous discussions among the engineers, destructive of unity of purpose, "good and pious men wait until delusions more insane than Millerism, and more fanatical and licentious than Mormonism, shall have overspread the land, and generated their broods of scoffers and atheists," having an "invincible will" *not* to discharge their duties. "The influential, the wealthy, the learned, the pious are waiting until the combustible and explosive materials of prejudice and ignorance and sensuality shall have been scattered more profusely through our country, and heaped together in greater masses in our cities, to be kindled by the torch of some political or fanatical Cataline. God grant that when the leading men in our community awaken to a sense of their danger it may not be too late to avert it."² The prospect is evidently not cheerful. "I do not hesitate to affirm," he says elsewhere, "that our republican edifice at this time, in present fact and truth, is not sustained by those columns of solid and ever-enduring adamant, intelligence and virtue;" and then, describing "the rotten materials of the edifice," he adds, "unless, therefore, a new substructure can be placed beneath every buttress and angle of this boasted temple of liberty, it will soon totter and fall, and bury all in-dwellers in its ruins."³ In other words, he thinks of American society in particular what Mr. Carlyle thinks of all Protestantized society in general, that it is "fast wheezing itself to death" in the fetid miasma of *naturalism*, "and deserves to die."

Perhaps any further evidence is superfluous; but as we are be-

¹ Reply to the Remarks of Thirty-one Boston Schoolmasters, p. 28.

² *Ib.*, p. 173.

³ Thoughts selected from the writings of Horace Mann, p. 180.

ginning to adopt in England, owing to inveterate religious conflicts, the secularism in education which has brought America to such a pass, we need not fear to err on the side of excess. On the ninth of last December, the New York *Journal of Commerce*, deserting fiscal for ethical meditations, and referring to President Grant's too famous speech at Des Moines, made this reflection: "So far from prohibiting the teaching of religious tenets in the popular education, we would encourage by every possible argument a more general attention to religious culture wherever children can be brought under such wholesome influence. If we go much further in the direction whither the schools have been drifting, it will soon need something more than an article in the Constitution to keep the whole nation from becoming atheistic or pagan." That this is the logical result of Secularism nobody seems to doubt, and many do not seem to care. "We have been lately told by the public journals that the researches of Professor Agassiz into the growth of the 'social evil' have 'almost destroyed his faith in the boasted civilization of the nineteenth century;' and that 'a large number of the unfortunate women and girls traced their fate to influences which surrounded them *in the public schools.*'"¹ Nor have they even the poor consolation of being able to attribute to the debasing Secularism which kills religion and virtue any compensating influence in promoting mental activity, except in the lowest spheres of thought or human learning and knowledge. "We are behind most nations," says the venerable Dr. Brownson, who knows his country so well, "in *intellectual* and moral culture."² It is not strangers, who might be suspected of imperfect sympathy with the country which they describe, who say these things, but honorable Americans, able to estimate religious and social problems, and who look each other in the face without fearing to provoke resentment or contradiction. A New England physician, who shall be our last witness, and whose painful work, dedicated to "the Hon. William Sprague, ex-Governor of and United States Senator from Rhode Island," cannot be read without horror, thus describes in 1871, from a professional point of view, the desolating results of the common school system: "Irreligion and infidelity are progressing *pari passu* with the advanced guards of immorality and crime, and all are fostered, if not engendered, by the materialistic system of school instruction. The entire absence of all religious instruction from the schoolroom, *which has resulted from the utter impossibility of harmonizing the conflicting creeds,* . . . is fast bearing fruit in a generation of infidels, and we are becoming worse than even the

¹ New York Catholic World, Jan. 1872, p. 442.

² Brownson's Quarterly Review, Oct. 1873, p. 509.

pagans of old, who had at least their positive sciences of philosophy and their religion, such as it was, to oppose which was a criminal offence."¹

We have now a basis sufficiently solid to support certain practical conclusions which demand the instant attention of all thinking men on both sides of the Atlantic. That Secularism, with its long train of ghastly attendant spectres,—*diræ facies, inimicaque numina*,—the destruction of reverence, obedience, parental authority, faith, virtue, of all, in a word, which constitutes the strength of nations, derives its fatal power from "the utter impossibility of harmonizing" a hundred rival creeds, is admitted both by those who advocate and by those who deplore the exclusion of religion from the common schools. The first contend that religious dissensions have made any other system "impossible;" the second, that, horrible as are its admitted results, there "is no present remedy for it." The evil is breaking up the foundations of society, but it must run its course. All who dread what is coming "are waiting," as Mr. Horace Mann says, till it comes! Yet it is certain that for calamities of a lower order the energetic American nation would soon find a remedy. What is this unmanly despair, this prostrate and impotent acquiescence in intolerable evils, but the evidence of a terrible judgment on the one hand, and on the other, an unconscious confession that Protestantism, by its destruction of all first principles, disintegration of faith and unity, suppression of authority, and ceaseless multiplication of rival sects, is ruining the life of nations, and preparing the way for Antichrist? What we see around us is but the fulfilment of an Apostolic prediction. Both St. Peter and St. Paul speak of "sects," which they call "works of the flesh," and of "self-willed teachers," as the special note and evil distinction of "*the last times*." They have come, as they foretold; and instead of inspiring fear, disgust, and condemnation, the very types in which their prophetic eye discerned the heralds and forerunners of Antichrist,—the men who "despise government," defame the Church, and "fear not to bring in sects,"²—are the popular dispensers of such shreds of religion as their contemporaries choose to accept, the echoes of all the antagonistic voices and humors of this lower world, and the boast of "modern civilization!" The unpardonable *crimes* of the apostolic age have become the characteristic *virtues* of ours! And the intelligent world, "plausibly amused," smiles at its own improvement. As each prophetic "seal" is opened, and the last tragic scene of the human drama approaches, it sees, not the signs of impending ruin, but of salutary progress. Nobody doubts that in the judgment of the Apostles, Secularism

¹ Satan in Society, p. 51.

² 2 Pet. ii: 10.

would have been regarded as a compact, conscious or otherwise, between those two familiar allies, Satan and the world, for the destruction of the Christian faith and of human society. Nobody denies that, whether its advocates intend it or not, that result is being everywhere promoted "by sure and not slow strides." We are entitled, therefore, to ask—at least of all who still admit that union with God is advantageous to man, and that the tried instrument which alone during so many ages cemented that union is of simply incalculable value—what has the world gained, either intellectually or spiritually, either for time or eternity, by suppressing the Church which was the invincible guardian both of piety and learning, in order to substitute a new agency, which only destroys the one without adding anything to the other?

For even the admirers of Secularism perceive, and often proclaim, that the Church is doing the same work at this hour in the whole earth, forming the same characters and developing the same supernatural virtues, as in all the ages of the past. In the New World as in the old, she is training in the same hour dear children of God and loyal citizens of the State, and is the only efficient champion, as a Protestant writer has told us, "of the cause of virtue and morality throughout the whole continent of America." Is the world so obstinately bent on self-destruction, as to refuse the benefits of which she is the sole and inexhaustible source? If she gave in the past all the truth, liberty, civilization, and refinement it ever possessed, is there any sign that she has lost the power to confer the same gifts in the present? The mould is not broken in which the pure gold with which she works takes its form. Look, says the Bishop of Orleans, contrasting her daughters with the unsexed types around them, at the army of consecrated virgins who go forth in her name and with her blessing to the ends of the earth, in quest of every want which can be relieved and every sorrow which can be consoled; and since you profess so much admiration for cultivation of mind, consider that "the three books which have perhaps been most widely read in our time are the works of Catholic ladies, the *Récit d'une Sœur*, the *Mémoires d'Eugénie de Guérin*, and the *Lettres de Madame Swetchine*."¹ But the same Church which in every age has offered to the love of God and the veneration of man, women like St. Agnes, St. Catharine, and St. Teresa, has not lost the art of creating men like St. Benedict, St. Francis, and the Curé d'Ars. And even her less worthy sons, who do not attain to *their* level—the thousands who, in a lower spiritual sphere, live in her light and act by her maxims—are, in America as in Europe,

¹ *La Femme Studieuse*, ch. x, p. 265.

models of civic as well as of religious fidelity, true patriots and loyal citizens, lovers of their country as well as of their God, submissive to human while subject to divine law, and the very pith and marrow of earthly States, of which they never disturb the harmony by the selfishness of private aims, nor menace the existence by factious sedition, or the more fatal conspiracies of religious license. It is not they who disturb the repose of statesmen, or alarm the solicitude of magistrates; for their only weapon against the unjust is prayer, their only answer to the persecutor, resignation. And even when oppression becomes intolerable, when triumphant iniquity marks them as victims, and the knife of the secret assassin, or the axe of the public executioner falls upon them, they utter no imprecation, wisely content to bless the hand which gives them an earlier deliverance from a world which is not worthy of them. How easy would it be to govern that foolish world, and how tranquil would be the life of kings and peoples, of cabinets and legislatures, if they had only to fear the rebellion of those who never revolt, and the machinations of those who never conspire! Yet the imprudent rulers of that delirious world not only refuse alliance with the only power which can give them assured peace, the only force from which they have nothing to fear, but affect to regard this friend and guide of every soul of man as the special enemy against whom they must keep vigilant watch, lest it should artfully undermine the *authority* of which God has made it the supreme expression and unfailling support, or compromise the *liberty* which it prizes more than any human good, because it is the fruit and evidence of that diviner gift of which God has said, "the *truth* shall make you *free*."

It would seem that human folly could go no further. Yet it seeks still lower depths. There are even cases in which the perverse imbecility of earthly rulers, complicated by sordid political motives, seems to transcend the limits of the possible, and pass into the fantastic region of the formless and intangible. It is a bitter reflection that the government of the great and generous people of the United States should furnish the most discreditable example. We need not fear to misinterpret the incendiary speech of President Grant, at Des Moines, because all its critics, English and American, understand it in the same way. The former, in spite of their devotion to Protestantism, are unanimous in condemning it. Even the *Saturday Review* calls it contemptuously "a bid for Protestant votes;" while the *Pall Mall Gazette* sees in this reckless and criminal disturbance of public order a proof that "patriotism" is not General Grant's distinguishing virtue. Mr. Carl Schurz, a prominent orator of the Republican party, is reported to have said that its incitement to religious fanaticism, "serves better as a cloak for

public rogues than as an instrument for national purification."¹ The *Review*, from which we borrow this observation, considers the speech an indication that "an unscrupulous political organization will create a third factor in our national elections," and that this wanton crusade against "so conservative, so law-abiding, and so useful a body as the Catholics of the United States," is mainly an artifice to divert public attention from ignoble frauds in which official persons are commonly believed to be involved. The New York *Catholic World*, to which we looked with interest for a reliable estimate of the President's electioneering rhetoric, discusses his speech in an acute and ingenious article, which will probably afford no little amusement to our brethren of the United States. Affecting, with a finesse which will not deceive their penetration, but which was perfectly legitimate on such an occasion, to accept General Grant's words in their literal meaning, our excellent contemporary thanks him, with diverting gravity, for uttering sentiments which are so entirely its own. "For we find nothing in the oration with which we are in the least disposed to take issue."² We also, the *World* adds, referring to the President's injunction to "encourage free schools," have always contended for the same boon. "Do we hear aright? Does the President of the United States maintain the proposition which has brought us so much contempt and derision? *What is a free school?* A free school is one in which every scholar can obtain an education without violating the honest convictions of conscience;" whereas, the pretended free schools of America are conducted on a principle which excludes a large section of the population from entering them. "To my certain knowledge," says a writer in the *Catholic Review*,³ "there is in the whole United States not one single German Catholic congregation, having as many as seventy-five children, which is without a school of their own;" and the same thing is true, in various proportions, and according to the means at their disposal, of the Catholics of other nationalities. On a much smaller scale it is even true, we believe, of certain Protestant congregations. In all such cases, affecting probably at least one-fourth of the entire population, American citizens are compelled by a cruel and oppressive law to support schools which, as Dr. Edson told Mr. Tremenheere, "have undermined already, to a great extent, the doctrines and principles of Christianity;" and at the same time to accept the heavy burden of building and maintaining *other* schools, in which no such deadly results are to be feared. By all means, then, says the *Catholic World*, let us have the "free schools" which the President so warmly recom-

¹ Quoted in the *Catholic Review*, December 21st, 1875.

² *Catholic World*, January, 1876, p. 435.

³ January 8th, 1876.

mends. We have not got them yet, but if he can help us to obtain what we have so long coveted, why should we refuse to co-operate with so powerful an ally? As an argumentative retort nothing can be more effective, and the irony is maintained with equal power and adroitness in relation to all the other clauses of President Grant's deplorable speech. But, while we applaud the prudent artifice of our American contemporary, who has contrived, in deference to a misguided public opinion, to expose injustice and rebuke insincerity in terms so inoffensive, the fact remains in all its shameful enormity, that the Chief Magistrate of a great nation, which by its Constitution is neither Catholic nor Protestant, has stooped to identify his private and personal interests with a scheme of public education which is creating, in the words of Mr. Horace Mann, "a generation of infidels, worse even than the pagans of old;" and that he inflicts this wrong on his country from no purer motive than the desire to vivify and reorganize his own political faction, utterly indifferent that its triumph should be purchased by the suppression of Christian liberty and the dissolution of public order, and by letting loose against the most religious and law-abiding section of the American community the worst passions of all for whom religion is only a name, and law only an instrument of oppression.

Only this incident was wanting to complete our estimate of Secularism, the agents by whom it is promoted, the motives on which they act, and the ruinous results to which their selfish and evil policy tends. Yet Secularism, as all classes concur in stating, is nothing but a product of "the utter impossibility of harmonizing multiform creeds." In other words, it is a product of the so-called Reformation, and, we suppose, one of its peculiar titles to the admiration of the human race. Like many other results of that anarchic movement, of which we perceive more clearly every year the fatal action upon modern society, it perplexes statesmen, puzzles preachers, and suggests to both that as religion is a factor of human life so unpliant and intractable, the only remedy is to get rid of it altogether. And they get rid of it accordingly. If after being expelled from the school it can contrive to maintain a precarious existence in the family, there is at present no law, even in Prussia, prohibiting that expiring effort. Modern legislation is yet content, with benevolent forbearance, to refuse it all public recognition, and, in once Catholic England, to sweep the children of God into the schools of Satan, with a coercive discipline of fines and imprisonment for all who refuse to come, or tarry on the way. The devout pupils of our Board schools, or at least a good many of them, may be safely trusted to pursue the system to its logical term, when they assume in their turn the civic toga, and to hunt religion out of the family, as their

teachers have hunted it out of the school. And then people will be able to say of England, as Dr. Edson says of America, that secular education has proved to be "only the first downward step to complete irreligion and infidelity, and thence to a corruption of morals such as was exhibited in the heathen world." Perhaps when that auspicious era arrives, some Englishmen will still be found to say with Lord Bacon, only using the past instead of the future tense: "The misery is that the most effectual means *have been* applied to the ends least to be desired."

We may now be permitted to ask once more, in conclusion, without excessive or indiscreet curiosity, what the world conceives itself to have gained thus far, and what it hopes to gain in the future, by usurping the teaching office of the Church, and forbidding her any share in public education? We are quite willing to take its own account of the matter. If it can point to *any* definite and realized gains—moral, intellectual, or social—let it tell us what they are. Is this too much to ask? It may choose any region of the earth where Secularism is throned for the field of comparison. Shall it be Germany, England, or the United States? It may compare its own *best* pupils with the peasants of Ireland, Spain, or Italy, or even those of Chili and Peru, who know nothing but their catechism, from which they have learned both dignity of life and true philosophy. There is a good deal of Secularism in China, India, and Central Africa, with the usual cheerful results; but perhaps the world would prefer to apply the test nearer home. If it will only apply it *somewhere*, we shall be quite content. But we venture to stipulate that it shall be applied fairly and honestly. Now all possible or imaginable advantages which can accrue to man may be classed under two heads: those which affect him in his relations to God, and those which concern his position in relation to society. We assume that even the world will hardly pretend that Secularism has done much for him as respects the first. It does not profess to have brought him into more intimate communion with God. To do that, even if it had the power, is no part of its programme. But perhaps if Secularism affords him no help as a Christian, it consoles and elevates him as a citizen. To this proposition we take a preliminary objection. There is no example in the history of our race, at any time or in any country, and least of all in the highly cultivated societies of pagan antiquity, of either an individual or a community tending to higher social perfection, while constantly descending in the scale of moral and religious worth. That is the candid testimony of all the sages of Egypt, Greece, and Rome. The burden of life was so intolerable to *them*, under conditions which modern society is striving to reproduce, that while they vainly invoked a Deliverer, the sum

of all their thoughts was expressed, in every dialect which they spoke, in that "wild word" *despair*. They had matchless poets and artists, temples of surpassing beauty, public highways with which we have nothing to compare; yet morally they were dogs, and they knew it. The whole world of that epoch, it has been forcibly said, was divided into "beasts of burden and beasts of prey." The great law of nature was almost abolished, and instead of desiring to prolong life, the chief aspiration of many, including the most cultivated, was to have done with it. There was nothing to live for! And then, in this crisis of its unutterable distress, our compassionate God had pity on that perishing world, and there arose, in sight of heaven and earth, a Vision of unimagined beauty—"coming forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array"¹—to which He, at whose word it sprang into life, gave this triumphal name, "THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD." Man wanted a teacher, and at last he found one. The reign of darkness was over. From that hour no soul of man was doomed to perish for lack of a guide. All that omnipotent love can do for the children of men shall be done, henceforth and to the end of time, by and through this Holy Church. In unity and authority it shall be second only to God. "The glory of Libanus is given to it, the beauty of Carmel and Saron; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the beauty of our God."² We have seen it, and see it now, in the darkest night as in the brightest day, reflected in the burnished mirror of that unfailing Church. Like her Divine Founder she may say to the world, as she points to all the enduring monuments of her long and beneficent reign,—the countless saints whom she has formed for heaven, the unnumbered boons which she has imparted to earth,—“What more could I have done for thee, and have not done it?” Whatever there is on earth at this hour of truth, peace, and hope; whatever it still retains of concord, civilization, and pure refinement, comes from her. If the wrath of the Avenger is turned aside, and the bolt which was about to fall arrested; if the loving patience of God still waits for the return of the penitent; if evil does not wholly triumph over good, nor the children of light lose heart in their combat with the prince of this world; it is the Church, the *unchanged* and *unreformed* Church,—the Church, that is, *as God made her*, before impious imbecility pretended to improve his imperfect work,—which stays judgment, redresses wrong, makes justice triumph, and conquers the gates of hell. All the true joys we taste in this world, and all the rational hopes we form for the next; all the benedictions which God can give or man receive,—the light

¹ Cantic. vi : 9.

² Isaias xxxv : 2.

of faith, the fire of charity, the virtue of the sacraments, and the strong protection of the Saints and of their glorious Queen,—are ours only because we are hers. Even the senseless world enjoys a respite from its inevitable doom, and is less vile than it would be, because she offers every day on her thousand altars the tremendous Sacrifice of reparation. As He listens to her voice, God forgets to punish, and the guilty escape, at least for a time, because the innocent hide them from the Judge.

Yet the thankless world, at the bidding of the cruel chief who rules not to save but to destroy it, greets her only with a frown of defiance, and finds nothing wiser to say to this Messenger of God and Teacher of the Nations than such words as these: "Depart from me, and leave me to myself. The benefits which you offer have no attractions for me. Your counsels weary and your reproofs affront me. I loathe the unity which has its source in authority, and the order which can only be maintained by submission. Chaos and anarchy have no terrors for me. They are the element in which I live. I have not, as you seem to imagine, any need of you. I can teach myself, or remain untaught. I am my own law-giver, prophet, priest, and king. When I am tired of one code of laws, I make another. If you provoke me, I can make laws for you as well as for myself. I have done so before now. Your impotent sentence, by your own admission, only takes effect in the next world; mine enforces its penalties in this. You and yours have had some taste of them already. There is war between us, not peace, and we serve not the same master. If I cannot have order except in alliance with you, I dispense with it; and if I must perish, as you tell me, I would rather perish without your help than be saved by it."

We seem to understand now why even He who came to seek that which was lost said: "*I pray not for the world.*"¹ Must we, then, conclude that its case is hopeless? Not quite. The Church will plead for it to the last with her mighty intercession. She is able to save not only her own, but many who as yet know her not. She will save by *teaching* them. The world may stop its ears, but the great Mother of all elect souls will not cease to speak. The Spirit of God is upon her, and speak she must. Even in this age of pagan Secularism she will continue to teach; and there is joy in the thought that many a poor captive of the world and the sects will listen in spite of himself, and, while she perseveres in teaching, will consent at last to be taught.

¹ John xvii : 9.