

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

VOL. XV.—APRIL, 1890.—No. 58.

---

## THE TRUE AND THE FALSE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL REFORM.

A FEW months ago, there appeared among the editorial articles of the *New York Herald* one in which the writer discusses the question of the most fitting residence for the Pope, in the event of his being driven from the lawful seat of his authority in Rome.

The substance of this essay was then already committed to paper, but the editorial in question furnishes so appropriate a text for our matter that a few sentences are here selected to serve that purpose.

"It is clear that a residence in America would be a serious mistake, amounting, in fact, to a misfortune. The Vatican is conservative in its methods, while public opinion in America is decidedly radical. We have little reverence for the past, and are engaged exclusively with the future. Authority goes for nothing with us, and reverence for it is every year on the decrease. A powerful, an omnipotent individualism pervades the continent, and this strong personality, backed, as it is, by an independence which is fearless and at times reckless, renders the republic an unfit home for an ecclesiastical monarchy. American Catholics are loyal to their Church, but they are apt to concede nothing, unless it squares itself with their own judgment."

That a "powerful, omnipotent individualism pervades this continent," in the sense and to the extent indicated with evident satisfaction by the *Herald*, is, we think, questionable. That all the

VOL. XV.—13

evils of our age, and those which threaten the peace of our own dearly-loved country in particular, are the noxious fruits of that pagan philosophy which only needs to be clearly exposed to excite disgust and repudiation in the heart of every true American, we are quite sure; and are equally certain that the fundamental principles of our government are the affirmations of the very opposite philosophy, that of the Catholic Church; and that all the hopes we fondly cherish of realizing our higher ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity are based upon that philosophy, whether in the social, political or religious order.

Despite the warning of an acute observer of popular manners and beliefs that "there is nothing to be expected from descending to philosophic discussions with some generations; to express their injustice, the nursery tale is best"; and, though we are forced to observe that this present age, which boasts so loudly of its spirit of inquiry and freedom of thought, really thinks but little and only echoes the too-often undigested and flippant opinions of the popular press and the lecture-platform, we have no mean estimate of the good sense and vigorous understanding of our people, to which one may, therefore, venture to appeal, with a not unreasonable confidence of obtaining a fair hearing and intelligent judgment.

One must needs descend to grave philosophic discussion in the present instance, for the subject forces us to get down to a calm consideration of fundamental principles, with the purpose in view of solving, if haply we may, the greatest of all questions which must be answered by this present generation—Which of the two philosophies, essentially antagonistic as they are in idea, expression and spirit, now contending for the mastery of human affairs, can be relied upon to furnish a philosophical criterion of that true progress of the human race which is universally sought for, and justly so, under the titles of reform, of social regeneration, of struggles for personal independence and intellectual liberty? Is it the Catholic Church, with its principles of unity and authority and its efforts, based upon a divine altruism, to establish the one and sanction the other; or, is it Individualism, with its principles of disintegration and "increased loss of respect for authority," and its pleas for universal license, the fruit of human egotism? And, on the contrary, which of the twain clearly furnishes principles, and shows in practical results sure indications of progress downwards, of degeneracy, of instability in human affairs, and a consequent abridgment, if not the imperilling, of all man's inalienable rights? Here are two definite questions for the serious attention and reflection of men who are willing to think and are not afraid to face logical conclusions.

We do not propose to discuss the question of the truth of the Catholic religion, either against the denials of the multifarious

sects of Protestantism on the basis of an assumed revelation of divine truth and of divine will in the matter of the eternal destiny of mankind; or against agnostics, self-styled rationalists and scientists denying the certainty of the existence of God and the need or even the possibility of a revelation. Protestantism, as erroneous Christianity, is fast losing all hold upon the masses, and all its contributions of evidence in proof of the existence of God and of His incarnation in Christ are received by unbelievers as just so much more argument to strengthen the claims of the Catholic Church. Protestantism is only an object of contempt in the eyes of intelligent unbelievers, among whom there is a common consent, as one frequently hears, that, if Christianity be true, the Catholic religion is alone its perfect and reasonable exponent.

It is the rational principles of Catholic philosophy, their deductions and application to human affairs, of which a clear exposition is now, in our humble opinion, more urgently called for than special proofs of the divinity of its religion, both to meet the antagonistic claims of the rationalist and to counteract the influence upon our own people of the dangerous sophistries abounding in all contemporary literature.

We are looking for an affirmation to which no one will take exception, and we think we have found one: "The pressing need of the hour is reform." So say the social and political economists; so say the doctors of law and divinity; so say all the philosophers, even the agnostic. There is no call for a division; for the voice of acclamation arises from the laborer, the mechanic, the tradesman, the physician, the lawyer, the priest and preacher, the grave statesman and witty satirist, the scientist and artist, the learned and ignorant, the rich and the poor, each from his own field of observation and from his own arena of suffering, as he attempts to frame a reply to the urgent demands of human aspirations, or give a response to the piteous appeals for human compassion. And we will add, the hour of pressing need is the hour of the human race which has been long in passing and whose end is not yet sounded. All history, as a narrative of human events, is but a record of reforms, social, scientific, philosophical, political and religious. The standpoint assumed by the historian, from which he views and criticizes the past, is one which to him at least is a real plane of higher elevation than what is occupied by the region he surveys. What appears in greatest prominence, and as subject-matter the most worthy of record, are those events which show mankind struggling to achieve some reform and progressing through reform to what is esteemed as better and truer. All artists know what is meant by the brilliant points and high lights in drawing and painting. Such are the world's reforms. They are the brilliant points, the high

lights, in the historical picture. They are the centres of interest, for the simple reason that what most deeply concerns the man of the present is this or that similar scheme of reform whose realization now enlists his keenest sympathies and absorbs his highest hopes.

But whence does the philosopher of history derive his idea of what is better and truer? Upon what principle does he found his comparison of past reforms or of present progress with other states and efforts of the race? We shall see. Without an idea of equilibrium, *i.e.*, of perfect, universal equalization of opposing forces, no idea of comparative inequality in power would be possible to the intellect.

But there is a very important and bed-rock question which must first of all be answered: Why are men not satisfied with the state of things present to them? How do they come to know, or even to suppose, that the balance of man's intellectual and moral capabilities, manifested especially in the general social result, is not in equilibrated perfection? Why have they never been satisfied in the past with things as they found them? Why is it now received as a self-evident proposition that things are not what they might be? Why would the same proposition have been received as equally self-evident at any period of the world's history? In a word, why is mankind ever announcing the necessity of a reform, and ardently looking for the coming of some inspired or singularly-gifted genius who, as a living personification of the yearned-for progress, shall be to his age a Reformer, a Liberator or a Saviour, proved too often by the rising of some egoistic charlatan after whom the ignorant multitude run with eager and deluded haste to their own bitter disappointment and destruction? The answer to all these questions would appear to be also self-evident. Men cannot be satisfied with what is felt to be a condition lacking in that perfection, the possibility of which they are innately conscious of, as they are as well of a consequent constitutional longing, with an ever-present will, to realize it. This universal consciousness of a possible perfection for humanity is in little distinguished from an inherent natural instinct.

In every order of life man possesses and cherishes in his heart of hearts an ideal of perfection which he sadly acknowledges is not his now, but which, with honest effort and fair play, may yet be realized by the race. No one will venture to dispute the assertion that man always bears within himself a desire of well-being and the consciousness of his own dignity, neither of which can be explained unless he possess an ideal of perfect well-being and of perfect manhood. But, even if he be conscious of a possible future perfection, why should he complain, as he has always done, that

the times as he finds them need mending? Why should the times be, not only unequal to his aspirations, but be judged as often worthy to be satirized and condemned as unjust and untrue, defrauding him of his rights, and, like a convict's ball and chain at his heels, impeding his footsteps in the way of a freer, higher, better and happier life? One would think the common word of mankind should be: So far, so good; well to-day, to-morrow better; Excelsior! Did the monkeys, from whose arboreal abodes we, who have ascended in nature, have descended to live in houses, as the evolutionists would have us believe, complain that their times needed mending, and their tails shortening? Do the unfortunate minority of the monkey-tribe, who have been outstripped in the race for manhood, still chatter in their own fashion for reform and strive to rub off their caudal appendage which, by some unaccountable mistake or oversight in the law of evolution, had to be curtailed instead of developed to make a man of him? Are not the times and tails of monkeys good enough for them? Why are not the times of men good enough for them also? This question is put expressly, and not without reason as will presently appear, for the benefit of those prophets, priests and disciples of the most simon-pure individualism, who believe in the monkey-ancestry of humanity, and must consequently deny to mankind, as will be shown, the ever-present consciousness of an ideal of perfect manhood. These are the philosophers who, it would appear, when they wish to exalt any object, find no other way except by depressing what they do not elevate.

We cannot be made to believe in the dissatisfaction of the monkey, nor in his ever-present yearning for reform of his times or of himself, unless it can be shown that he has or had an idea of unrealized, yet realizable, perfection. Certainly, there is no other way of explaining the universal dissatisfaction of mankind with its present state.

Who told man his times were degenerated? Who tells him so now? Where did he get his idea of perfection possible of attainment? Philosophers, historians and scientists—all agree in asserting that mankind is ever making progress; some say in nature, and all say in acquirements. Why does he care to make progress? How does he know he is not perfect now? Does the fact of actual progress supply a philosophical basis from which the idea of perfection is derived, and inspire discontent at its long delay? Then will we believe that the monkey had an idea of perfection and equally with unhappy man damned his times for being out of joint, and industriously applied himself to get rid of his tail? "Oh, no; only rational creatures can have ideas." Ah! we understand. It was when the monkey had developed into man and became able to

reason and to progress as a man, that the idea of perfection entered his mind. Observation by comparison of actual progress develops the idea of possible perfection. Tell that to the gaping multitude who think not, but no philosopher worthy of the name will listen to you. For, that were to argue from the possible to the real, from the particular to the universal, which cannot be done. That were to argue from individualism, the philosophy of the formal, discrete and conglomerate, to the Catholic system, the philosophy of the real, concrete and organic unity. Perfection is not comprehensible, save as a logical, synthetic, harmonious unity, and progress *in medias res*, being essentially discrete, could never give the idea of perfect unity without the previous idea of the synthetic totality.

Parts are not parts of a whole to the mind unless there is, at least, an ideal conception of the total whole of which they are parts.

So, the human intelligence could never obtain an idea of intellectual or moral perfection, which is the synthetic expression of perfect nature, unless human nature, at some time or other, was in actual possession and observation of it, and thus transmit that idea as a perpetual, natural inheritance to the successors of the race.

Man does not, therefore, aim at reform of his present state, attained through the processes of struggle, and thus make actual progress, because such bits of progress, when compared one with another, give him the idea of future possible perfection, but all his efforts at progress are, in fact, based upon his constitutional desire to reform and reinstate an original perfection, of which he has indeed the idea, and a deeply-rooted one, because he is painfully conscious of its original possession at some period of the race, of which he is an individual expression, both corporally and spiritually, and conscious, as well, that such original perfection is an attribute of mankind which has become vitiated and degenerate.

In vain will the individualist make use of the subterfuge that man, as a rational being, has intelligence of the principles of contradiction, and hence can distinguish more from less, in both the logical and the ethical order, *i.e.*, he knows what is greater from what is less; what is higher from what is lower; what is better from what is not so good; and, therefore, by scientific observation of positive advance to what is comparatively greater, higher and better he deduces the idea of an actual perfection to be attained. But, again, no such idea can be deduced by the principles of individualism. For the idea of perfection, as either a logical or an ethical affirmation, is not the idea of a product by addition or multiplication of being or of quality of being, but rather the idea of harmony from equipoise between the possible or acquired condition of being and its destiny originally inherent in it, answering to the question of: What is its end or final purpose? The equilibrium of a one-

pound weight with another pound is as perfect as that of countless millions of pounds. Now, the imperfection of mankind is due to its state of disequilibrium, which can itself only be affirmed to be such by virtue of the idea of perfect equilibrium, which his original destiny affirms constantly to his soul as necessary to perfect harmony and consequent happiness and peace of body and mind and spirit.

Individualism has no such definite ideal of human perfection, and never pretended to formulate one—a forced confession of its utter inability to offer any criterion for the solution of the enigma of life. But the philosophy of the Church, and it alone, clearly posits such an ideal, by affirming it to be man's perfect equilibrium and harmony with God; and his present state of imperfection is thus plainly seen to be due to a want of this equilibrium, which the pain of discord and his aspirations for that supreme harmony and union with the All-Perfect, once had but now lost, are ever impelling him to re-establish.

No wonder that the peoples whose civilizations were fashioned by this divine philosophy have exhibited among all classes of men a marvellous spirit of social contentment and peace, to whom life was no insoluble enigma to fret the heart out with unsatisfied longings and drive the chartless wayfarer to suicidal madness and despair, for they possessed the master key that opens the mystic doors of both time and eternity: "Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all other things shall be added unto you."

No wonder that the philosophy of individualism, having no ideal of perfection, should have no definite end to offer in the acquisition of science, of material goods, or even of moral virtues; but throws back the soul into the gloomy refuge of an egoistic misanthropy, inspiring only a vague craving and savage lust for more, simply as more. Of its disciples, it was written long ago: "The eye of the covetous is insatiable; he will not be satisfied till he consumes his own soul, drying it up."—(Eccl., xiv., 9.)

The true reformer whose works show a real progress does not, therefore, propose a new theory of existence, the discovery of which he claims as an original invention, as if mankind had never yet known how or why to live. The reformer who is a restorer of perfection goes to work to mend the world as he finds it, correcting aberrations in human life from its ideal equilibrial harmony with truth and right and justice, be it in society, in government, or in religion, by recalling mankind to the contemplation of first principles; not new ones, but principles which are eternal, and in human nature constitutional as the foundation of his sublime destiny.

A most important and undeniable conclusion is evidently deduced from the foregoing considerations. As the history of mankind

evidently shows, and as it is, in fact, little else but the record of reformation by re-affirmation of first principles, and especially of man's original ideal of perfection, human life may be said to have always been in need of mending. And that mending has been the work of the reformer, each in his own age, to bring about the special renewal of society, and effect the needed healing of the nations. Mark what follows. Nothing can need mending that is not broken, and what is broken was once whole, all boastful "honest opinions" to the contrary notwithstanding.

It does not need the theologians to teach mankind that the race is fallen from its original high estate; all history and every man's personal experience gives irrefragable testimony to this truth.

Hence we demand, as logically imperative upon the reason of every man who unites his voice in the common acclamation of assent to the first proposition—The pressing need of the hour is reform—that he also give unqualified assent to the conclusion drawn, that reform (which is, indeed, progress toward perfection) is based upon the idea of an original perfection of man of which some original cause has deprived humanity. From which, as well, follows the indisputable corollary that, as the ever present longing and striving for what ought to be better argues present imperfection through loss of the perfect, that imperfect state and consciousness of liability to fall back, even from an acquired civilization, proves that man is degenerate, and needs, not progress in the sense of our modern demagogues and atheistic philosophers, but regeneration; and that his efforts towards what is indeed progress is due to a perpetually impelling instinct which urges him to re-establish the lost perfection of the race.

So reform is indeed progress, in that the age is bettered by its success; and progress is reform, in that a higher and truer realization of the original perfection of mankind is being achieved. So both ends meet. If man seeks for future progress in perfection, he instinctively argues from the standpoint of a perfection past and lost. He bases his right to demand an improvement upon what he has, and the right to complain justly that things are not what they might be and should be, based on the self-conscious truth of the idea he has of a former excellence of which he is a disinherited heir through somebody's fault, folly, or misfortune, to his great damage and suffering.

We beg the reader to consider well the ground upon which this truth places us. We will find it a point of vantage from which we can discern and measure the whole bearing of the vital questions which this generation, with no little agitation of spirit, is striving to solve. We will find it a point of elevation, a summit amid the varied and lofty heights of human speculation, hidden from many



by the clouds and mists of the prevalent sophistries and skepticism of the day ; an elevation from which we can calmly look forth and clearly survey the wide horizon of human thought and effort within which are displayed the movements of the contending forces, marshalled by the two antagonistic philosophies of the age, to decide the fate of our present disturbed and as yet, it must be confessed, uncertain civilization.

To the intelligent reader it need hardly be said, that the principle which affirms all evolution of human life to be referable for its logical realization to an original creative ideal of perfection being once accepted, one is put in possession of an infallible test which readily solves many of the theories of cosmology and sociology now striving to force themselves into notice.

By the ingenious use of the popular term "Progress," taken in the sense of the individualist as "development by accretion or by fateful evolution," founded upon no ideal, the unthinking multitude have been gradually prepared to accept as worthy of examination, at least, and as even probably true, the pretentious theories of self-styled scientists, who not only deny the unity of the race, but would have us believe that man is only a developed beast ; that the present and past barbarous and tyrannical despotisms, pagan manners and idolatrous religions, are only logical progressions of the race, and that the savage state is a true inchoate, embryonic condition out of which the later civilizations, with all their higher and purer customs and religions, have deduced by a fateful, inexorable process of evolution.

Tested by the light and evidence of the irrefragable principle we have established, viz., that progress is the reform, regeneration and reconstruction of mankind, based upon a primitive and ever regnant ideal of perfection, all such theories are ruled out at once as fallacious by the philosopher, and as despicable by all who love and honor the worth and dignity of the human race.

For he who announces disorder, error, degeneracy, physical, intellectual or moral sickness, by the very fact affirms the prior existence of order, truth, perfection, physical, intellectual and moral health. To assert the contrary, as the philosophy of individualism does, whether in the mouth of the Socialist, the Positivist, the Evolutionist, the Agnostic, or the Transcendentalist, is not only in open contradiction to facts as manifested in the history of the human race, but is plainly irrational and absurd. The existence of God has not been denied or erroneously conceived until it was affirmed in truth. Man does not, nor can, proclaim and denounce himself as a sinner, in that he has permitted or by his fault brought about a state of society which culpably restrains human liberty, and in which the majority of mankind are robbed of just and in-

alienable rights, until he is conscious of a high and perfect estate in comparison with whose perfect elevation of nature he measures his present deplorable and guilty condition.

It cannot be other than senseless for one to assert himself to be in the wrong, if he cannot tell what is the right which he fails to believe or do, and which is both logically and actually prior to his infidelity or unjust deeds. The Socialist, who denies original sin in man, yet accuses society of actual depravity, must confess to the existence of an original perfect society upon which he is obliged to confer the power of free will to deprave itself without man being at all responsible for the act or its consequences. That is absurd, to be sure; but then, no one has the saying more thoroughly by heart than the Socialist: "*Populus vult decipi et decipiatur.*"

By the innate conviction of man's primeval dignity and excellence of nature, confessed by his continual efforts at reform, based, as they evidently are, upon the right to claim all that has been conferred upon humanity, and his willingness to purify by the expiation of personal effort and self-sacrifice the sinful, or, if you will, unfortunate, degeneracy of his age, man is also the constant witness to the two most important fundamental truths which can engage the attention of the philosopher, viz, the unity and solidarity of the race, by virtue of which all past gains, glories, dishonors and sufferings of mankind are reckoned ours by inheritance, and all its future possible fate claimed by anticipation.

We prefer to quote just here the very clear and concise exposition of these principles made by Donoso Cortes, in his remarkable work, "Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism:" "From the dogma of the concentration of human nature in Adam, united to the dogma of the transmission of this same nature to all men, proceeds, as a consequence from its principle, the dogma of the substantial unity of mankind. The human race, being one, ought at the same time to be multiple, in conformity with the law which is the most universal of all laws, and is at the same time both physical and moral, human and divine, and in virtue of which all unity engenders plurality, and all plurality resolves itself into unity.

"Mankind is one by the substance which constitutes it, and it is multiple by the persons who compose it, and therefore it is one and multiple at the same time. In the same manner, each one of the individuals who compose humanity, being distinct from the others by that which constitutes his individuality and blended with others by that which constitutes him an individual of the species, that is to say, by substance, becomes in this way at the same time one and multiple, like the human species.

"As a consequence of both proceeds the dogma according to

which man is subject to a double responsibility—that which is proper to him alone and also that which belongs to him—is common with the rest of men. This responsibility which man shares in common with others is called solidarity. This law of solidarity is so universal that it is manifested in all human associations, and men cannot unite to form a society without falling under the jurisdiction of this inexorable law. Through his ancestors man is in a union of solidarity with past ages; through the successive duration of his own acts and through his descendants he enters into communion with future ages; and, as an individual and a member of domestic society, the solidarity of the family weighs upon him. As a priest or magistrate, he enters upon a communion of rights and duties, of merits and demerits, in common with the magistracy or the priesthood. As a member of a political association, he becomes amenable to the law of national solidarity, and finally, in his character as man, the law of human solidarity reaches him, and, notwithstanding that he is responsible in so many different ways, he preserves his personal responsibility whole and intact, which none other diminishes, restrains or absorbs.

“He may be virtuous, although a member of an offending family; uncorrupted and incorruptible, although belonging to a depraved society; a prevaricator, although a member of an irreproachable magistracy, and a reprobate, although a member of a holy priesthood. Yet this high power, which has been granted to man, of withdrawing from this solidarity by an exercise of his sovereign will, does not in anything alter the principle in virtue of which, in matters in general and without diminution of his liberty, man is what the family is in which he is born, and what the society is where he lives and breathes. Such has been, throughout the duration of historic ages, the universal belief of the world.”—(Pp. 231–5.)

This principle of solidarity, then, which is fundamental in the Church, and may be said to be the principle of cohesion and of continuity both of the race in general and of all particular associations of it, such as the family, the state and the Church, is one which, both logically and practically, the antagonistic philosophy of individualism should deny. Both the individualist and the Catholic philosopher, however, affirm these doctrines of the unity and solidarity of mankind, but they do so in a different manner.

The first, following the Positivist and Socialist teaching, ascribe to humanity as to society a unity which is self-sustaining and possessing a kind of deific existence, worthy of worship, of which men are not the constituent elements and the constitutors, but rather its slaves and instruments. So far as this philosophy holds to the truth of the solidarity of the race in agreeing that all men are subject to a common responsibility both active and passive, it does so

by an absurd process of reasoning backward and downward, deriving this responsibility from the autonomy of a supposed organic humanity and society which cannot be other than mere fictions of the mind, and, true to its egoistic principle, conferring upon them all the attributes of individuality and necessary existence. On this doctrine reposes, as one plainly sees, the whole system of secularism as applied to Church, state, the family, education and all their egoistic, soulless social organizations.

It is not the salvation and liberty of individual man that it affirms and seeks, but the supremacy and odious tyranny of the fictitious unity it presumes to create and set up for adoration. Hence its boasted maxim: "*Salus reipublicæ suprema lex.*" Such a doctrine is standing the pyramid upon its apex, from which nothing but instability in all human affairs can be expected.

If this doctrine of solidarity, in the sense affirmed by the Church, were not true, no man need ask the question which the would-be "omnipotent" philosophy of individualism, conscious of its utter inability to solve the enigma of life, has of late so diabolically thrust upon a generation already shamefully distinguished for suicide: "Is life worth living?" since all would readily agree that it is not. If I inherit nothing from the race but the puny existence of a few miserable hours, to be spent in painful efforts to support life, to solve (?) the problems of science and enjoy life's fleeting and unsatisfying pleasures, of which the more intense in delight are the briefer in duration, and at life's termination lose all hold upon the future, in that I cease to be one of the elements and fruits of human existence, what can possibly avail the cost of life to me, though it were the longest, and, as the world reckons it, the happiest? If, at birth, I do not wake to an inheritance of the merits of the past glories of mankind, or as a new heir to the majesty of its sufferings, what has life to offer me but a shallow goblet of bitter pleasure to be drunk in selfish thirst, then gladly escaping by a welcome death the jealous envy of those who have had less, and the haughty contempt of those who have had more than life has given to me?

But to the instinct and belief of all men it is far otherwise. Any life is deemed worth the living because it neither begins with birth nor ends with death. The unity of human nature is not formal, but real; both because all animal life is vivified by the one unbroken stream of blood uniting the original man through all men who are to be in a common solidarity of physical existence, and also because of the mysterious transmission of the same tri-une spiritual stream of intelligence, will and affections uniting man's spiritual nature in a common solidarity of intellectual and moral responsibility.

Humanity is, then, no empty-sounding word. It is multiple and

diverse in its manifestations while ever being one and common in communion of life and responsibility. Individuals are thus endowed with the common dignity of the race referable for its exalted character to the divine ideal of it, share its fate, and perpetuate the race in perpetuating themselves and their acts.

*Nihil humani a me alienum puto.* So say all men, embracing in thought all mankind as both giving to and receiving from him racial honor and sympathy, and bearing with him the obligation to relieve human suffering and expiate human sin. What are the past glories of mankind to me, if they are not mine, by being the glories of *my* race? From whence, besides, could possibly spring up within me the glow of enthusiasm as I scan the proud record of man's past noble achievements, or stir within my heart the impulses of a worthy ambition to have so lived as to deserve well of my kind, if I live not both in the past and in the future? Are the sufferings of mankind in the past as I learn them, in the present as I both know and feel them, and in the future as I foresee them, be they for justice's sake, in the defence of truth and right, or even its sadly-earned woes for its follies and its sins, nothing to me? Then am I not its born image and son, but a miserable abortion, a monster without traceable ancestry, whose living is indeed of no worth to it, and of but counterfeit value to myself.

Upon this indisputable doctrine of solidarity reposes the validity of the charter of all human rights, social, political and religious; since the idea of right is inconceivable if an intercommunion of human responsibility be denied, which again, without the affirmation of a common nature, would be equally inconceivable and absurd.

To it must be referred as well the justice of the universally recognized claims to the glories of an honorable and illustrious ancestry, the principle of national identity, the consecration of the flag, and other symbols of national unity. It is the fountain of the virtue of patriotism. It is implied in every common effort made to lift a brother man out of the ditch, and it gives meaning and more lustre than the eye seeth to the crown of laurels which a grateful people weaves for the brows of its heroes who have gained its victories, or to be laid as a pledge of memory upon the graves of its martyrs who have gone to death for its love. Eliminate the doctrine of the solidarity of humanity, and all those ideas, purposes and sacrifices would be meaningless.

That the true estimate of the worthiness and hopefulness of human life, with all the aspirations, sympathies and union of effort directed to a common end, are justly held to be universal with mankind (whose exceptions are deemed wanting in reason or despised as stupid misanthropes), we are logically led to the conclu-

sion that mankind are naturally Catholic in philosophy, and would be universally so in effect but for the inconsistency born of man's perverse and degenerate will. Partaking of the like mysterious perpetuity of life and communion of glory and suffering with which the race itself is endowed, not only nations and families are thus kept in their own orbital system of harmonious movement, each in its own order working out a special destiny, but individuals as well establish a similar solidarity, within whose circle of common virtue and spiritual power are drawn those who look up to them as the fathers and founders of their states, their civilization or their religion. They are descended from him by the same law of solidarity through spiritual genesis, entering by inheritance of his spirit a new sphere of responsibility. And this is equally true of those wretches who have prostituted their genius in establishing tyrannies of rule and systems of false philosophy and religion, as it is of those who rise upon the horizon of their age as brilliant orbs diffusing life-giving rays of truth and justice, whose aurora is marked by the dawn of new liberty and peace, and whose setting leaves the world that was illumined during their transit renewed and refreshed, with all its fields of human labor already heavy with full harvests of virtue.

These are the men who truly reform their age, and in reforming their age they reform the race.

And if they do so, it is because they will be found to have recalled mankind to the contemplation of its pristine state of perfection by announcing eternal principles of truth, liberty and justice; not principles to be gradually elaborated by progress, but principles that were ever in the right of mankind to claim as a basis of life, because the same idea of perfection was ever his. And because they appear when the times sadly need mending; when the spirit of degeneracy has so enslaved the human mind as to shut out from clear view that original purity and destiny of the race as to lead men to ask, as some do now, if indeed life be worth the living, we find them recalling the despairing nations to new hope by some supreme word of wisdom or deed of supernatural heroism and self-sacrifice, holding up in strong contrast the dignity and inalienable rights of man, the possibilities of bringing their nature up to perfect conformity with its highest ideal, when compared with the present state of decadence and peril of social, civil or religious damnation.

You cannot arouse enthusiasm for reform without first convincing those you wish to reform that they are degenerate. But to do this you must evidently instruct them, or rely upon their possessing a lively consciousness of a former state of perfection of which their present one is a deterioration. Of what use to appeal to the degenerate scions of a royal house to assume the reins of

power and practise the virtues of kings upon the sole plea of progress from their degraded plebeian state to one of sovereignty. They must be told, if they be ignorant, of their illustrious descent, and made to feel that it is a duty to sustain the renown of their noble ancestors. Of what use to breathe the word freedom into the ear of the shackled slave unless you teach him that all men are born of a free and equal nature; that he has been made a slave after and not before birth; that personal liberty is, and always was, the sacred birthright of man, and therefore that his slave-father begat, and his slave-mother bore, and brought him forth into God's world a free man?

What is true of one inborn right of man is true of all, for the ideal of humanity is and ever was "the perfect man." So we again affirm as past all doubt or contradiction that mankind, in reforming itself to what is better, returns to original perfection by reaffirmations in act of its ideal rather than that it advances to the realization and enjoyment of a product by gradual development of human nature, of which his present imperfect condition is embryonic and in process of formation; a truth which at perhaps no time of the world's history it would appear was ever so commonly ignored or openly denied as in our own boastful age of science. That was a bitter satire of the musician Grétry, but it has its application quite as aptly and forcibly now as when it was penned a century ago. *Plus nous deviendrons savans, plus nous nous éloignerons du vrai*—The more scientific we are becoming, the further we are taking ourselves away from truth.

Why do the names of great and true reformers live as saviours or their race or nation? Why does the name of Jesus Christ—*Nomen adorandum in æternum!*—live as the only true, universal Saviour of the world? Because, in their own order and degree, according to the sublimity of their mission to restore and build up again the fallen fortunes of humanity, they presented and enforced certain fundamental truths whose criterion can only be found in man's original supremacy of nature and endowments, and thus established a movement, not of progression to an unknown and baseless perfection to be hoped for through the working out of unintelligent physical laws, but of restoration, of redemption, of regeneration, as the basis of an ever-present, urgent ideal whose spiritual forces irresistibly attract all mankind. This fully explains why man is ever uneasy and discontented with his age and his environments.

Herein lies the secret of all his unbounded aspirations. This is what renews his courage in failure and disaster, gives value to every well-meant effort, and more than repays the heaviest sacri-

fices that his own life, or the lives of his brother-man, may demand of him.

Such men appear at what are clearly seen by later historians to be critical periods in civilization. The vitiated and perhaps fast-corrupting order in society, in government or in religion, is seen to have threatened confusion, revolution and ruin. It was as if the bond which held together the once stable arch of civilization had become disintegrated and broken, and the once harmoniously related stones of the structure had rebelled against each other, refusing to give and yield mutual support, no longer obedient to the law of solidarity which alone can produce unity. Rebellion against unity is ever due to the affirmation of the egoistic principle of individualism; the principle "of man's first disobedience and the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe"; the principle of that arrogant self-worship which hurled the first star of heaven from his orbit of supernal order, and bade him utter his word of defiance. "Better to reign in hell than to serve in heaven." Then, indeed, is it felt to be true that the pressing need of the hour is reform, and it is explained why the inspired saviour of his age always exhibits in both word and action a singularly impatient haste. He knows that the seeds of death are more rapid in their germination than the seeds of life; he knows that the swift and swirling waters of the unrestrained torrent go quickly to the abyss with loud threatenings of death and destruction; but the peaceful stream which irrigates the smiling fields, imparting to them new beauty and fruitfulness, flows but slowly and in majestic silence. Yes; he sees that there is pressing need because he is one of those who rise before the dawn, and during the shadows of the night, when men sleep in fancied security, he has seen the "enemy" a-field sowing broadcast the cockle which will surely choke the good grain ere it can ripen for a harvest. None so quick as he to see the rapid commingling of the thousand and one streams of error and passion into a torrent of ungovernable anarchy, in which society will soon be hopelessly overwhelmed. No wonder he speaks in eloquent haste and with an imprudence of language which scandalizes the slower of heart. No wonder the tones of his voice are marked by the shrill accents of warning and alarm. He is the chosen seer of the hour, and beholds with prophetic glance the impending ruin and corruption threatening his generation. Therefore he who announces and secures the accomplishment of the needed reform is truly a saviour. He saves society; he saves the country; he saves the rights of his fellow-men; he saves the child, the woman, the family; he saves religion; he saves, it may be, the whole human race.

Degeneracy is intellectual and moral death. Reform is revivi-



fiction, and he who is the true reformer and saviour brings new life to the world. Now we begin to see what is fully meant by the phrase, "the regeneration of society." No wonder we hear Him who was and is the true Saviour of mankind in all orders, the supreme regenerator of all human relations, use the significant declarations: "Ye must be born again;" "I have not come to destroy the law, or the prophets, but to fulfil." No wonder we hear Him calling men to imitate the perfection even of God. No wonder that this chief affirmation was "Union," as it has always been of the divine philosophy and theology which He promulgated to the world, and, following the law which governs the march and victory of truth, is slowly but surely bringing about that divine "restitution of all things" which he prophesied, and which his first apostle took it for granted men knew of and yearned for,—that restitution having been the "speech of God by the mouth of His holy prophets (reformers) from the beginning of the world."

The reformation of the world inaugurated by Jesus Christ would be more than an incomprehensible enigma, it would be a senseless paradox, but for the truth of the original perfection of mankind, to the restitution of which, by regeneration of all human relations, His reformation called humanity and condemned the spirit from which all degeneracy arises. No less incomprehensible would be the doctrines of perfection as so completely announced and clearly defined by Him unless the principles of solidarity and of racial unity be assumed as their ethical basis. With these unquestionable fundamental principles in view we commend to our sincere reader another perusal of the Gospels and Apostolic Epistles. If, mayhap, we have pointed out to him an untrodden path to the "Mount of Vision," it is not unlikely he will say, as more than one has said who came to their perusal in the light of a true philosophy—"Though I have studied the Scriptures from my youth up, yet I am as he who readeth for the first time."

Reformers are saviours of men, therefore, not in that they inaugurate a new era of progress from nothing to something, but in that they restore and save what is lost by restoring a broken, disintegrated and dissolving condition to unity and harmony; by a re-formation of humanity in its various relations; by a re-affirmation of that divine unity impressed upon the race, and whose preservation is concomitant with its struggle for perfection; and not the proclamation and establishment of a new, factitious unity, a conglomerate aggregation devoid of all vital principle and powers of fecundity; a body lacking, indeed, continuity, as it lacks an original ideal, and therefore impossible of logical definition.

Whence we get a sure criterion of the value of all great movements in the social, civil or religious order which offer themselves

for recognition and assent as evidences of true progress and logical development of the mental, physical and spiritual powers of mankind. True enlargement and advance in any or all of these orders of human life and activity are dynamically centripetal, not centrifugal. They lead to the Catholic affirmation, reconciliation and reconstitution of unity and harmony, and are abhorrent to the negation of it by the teaching of principles which produce multiplicity of antagonistic forces in society, Church and state by the introduction and fostering of the principles of individualism.

It is clearly illustrated on every page of history that degeneracy and disintegration of their autonomy in peoples, in their social relations, in the state and in religion, has ever been signalized by the oblivion of this doctrine of solidarity and consequent denial of equal rights and common responsibility between the governor and the governed, everywhere enjoyed as they were valorously defended when the Church named both their religion and their philosophy. Long before that philosophy, which is essentially adverse to the highest interests of mankind by contrast of principle, justly named individualism, had crystallized into socialism, communism and anarchism in society, into secularism in State and judicial administration, and in education, and into self-destructive sectarianism in religion, it had shown its power to disintegrate humanity, to establish castes and classes full of irreconcilable enmities and jealousies, "producing," as says that eminent writer already quoted, "the bloody and sensual egotism of the ancient pagan nations, transmitting a tradition that certain peoples of the common race were constitutionally cursed and disinherited of all right and quality of virtue, and forever condemned to legitimate and perpetual slavery."

Hardly less degrading was the racial egotism of the Jews, to whom Jesus Christ came as the equal Saviour of all men, and to whom the Catholic Apostle *par excellence*, St. Paul, knew neither barbarian nor Scythian, neither Jew nor Gentile, neither bond nor free. How could either the religion or the philosophy of this God-man or His apostle be anything else but Catholicity? Rome in her imperial despotism, Athens in her insolent and rapacious aristocracy, under the pretence of democracy, and later nations, whether enslaved under a king or a commune, who have equally dared to insult the outraged dignity of man by flinging in the face of Europe the arrogant boast, *l' état c'est moi*, all manifest the like fruits of the same egoistic philosophy. That boastful maxim of the ancients, *salus populi suprema lex*, was but a specious pretext for absorbing the rights of the man in the interest of the nation. It seemed a proud and a glorious thing to say, "I am a Roman citizen." "I am an American citizen" sounds tame in comparison

to it. And yet that Roman citizen was nothing but a political slave, the tool of a pagan Socialism, a sort of State Freemason. He was a citizen; true, but he was not a man. For what was the pagan political doctrine as laid down by the jurisconsults of Rome? Of the subject—*Non licet esse vos*—you have no right to exist. Of the government—*Princeps legibus solutus*—the ruler is bound by no law; or, as the English have translated for themselves, the king can do no wrong.

M. Guizot, no mean philosopher of history, and beyond suspicion of personal bias in favor of Catholicity as a religion, contrasts the influence of the ruling power of the Church with that of Protestantism upon society in the question of popular rights. "After the fall of the Roman Empire and during the Middle Ages it was the Papacy which, in the turmoil of the violent disorders of the times, was the defender and the patron of the rights of the people."—(*L'Église et la Société Chrétienne*, p. 103.) Of Protestantism he says: "Protestants have not known how to reconcile the rights' and necessities of tradition with those of liberty, and the cause of it undoubtedly has been that the Reformation did not fully understand and accept either its principles or its effects, whence arises a certain inconsistency and narrowness of spirit."—(*History of Civilization*, Lect. 12.) And of Germany, the school where Protestantism learned both its philosophy and its religion, he says that "far from demanding political liberty, it has accepted, I should not like to say political servitude, but rather the absence of political liberty."

That the philosophy of Protestantism is individualism it were superfluous to prove, for its fundamental principle, the right of private judgment, is perhaps the most extreme application of that philosophy ever made. Its palpable fruits of dissension, disintegration, its vain attempts at union of its sects, and its foremost position in the ranks of those who would achieve the impending ruin of our present civilization by secularizing the family, education, the state, and even religion, all go to prove that its germinal principle is identical with that of the philosophy of individualism.

If ever the Church was called upon to sound the note of alarm, it is now. Many of the wisest and best, albeit in matters of philosophy most ignorant, as well as the designing and the worst, have boldly thrown out the standard of secularization of what is essentially divine in constitution, and whose triumph would be marked by dissolution of the family, abolition of the rights of property, which repose ultimately upon the supremacy of the doctrine of the solidarity of the family (the principles of the perpetuity of both family and property), the weakening, if not the total annihilation, of government by anarchical maxims, and the gradual, as already patent, de-

generacy of national and personal moral virtues resulting from the secularization of education, whose most evident and undeniable product, and one likely to prove the most poisonous and disastrous to the destiny of our civilization, is the prevalent tendency to that Satanic intellectual egotism, under the name of Agnosticism, which, in denying the divine origin of the race, denies its moral responsibility to a Creator, and fears not, even at the price of self-stultification, to deny the very existence of the Creator Himself.

If we ask others from whence arises the present widespread belief, in spite of its glaring violation of justice, that the right of education inheres in the state, the answer that we get, or that they dare to give, is the Socialist maxim: *Salus reipublicæ suprema lex*. If we ask ourselves the cause of this slavish yielding of parental right and base shirking of parental responsibility, we can find it nowhere but in the prevalence of that "omnipotent" individualism in the philosophy of the day which not only logically ought to, but practically does, deny the divine constitution of both family and state, and refers the existence of both to individual human caprice and rule. Denying the law of solidarity as of divine constitution, it denies all basis and reason of responsibility, frets under its restrictions, and eagerly catches at some creature of its own, which it holds the state to be, upon whose body (for soul it has not been able to give it) it can shift the whole burden. No wonder that its schools are soulless and godless. The individualist doctrine of Socialism does not recognize divine authorship in anything, least of all in the state. Its god is its own creation, and all its authority is derived from the individual. The maxim, *vox populi vox Dei*, is theirs in its basest sense.

If we ask our modern jurisconsults why there is such a shameful exhibition of weakness in ruling powers, shown in the difficulty of the conviction of the most notorious criminals, and the widespread delay of judicial decrees in the courts, we get nothing but a miserable excuse in reply, either that political influence is more powerful than law, or that there are not enough courts to dispose of the indictments. If we ask ourselves the reason, we find it again in the popularity of the same atheistic philosophy which would secularize both the judiciary and the state. Shall a thing judge and condemn its own creator? By whose will and idea of justice shall they judge? Through whose strength shall they dare to be strong?

By an unerring and logical instinct both governments and judiciary, becoming more and more the creatures of the individual, at whose beck and call, known as popular opinion, they move as puppets, lose sight of their divine right, and become weak and timorous. Penalties are relaxed and justice is long delayed. Pleas

of insanity and eccentricity are willingly accepted where the sense of the immorality of crime no longer prevails. The force of the traditional ordeal of the oath is less relied upon, or even dispensed with, and replaced by the affirmation of the individual. Secularization of the state and the judiciary must, therefore, be followed by the sight of criminals stalking, with shameless effrontery, the open streets, corrupt officials who defy impeachment, and even murderers, whom the godless courts dare not or care not to imprison or hang.

If we seek in the journals the expression of the public opinion concerning the outgrowth and dangers of the daily multiplication and despotic tyranny of soulless corporations, trusts, and the like evidently godless and irresponsible associations, we find grievous and bitter laments enough over the suffering of the slaves of labor forced to come under the grinding grasp of the heartless capitalists who, taking advantage of modern improvements in machinery, have reduced the once intelligent mechanic to an unintelligent mechanical instrument, thus entirely bereft of the natural happiness arising from being the producer of a whole work, crushing out all individuality and stunting the growth of all natural genius. All this we find, but no explanation of the principle which is thus building up an insolent and omnipotent plutocracy which buys and sells votes of men who call themselves freemen, but goes further and corrupts officials in high places, who, in turn, pass laws and render decrees to serve the ends of their base masters.

What is the cause of this alarming degeneracy, for what else will any one dare to call it? We must look for the cause in its germinal principle, the same one that lies at the root of all degeneracy. It is the same omnipotent and damnable individualism, the satanic philosophy which identifies the attainment of superior scientific knowledge, the possession of more wealth and of more power with essential good, to be sought for their own sake. Who thus seek these things? Those whose rule of life and base ideal of happiness is to enjoy what pleases them, not what *ought* to please. Selfish egotists, for whom the whole world is a prey to be caught and to serve their caprice or diversion as one cages a wild beast; apt pupils in the school of that philosophy which knows no responsibility because, both by its theories and its practice, it denies the divine solidarity of mankind, which alone can establish fraternal relations between man and man, and waken in the breast all those common sympathies, affections, and tender, yet noble, virtues, lacking which society would soon be broken up into hordes of jealous and vindictive savages, whose hand would be against every man without law and without conscience.

Such is individualism. How do you like it, brethren, as a crite-

tion of the perfect civilization you picture to yourselves as the hope of humanity? How think you it will serve as the basis of the much-needed reform you so urgently call for to-day in society, in politics, and, if you will, in religion? Are you quite sure you would like to see the philosophy of individualism wholly omnipotent? If one comes forth announcing himself as a present saviour of his age, will you enlist under his standard, and make yourselves and children his sworn disciples if such be his doctrine? Is it not plainly the doctrine of a destroyer, and not of a saviour, of mankind?

Where, then, shall we find a philosophy which furnishes the doctrine of one who assuredly will be a saviour to our present civilization; which shall render abortive the destructive tendencies of individualism, and moreover affirm principles of conservation of what is good; which will offer the criterion of a true reformation of the present worthy to be called a regeneration of society, and endowed with true generative principles of development and order; will build up a coherent system of thought and life in accordance with the universal consciousness of an appointed perfection of humanity?

There is such a philosophy, and there is but one; the most fitting term for which would indeed be Socialism, were it not that such a term is already identified with doctrines and effort based upon the worst phases of individualism. No other term is left but Catholicity, which indeed it bears. Unlike its antagonistic philosophy, as exhibited in various concrete forms such as Socialism, Communism, Anarchism, or pure humanitarianism, Catholicism is both a religion and (what is not so well known) a complete consistent system of universal philosophy embracing the whole field of human thought and applicable in logical consequence to all human life and condition. The philosophy of its theism, called theology, the philosophy of its faith, is not in any sense different in fundamental principles from the philosophy of its humanism, or pure science. It has but one order of logic for the investigation both of the knower and of the known.

The idea of man's original perfection, of the unity and solidarity of the race, are regnant ideas both in its theology and in its philosophy. In its theology they are dogmas, and in its philosophy they are traditional facts; and it never loses sight of these fundamental truths of human history, life, and destiny in the exercise of its formative and sustaining power, influencing and regulating, sanctioning and defending the solidarities of social, civil, national, and religious life.

It is precisely the affirmation of these truths which puts it into antagonism with all the characteristics that have been noted of the

philosophy of individualism, inspiring opposite sentiments and directing the attention of mankind to the attainment, in one or another order, of a common destiny of glory, honor, progress, and happiness. Stimulating individual excellence, it does so, not for its own sake, but with a view to the superior perfection of the individual as one of many brethren, with whom, if he enjoys superior advantages, he is bound by obligation of a common responsibility which becomes heavier as his personal acquirements are the greater.

Thus it alone has offered to mankind a universal brotherhood, and has been able to diffuse the spirit of a fraternal love which, despite all the necessary diversity of human conditions of life, confers the boon of a supereminent equality fully and practically realized; an equality which is one of the greatest marvels of the world and for which its enemies in vain seek for a solution outside of its own principles. While regarding the acquisition of knowledge, of wealth and power as both legitimate and laudable, which individualism, true to its egoistic principles, fosters and encourages to exaggeration, to the aggrandizement of self-interest and self-conceit, the philosophy of our religion, as the highest and purest altruism, enforces the doctrine of the community of all goods in so far as the common right to life, liberty, and happiness may lay claim under the title of a common responsibility which equally binds the learned and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the capitalist and the laborer, the governor and the governed, a responsibility of reciprocity.

This true philosophy of happiness, as it is of human perfection, is far from placing the means of either in the attainment of any created good for its own sake; whence, among those nations where the Church has been supreme we observe a certain indifference manifested towards the gaining of riches, and the pursuit of mere animal comforts and luxuries; in broad contrast to that feverish, jealous hankering for the amassing of colossal wealth and its enervating environments, which are the well-known and deplorable fruits of individualism, at the expense not only of health and social harmony, but also of those nobler and more refining manners and vigorous virtues for which the civilizations of those people influenced by the philosophy of Catholicity have been signally distinguished.

If Catholic nations worthy of the name have ever been distinguished for their spirit of content with what is moderate, plain, and simple, and for which they are reviled by an age whose god is the almighty dollar, and which hails the invention of every new luxury as a sign of progress, it is because their philosophy was founded not only in the doctrine of Christ which declared the poor as the blessed ones of the earth, but also in the truth of reason

that "*virtus rerum in medio consistit.*" They had their kings and princes, their nobles and lords of great estates it is true, as they had and still have their republics, but they offer to our view a self-respecting, free, virtuous and contented people, firm in the defence of their civil and religious liberties, unenvious of those upon whom Providence had bestowed special powers and wealth. "For aught I see," says an old writer, "they are as sick that surfeit with too much as they that starve with nothing: it is no mean virtue to be seated in the mean." Their philosophy was well expressed by an ancient statesman: "The majority of citizens should be neither too rich nor too poor. Those who are too rich become often proud and insolent, and the poor vile and cunning. The greater number of moderate fortunes, the greater will be the stability of states. A universal mediocrity in this respect is the most wholesome." And history confirms the acceptance of this doctrine when it shows us that until the disastrous revolt of Protestantism, the legitimate child of an antagonistic doctrine, there were so few of the "too poor" to be found in Catholic nations that such institutions of egoistic charity as the "poor-house" and the name of "pauper" as a recipient of enforced state benevolence were utterly unknown.

The enormous and unjust inequalities in worldly possessions which now prevail in modern society, resulting in a threatened disruption of the whole social order, the fears of which are boldly confessed on every page of contemporary literature, cannot be laid at the doors of the Church. It had its high and low classes, its noble and peasant, its prince and mechanic, but it never had, in the days of its "omnipotence" in human affairs, a class out of which were spawned a Communist or a piratical "Trust" company. It has been left to the philosophy of individualism to found the base order of the Plutocrat, and determine the rank of the gentleman by the amount of stock one holds in wealthy corporations; to stir up in the popular mind a morbid craving for the possession of wealth, with all its diabolical train of envy and jealousy between the rival competitors in the mad race for gold, and of murderous hate in the breasts of those who have been thwarted in their desires; to breed a class of bank robbers, of peculating employees, of bribed legislators, of stock-watering thieves, all of whose "operations" are daily heralded and commented upon in language which shows that the popular conscience is so blunted as to deem these iniquities fitting subjects rather for satirical humor than for denunciation, in terms of horror and shame, on account of the indelible disgrace which should attach, not only to the criminal, but to the whole fraternity of our humanity.

He who changes the principles of his philosophy is, perforce, obliged to either adopt a new terminology or falsify the existing



one. Fraternity, Liberty, and Equality are terms as old as Catholicity; and are, indeed, words of spirit and of life in her mouth of no doubtful meaning. Adopted, as they have been, as a shibboleth by the Socialists, they have been employed as watchwords of open and secret societies whose aim is the destruction of all order by machinations against established peace, and the spread of doctrines which would abolish all legitimate authority, the rights of property, and ultimately lead to the denial of all moral virtue and responsibility. Catholic philosophy, true to its principles of the solidarity and unity of the race, feared not to demand both the manners and the moral obligations implied by all those terms. If it taught men that they were brothers, it led them to treat each other as brethren. Nothing is so conspicuous, even at the present day, among those peoples who inherit more or less of the faith and manners of Catholic times, than the mutually polite and urbane bearing and speech, alike of the high and low, the rich and poor, while preserving a singular air of nobility and self-respect which even the very beggar does not lose. Chateaubriand observes that "one can never remark in Spain any of those servile airs or turns of expression which announce abjection of thoughts or degradation of mind: the language of the great seigneur and of the peasant is the same, the greeting the same, the customs, the compliments, the manners are the same."

Another writer gives a singular testimony: "Spain," he says, "is the true land of equality. The least beggar lights his *papelito* at the *puro* of the greatest lord, who allows him to do so without the least affectation of condescension. Strangers, and above all the English, have great difficulty to put up with this familiarity. Servants are treated with a sweetness very different from our affected politeness, which seems each moment to remind them of the inferiority of their condition."

"I will say for the Spaniards," says still another observant traveller, "that in their social intercourse no people exhibit a juster feeling of what is due to the dignity of human nature, or better understand the behavior which it behooves a man to adopt towards his fellow-beings. The wealthy are not idolized; the duke or marquis can scarcely well entertain a very overweening opinion of his own consequence, as he finds no one to fawn upon or flatter him." The whole Spanish literature, says Kenelm Digby, is stamped with this character. "Often have I heard it said and related by our Ancients," says the author of a Spanish romance, "that one ought never to magnify any man for his riches, nor to esteem him less for his poverty, however great it may be." And again: "In Spain the dignity of the man seems to rise in proportion as his rank descends." "In our Galicia," says Sanchos, "the blood is so

generous that the only thing which distinguishes the poor man from the rich is that the former is obliged to serve." What but Catholicity, asks the writer from whom the above is quoted, could have so reversed all notions of the pagan world? And we may also ask what but Catholicity now has the power to reverse the notions of our present revived paganism in society, and establish true fraternal relations among the warring classes which Socialism, with the cry of Fraternity upon its lips and jealous enmity in its heart, has created.

If the blood of the Spaniards was esteemed as of so generous a nature as to confer an equal social nobility upon both rich and poor, it is simply because they were apt scholars in the school of a generous philosophy; one which knew how to proclaim and dared defend the common dignity of human nature, and whose teaching and training established not a factitious brotherhood of mankind of empty name and of treacherous deeds, but a real fraternity founded upon the basis of a pure and exalted altruism whose ideal was drawn from the divine fraternal relations established by Jesus Christ, the Catholic Saviour of mankind, and which realized in wondrous and countless examples the virtues of loyalty, fidelity and honor, of amenity of manners and benignity of heart, and, above all, of self-sacrifice carried to a pitch of heroism the very possibility of which the modern mind accepts with difficulty.

One of the greatest marvels that impresses the mind of the historian is that the Church was not only able to transform the whole order of pagan civilization by bringing all men under its sway to regard each other as brethren, but that it was able to inspire them with a sense of equality, despite the manifold and necessary physical, mental and moral inequalities of mankind, and that, too, not by depressing the high and more worthy, but by elevating the low and mean.

That all men are by nature free and equal, is a doctrine which was first promulgated to a world of tyrants and slaves by the voice of the Church. And what it taught by word of mouth, it had the power to realize in deeds. Only of a nation brought thoroughly under the influence of Catholic teaching could the following anecdote be related: "A king, leaving his palace in company with some courtiers, passed a beggar standing at the gate, to whom he gave an alms, at the same time lifting his jewelled cap in return to a similar salute from the beggar, adding with a gracious smile: "God keep thee, brother." Hearing which, one of the courtiers, affecting surprise at such a speech, said: "Is the beggar, then, one of your royal family?" "Nay," quickly responded the king, "he is not one of mine, *but I am one of his.*" This charming story, *si non e vero*, would certainly be judged as singularly *ben trovato* by

all familiar, through study or observation, with Catholic times and manners, so leavened as they were with the spirit of true equality that the king's daughter was held to be every boy's sister; the little prince every sister's brother.

Modern Socialism is not without its boast of equality as one of its ideal maxims. But who that hears of the various Utopian schemes offered by them as panaceas for all the grievous ills now affecting the social order, cannot see that they hold up to the view of the suffering masses, to whose biased judgment alone they cunningly address their appeal, a spectacle of equality as contemptible in its nature, being nothing more than the establishment of an autocratic state, of which all citizens are reduced to a common slavery as the price of the satisfaction of their mere animal appetites, as it is utterly hopeless of realization; thus cruelly goading on an already over-exasperated and blind multitude to the madness of despair. Persuaded that they are the victims of social injustice, they are easily duped into rushing to the destruction of the whole social fabric, oblivious of, or too ignorant to comprehend, the lessons of an inexorable logic that reformation of society must begin by the reformation of men who make society what it is; that society can have no autonomy apart from the men who constitute it, and therefore the disruption of a present order arraigned as guilty of injustice is no guarantee of a better order at the hands of the very men yet unreformed, who are, themselves, the responsible transgressors.

Certainly not by Socialist doctrine, which denies both the existence and possibility of sin in man, while absurdly illogical enough to denounce in the same breath his chief work, the social state, as one worthy of condemnation and death for its crimes.

The fundamental doctrine of Socialism, that sin is not in man, but only essential good (though by a most inconceivable inconsistency they demand of men a common sacrifice to the ideal god of society they propose to set up for adoration), we find very carefully kept in the background by these Utopian philosophers in their works until they have presented to their dupes the enticing bait of a social plan (it has no pretension to be called order) where all will be equally rich and powerful, all equally clothed, fed, lodged and amused. A notable exemplification of this is seen in that late clever, but specious, Socialistic production, "Looking Backward," by Edward Bellamy, in which this ruse is skilfully performed. It is only when we come to the telephoned sermon near the close of the book that there is the least pretense to offer to the reader anything in the shape of a principle or argument upon which to base the possibility or reasonableness of the Utopian republic so clearly depicted in detail. Then, amid much platitudinous talk, the Socialistic doc-

trine of man's essential goodness and, by implication, his freedom from all moral responsibility, is deftly sandwiched in as the *raison d'être* of the whole fatuitous scheme. A fitting comment upon all that precedes it, and which is evidently used as bait to catch the unreasoning vulgar eye, may be summed up in the language of a quaint old writer, the *Sieur Charron*, in his "Book on Wisdom": "The common people have no other Notion of the public Good but what they are sustained by; nor can you make them believe that any other, either Duty or Benefit, is incumbent upon, or to be expected from, those that sit at the Helm comparable to that of feeding the Subject; as if Society and Government were instituted for no other purpose than to see that the vulgar and poorer sort of Men should never want a full Belly" (vol iii., p. 1089). One cannot but admire the ingenious special pleas which appear on every page of Mr. Bellamy's book; but we are not at all surprised to find him, in company with all philosophers of the Socialist school, inconsistent and illogical when he attempts to grasp the solution of the real problem he has in hand. It is presuming a little too much upon the credulity of his readers to blandly take it for granted, as he does, that all care, sorrow and crime are the results of a defective, comfortable, physical maintenance, and of ignorance in scientific education. But even the cure of society by the elimination of physical suffering and ignorance being supposed, he is obliged to confess that the ideal of perfect human happiness is not yet attained. Playing the role of preacher, he thus summarizes the doctrines of his Credo: "The betterment of mankind from generation to generation, physically, mentally, morally, is recognized as the one great object supremely worthy of effort and sacrifice. We believe the race for the first time to have entered on the realization of God's ideal of it." Who has revealed to him that God's ideal is of a world-life of mankind which shall know neither poverty, care, sorrow, ignorance nor sin? We would be pleased to be told why this presumed divine ideal is not already realized or was not from the beginning, and what brought into the world and kept there (until his visionary date of 2000 A.D.) all the care, sorrow, ignorance and sin of which the world's history is one continuous record. The Socialist is obliged to both assert and deny the existence of evil, to proclaim that it never had a cause, and yet denounce mankind for not setting to work to dismiss it incontinently from the face of the earth. We would like to see something else than mere assertion that all divines and philosophers hitherto have been wrong in their estimate of man as a sinner. Who is to blame for the existence of "the constant pressure" upon this "essentially good" being "through numberless generations of conditions of life which might have perverted angels"? If man is not the sin-

ner, who is? Is it God? And if this were not so inconsistent as to defy comprehension, we find upon the very next page a singular contradiction to the whole Socialistic thesis in his affirmation of the Catholic dogma of man's constitution in original perfection: "It is a pledge of the destiny appointed for us that the Creator has set in our hearts an infinite standard of achievement, judged by which our past attainments seem always insignificant, and the goal never nearer;" a doctrine the consequences of which we have sufficiently enlarged upon in a former part of this essay. Yet this facile writer does not shirk the writing of fine sentences at the risk of taking back on a second page what he has asserted on the first. For, a few lines further on, we find "the return of the race to God" defined as "the fulfilment of its evolution, when the divine secret hidden in the germ shall be perfectly unfolded." Mr. Bellamy is not, so far as this book gives evidence, a disciple of Darwin, but he is a Socialist; and all Socialists are disciples of the school of individualism who, by either name, deny the true solidarity of humanity, deny original sin and its consequences, and, with the usual inconsistency of error, loudly call for reform of a degenerate social order, *the work of man who is not degenerate*. The consequence of such doctrine is plain. There is no original responsibility in man for the care, sorrow, crime and death of which the world is full, neither for the evils of society so much deplored and illogically denounced. All this is nothing but man's "return to God by way of natural evolution of his essentially good nature." There is no more sin in the grievous hurts under which humanity suffers, either in individuals or their associations, than there is in the hurts sustained by a little child who falls in his efforts to learn to walk. The *simile* is Mr. Bellamy's own. "We are now (A.D. 2000) like a child which has just learned to stand upright and to walk." A world without the possibility of sin would be a world without the possibility of moral responsibility. And yet, Mr. Bellamy and his fellow-Socialists find fault both with man and the society he has founded, or rather, after their illogical fashion of reasoning, both with any society not founded on Socialist self-contradictory and inconsistent principles, and with the man whom society has produced.

If the philosophy of Catholicity has ever been the persistent opponent of that logical outcome of individualism known as Secularism, in the family, in education, in government and in religion, it is because it alone affirms irrefragable principles of human liberty. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity are principles of mutual dependence, and resolve themselves into each other. As has been said of those theological virtues, "Now there abideth Faith, Hope and Charity, but the greatest of these is Charity," so the philosophy of Catholicity leads up to a like affirmation, "Now there abideth

Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, but the greatest of these is Fraternity ;" for it is the spirit of human fraternity, forwarded upon the doctrines of the unity and solidarity of mankind, the first and last word of Catholicity, which inspires the aspiration for human liberty, fosters it, judges and defends it, and is impossible without it.

This is readily proved. For what is liberty? It is the enjoyment of the right to be and to do what one *ought* to be and to do. Eliminate the idea of duty and mutual responsibility, and he is a fool who does not see that such liberty as is then at man's disposal is license—the enjoyment of a supposed right of being and doing what it *pleases* one to be or to do ; an expression of egoistic individualism so extreme that it is beyond anything to which barbaric savages have ever been supposed to have descended.

Without the doctrine of solidarity, as affirmed by the Church, true liberty is inconceivable, for upon this doctrine depends the idea of the possibility of society even the most savage. What is Secularism, and how does it nullify human liberty? Secularism is only a polite word for social Atheism, the last word of the self-conceited philosophy of individualism, which, in the expressive diction of the day, counts God out in all questions where man has the opportunity of voting ; a stupid and self-destructive democracy which finds its blind adherents in all political parties in our beloved country, practically annulling the civil and religious rights guaranteed to a vast number of its common citizens.

The atheistic principle of Secularism nullifies liberty. How? By rendering the exercise of it impossible through denial of the means of its exercise. What are these means? The practice of obedience for love (in the spirit of fraternity) to legitimate authority. The obedience of fear rendered by a slave is not the means of liberty ; neither is forced obedience to unlawful and tyrannical authority.

Legitimate authority must first be posited before even rights can be either affirmed or defined ; and the enjoyment of them, which is liberty, is equally referable to it, both for its definition and defence. Liberty is not self-defined nor self-guaranteed. That is the fallacious dream of individualism under the title of Anarchism, which is a logical deduction from the denial of sin, for the negation of sin is a denial of responsibility to law. The idea of penalty thus vanishes with the rejection of all authoritative power in government, human or divine. This is succinctly expressed by M. Proudhon, at once Socialist, Anarchist and Atheist. He says in his "Confessions of a Revolutionist" : " All men are free and equal. Society is then, as well by its nature as through the function for which it is destined, autonomous, that is to say, having the right of self-government. The sphere of activity of each

citizen being determined by the natural division of labor, and by the choice which he makes of a profession, and the social functions being combined so as to produce a harmonious effect, order results from the free action of all. From this must proceed the absolute negation of government; therefore he who attempts to govern me is a tyrant and usurper, and I declare him to be my enemy." Secularism is here distinctly affirmed in claiming a complete autonomy for that "collective being called Society," as M. Proudhon elsewhere terms the social order of humanity according to Socialist doctrine, which, as said before, is essentially atheistic. He talks of the "logic inherent in humanity," of the "superior reason residing in it." The absurdity of such a claim hardly needs demonstrating, since what is denied of the individual cannot be affirmed of the species.

This "collective being called Society," according to all Socialists, is a sort of collective or conglomerate deity to take the place of the one True God, and whose visible personification, to be servilely adored as the supreme wisdom and source of all right, they have all agreed to find in the State. It is then the triumph of Socialist ideas when we see the State assuming control over the laws of marriage, which govern the existence and defence of the family, over the education of children, and compelling even the Church to acknowledge it as either supreme head or supreme protector. That the liberty and equality of social, civil and religious rights guaranteed to us Americans by the Constitution are not based upon the individualistic doctrines of Socialism is a truth which we fancy no true American citizen would think of questioning for a moment, yet the daily encroachments of State power in absorbing the rights of the individual, following upon the base and supine yielding up of those rights one after another by men with "Liberty and Equality" upon their lips, but with the spirit of servitude in their hearts, setting up a tyrannical Moloch of their own fashioning, to which they are blindly sacrificing themselves, their children, their honor, and the sacred dignity of their human nature, now more justly termed state-like than god-like, all this widespread and daily increase of the influence of the philosophy of the would-be "omnipotent" individualism is unquestionably preparing the way for the ultimate triumph of Socialism and the consequent revolution which would make us a nation of slaves. Yet the writer in the *New York Herald* tells us that "authority goes for nothing with us, and reverence for it is every year on the decrease." What can he possibly mean by "authority"? Does he mean to assert that reverence for that divine authority to whose sanction alone we can presume to refer the divine ideal of a republic which we proudly claim to have set up and are laboring to realize, is daily on the decrease; and that we have

already so far lost all consciousness of the ultimate *raison d'être* of our national existence and glorious prestige that it can be truly said that it "goes for nothing with us"? Alas! then is the sacrifice of our boasted liberties nigh completed, and the last link is being forged of the fetters with which socialistic individualism would bind the freest and noblest child of Liberty ever baptized at the font of God's politically regenerated humanity.

Although the writer's assertion greatly exaggerates the truth, and was doubtless made use of as mere clap-trap to furbish up the worn-out absurdity that obedience to the spiritual authority of the Holy Father contravenes loyalty to all civil government, and is especially incompatible with true obedience to our own republican institutions, yet it is so far true that the poison of individualism is undoubtedly weakening the due respect for legitimate authority in both the spiritual and the temporal order to such a degree that the wise and good are beginning to entertain just fears for the ultimate consequences of its increase, and are casting about for the affirmation of the very principles assuring national stability and peace which only Catholic philosophy can furnish. The writer's language plainly offers about as complete a condemnation of the philosophy he exalts as one could well wish to see.

Liberty is no bastard offshoot from the unconsecrated cohabitation suggested and devised by individualism. It is the legitimate offspring of a divinely sanctioned union, and lawful heir to all the rights and privileges possessed by its noble parentage.

Again we repeat it, Liberty is not self-defined nor self-guaranteed. Reposing upon responsibility, it must be both defined and guaranteed by legitimate authority, which must posit the criterion of responsibility and define the limit of obedience and duty. Authority as such has nothing to do with what it *pleases* one to be or to do, but it has all to do, as is evident, with what one *ought* to be and to do; by definition, judgment and vindication of right, no less than the just exaction of duty.

Secularism, the godless social order, is the enemy, the very denial of human right and liberty, by the denial of the divinely legitimate authority vested in the institutions of the family, the State and in religion. Authority logically correlates an author. Who or what is the author of the family, of the State, of religion? Is it mankind, either in discrete individuals, or in collective humanity? That the authorship of neither man, the family society, the State, nor the Church is to be found in themselves is evident. For no reality posits its own ideal. The ideals of all these realities logically precede their existence, as they must be referred to for their *raison d'être* and their *raison d'agir*. Man is not his own author, because he does not posit the ideal either of his being or his act. As the founder of the family, of society, of



the State or Church, he is nothing but an instrument, realizing the divine ideals of these institutions. Not being his own nor their author, he is not the origin of his own or of their authority, which he or they exercise in the fulfilment of a divinely appointed destiny. Neither does authority find its origin in concrete humanity, as so confidently claimed by the individualistic Socialist. For what is his humanity or his society? Nothing but a "collective being," a conglomeration of distinct, diverse individuals. *Quod non habet, non dat.* If the source of authorship of the race, of family, State or Church, is not possessed by the individual, *i.e.*, by humanity or society in the discrete, neither can the individuals confer it upon humanity or society in the concrete. Are the individual stockholders of an insurance company, for example, either singly or collectively, the authors of their body, and do they give it authority? By no means. It is no body, has no real or legitimate existence or authority until the State, by the supreme authority vested in it, has declared it organic and conferred being and subordinate authority upon it. Both the humanity and society of the Socialist is precisely in the same condition; conglomerate, devoid of all principle of union and perpetuity, as they are utterly devoid of the characteristics of original authorship or the power to exercise or confer authority. In a word, their solidarities are not referable to a true origin of authority, and therefore cannot legitimately, because not logically, germinate other subordinate solidarities. And the family, the State and the Church would be in the same plight; devoid of an original authorship, to whose primal authority and will they owe their being, their rights and their liberty to be and do what they ought, and whose responsibility is a reflex of the original responsibility reposing in their author.

Secularism is the reposing of authority in a source which has no creative power, *i.e.*, in the creature of the individual, assuming the power and prerogatives belonging only to God, claiming the right to make or unmake the family, the State and the Church at its will. Secularism is the principle of all institutions which proclaim that they exist and act without God; and so we see such States developing, as we have had past and recent examples to prove, godless governments, flaunting the flag of a republic and wielding the sword of the autocrat, hanging with cowardly truculence upon the popular will for existence and the right to rule, the judiciary swayed by the political influence of the hour; the education of the masses cunningly claimed as a high prerogative of the godless State and becoming equally godless as it, nay, not godless, for the State has declared itself omnipotent, and has usurped the throne of sovereignty once held by the True Divine God, and presents itself as the new human god to be obeyed. So we see that this new sovereign divinity seizes at once by violence and con-

fiscation upon the property once given to and held as sacred to the honor and worship of the God it has dethroned. What wonder after this to find the human race itself attacked by claiming the right to make or unmake the family, which it dissolves by its laws of divorce in defiance of the fiat of the Old and True God! What wonder to see the State made up of *citizens* indeed, but who are no longer free and independent *men*! So we see the ignorant populace stimulated to rapine and revolution by socialistic denials of the rights of property, and claiming for the State the universal and absolute proprietorship of it. So we see State churches, their cringing hireling priesthood begging at the doors of their imperial master the dole of subsistence, and waiting for its beck and nod to preach the everlasting and supreme word of the Old and True God in terms to suit the taste of the new one and its blasphemous pretensions. Conceived by the spirit of the world and knowing no other end to propose to mankind but the possession of what the world esteems as good, we see the fruits of Secularism in the multiplication of soulless corporations and trusts, insolent and greedy capitalists absorbing the whole field of individual free labor, grinding the face of the poor, forcing them into its slave workshops, its brutalizing factories and mines, and mocking their helpless efforts for freedom of labor and appeals for just remuneration with the arrogant question: "Well, what are you going to do about it?" "Are we not brethren?" they cry. "Have we not human blood and feelings and aspirations for happiness as well as you?" "What responsibility have we whether you live or die?" is the response. "We are disciples of the new gospel—Every man for himself. If you want liberty and happiness, find it as best you can; we are not obliged to give it to you." Liberty with Secularism? The thing is a delusion; from which the enslaved people in vain strive to awake until there shall arise a saviour of his age who shall whisper in their ears the long-forgotten and long-despised name of God. To oppose the rapid descent to revolution and anarchy, to regenerate a depraved and suffering humanity that philosophy and that religion, which alone possesses the mysterious power of divine equilibrium, knowing as it does how to sanction, sustain and defend legitimate authority, without sacrificing the rights of the subject, must proclaim the rights, the liberty and justice of humanity as identified with the rights, the liberty and justice of God.

It has not been written in vain, "The poor man cried, and the Lord heard him." "Whatsoever God hath joined, let no man put asunder." "By Me kings reign and judges decree just things." "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Go preach the Gospel to every creature; whosoever heareth you, heareth Me."

The philosophy of Catholicity, as well as its religion, posits all

authorship and authority in God. As author of all humanity and its solidarities, He holds Himself responsible for what He has ordained. All the truth, goodness and beauty, all the reasonableness of being what it is and of acting as it does; that is, the essential conformity of the reality of any work with the ideal of its author and the rectitude or equilibrium which self-consciousness affirms as existing between its will and the author's will, and which constitutes the logical and ethical basis of what is called "right" and of the liberty of its exercise, must be identified with and referred to the personal authority and responsibility of its author. If man demands life, liberty and happiness in the exercise of his rights, in the social, political or religious order in his own name, he will receive nothing but the mocking answer, "Art thou stronger than I?" He must demand them in the name of God, their responsible author, and he shall not cry into an ear that heareth not, nor appeal to an arm that is not able to save. Catholic philosophy teaches its disciples, and Catholic faith inspires its believers to refer all the strength and hopes of human rights to the authority of the name of God. "*Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.*" "*In Te, Domine, speravi: non confundar in æternum.*"

In vain will the delusive philosophy of individualism comfort the victims of injustice and oppression with the pretence that when the crushed are in the majority, then relief can be had. Are rights only rights because the majority so adjudge them? Dashing this false and cowardly doctrine to the ground, and exhibiting it in all its absurd weakness, a man who, inspired for the moment by the truth and heroic philosophy of Catholicity, arose one day in the might and majesty of the truth which possessed him, and uttered a sublime sentence, which deserves to live forever: "Do you tell me that I speak in vain; that the majority is against me? I tell you that with God *one* is a majority."<sup>1</sup>

If then by God's mercy there is to appear to this self-worshipping and self-willed age a saviour to whose life, words and spirit of self-immolation it is to owe its regeneration and deliverance from the degenerating and destructive influences of satanic individualism, it must now be quite evident what his doctrine will be. Under the encouraging teaching and beneficent influence of the philosophy of Catholicity, society, vainly seeking for a rational solution of its disorders elsewhere, will again take heart and resume its true relations with its divine author. Again will the ideal of man's original perfection as he came forth from the hand of the perfect author be set as a goal of divine attraction for all human life and effort. Again will man hear, and not as a chained slave despair of understanding the truth which makes him free. No

---

<sup>1</sup> Wendell Phillips.

longer will the doctrine of the Church, which weighs the material and temporal in the balance of the spiritual and eternal, be looked upon as paradoxical. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." "Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all other things will be added unto you." Again will arise the spirit of a true humanity, which will breathe hope into the aching breasts of the down-trodden peoples, the spirit of a divine liberty, equality and fraternity, whose sanction and defence has ever been, as it can only lie, in that divine philosophy which is the expression of the God-word in man, the logic of regenerated reason, the doctrine of the true and only Saviour of the world; which, indeed, like its author, can be scorned, traduced, scourged and crucified, but, like Him, will surely pass through the grave without corruption, and rise again heralding in the dawn of a new day of life, liberty and happiness for mankind.

---

### CATHOLIC WORSHIP AND CHRISTIAN ART.

*The Offices and Ceremonies of Holy Week.* Card. Wiseman. London, 1839.

*Genius of Christianity.* Chateaubriand. Baltimore, 1856.

*Histoire de l'Eglise.* Par l'Abbé Darras. Paris, 1874-1888, Vol. 30, Appendix.

*Mores Catholici; or, Ages of Faith.* Digby. New York, 1888, Bk. III.

IT is impossible for one who studiously examines the majestic cathedrals of the old world, especially those that are still devoted to the purposes of Catholic worship, to be unimpressed by feelings of wonder and surprise; and if the student know aught of the Catholic ceremonial, and be withal an unprejudiced observer, he will be unable, as a result of his study, to resist the conviction that Mother Church has done both wisely and well in wedding Catholic worship to Christian art.

As he gazes on the gorgeous paintings and noble sculptures that adorn both nave and chancel; as his eye glances admiringly along the clustered columns that rise in stately splendor to the Gothic vault above; as he perceives the massive organ whence reverential music is wont to steal in waves of solemn sound; as he