

Re CONSIDERATIONS

ORESTES A. BROWNSON

Civil and Religious Freedom from *Seeking the Truth*

These admirable Discourses on civil and religious liberty have appeared, we believe, in a separate publication, but we have seen them only in *Le Correspondant*, where they were first published. *Le Correspondant*, by the way, published on the 25th of each month, is a periodical that we can conscientiously recommend to the general as well as to the Catholic public. It is able, learned, liberal, spirited, sincere, and earnest. It is the organ of the liberal Catholics of France, the only Catholics in Europe who sympathize with the loyal people of the Union in their war against the slavery Rebellion; and the best account of the struggle in which we are now engaged, that we have seen in any European periodical, has appeared in its pages, written by M. Henri Moreau. Its writers are such men as the Bishop of Orleans, the late Père Lacordaire, Count de Montalembert, Count de Falloux, Auguste Cochin, A. Pontmartin, Henri Moreau, M. de Meaux, Prince de Broglie, and others hardly less eminent, all fervent, orthodox Catholics, devoted heart and soul to civil and

"L'Église libre dans l'État libre. Two Discourses pronounced in the General Assembly of Catholics, held at Mechlin, August 18–22, 1863. By M. Charles de Montalembert. 'Le Correspondant,' for August and September. Paris: 1863." From *Brownson's Quarterly Review* 1 (July 1864): 258–91.

religious liberty—men who combine the faith of the martyr ages with the civilization and progressive spirit of the nineteenth century.

These Discourses are able and eloquent, as is every thing from the illustrious author, and exceedingly well timed. They are well matured, well reasoned, and contain views and advocate a policy which no friend of religion and civilization can prudently disregard. They are grave and earnest, bold and manly, noble and chivalric; and they have been read with surprise by non-Catholics, and with delight by all Catholics who do not happen to have their faces on the backside of their heads. They, however, have not given universal satisfaction, and several journals have entered their protest against them. They have incurred the decided hostility of *La Civiltà Cattolica*, a periodical printed at the Propaganda Press, and published at Rome, under the eye of the General of the Jesuits. They have also incurred the wrath, we are told, of the new *Dublin Review*, said to be the organ of His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster. They do not appear, however, to have been opposed by the Catholic organs of the United States, all devoted, as they are, to slavery, and hostile to liberty, whether civil or religious; but this is, probably, owing either to the incapacity of their conductors to understand their hearing, or to the fact that their author is a Frenchman, and a former peer of France. Had he been a plebeian, or had he been born a Yankee, and a Yankee who will not concede that to be a Catholic it is necessary to denationalize himself, and become a foreigner in his native land, they would doubtless have honored him by a more formidable opposition than they have as yet received from any of the Catholic organs of Europe. Becoming a Catholic in this country means becoming an Irishman, or at least a European; and if one becomes a good Irishman, a good European, or a decided anti-American, he is a good Catholic, let him defend what doctrines he may.

That M. de Montalembert's Discourses in favor of civil and religious liberty should incur opposition from *La Civiltà Cattolica* is in the natural course of things. That periodical is the organ of Society which has outlived its day and generation, and which is now not in-

aptly symbolized by the barren fig-tree of the Gospel. It was a noble and illustrious Society in its origin, and successfully did it labor to check the progress of error, and to place the Church in harmony with the civilization of the age. Its members were men of high character, often of noble birth, with the training and polish of men of the world, the literary tastes and culture of the most accomplished Humanists, the erudition of cloistered monks, the freedom of motion of secular priests, and the ardent charity and burning zeal of apostles. God gave them a great work to do, and they did it, and did it well. They deserved and won the admiration and gratitude of the Catholic world. But the Society being only a human institution, subsidiary to the Church, was not able to adapt itself to the wants of all ages and nations, and the time was sure to come when it would grow old and disappear, like all things human, or remain only to cumber the ground. When it had done the special work assigned it to do, its strength was exhausted, and it became necessarily unable to perform, or even to perceive, the new work demanded by the rapid social changes and new developments of civilization which the movement and progress of events are continually introducing. The world went on, and as it neither would nor could go on with it, the world went on without it, and the once illustrious Society of Jesus stands now calling out for it to stop, for it is going too far, or seizing hold of its skirts and trying with all its might to hold it back.

The Jesuits understood the wants of the age from the middle of the sixteenth century to that of the seventeenth, especially on the Continent, better than any of their contemporaries, and fulfilled with great success that extra-hierarchical mission which, under the new Law, may be termed the mission of genius, and which corresponds in some measure to the mission of the prophets under the old Law. But in their controversy with the Jansenists their glory culminated, and they ceased to lead the civilization of the world. They never understood the eighteenth century; and, holding the chief places of influence, they suffered the world they themselves had educated, to lapse in philosophy into shallow sensism, and in religion into the crudest

infidelity. Still less do they understand this nineteenth century. They are out of place in it. They themselves feel it, and, determined to be what they were or not to be at all, they seek to arrest and turn it back to what the world was when they were in their glory. They are good men, learned men, excellent scholars, earnest, devoted, and self-sacrificing priests—none more so in the Church; but they understand not the work of this age. They see not that this age demands men who are to it what St. Ignatius Loyola and his Companions were to theirs—men of large minds and a free spirit, who dare break from routine, to reject the dry technicalities of the schools, to take the world as they find it, to accept the new learning, the new social order, and to Christianize the new civilization by baptizing, not anathematizing it. The Jesuits did their work by harmonizing, not dogma, which is immutable, but theology, the schools, and ecclesiastical administration, with the new developments of civilization in the sixteenth century; but they see not that this is precisely the work now needed in regard to the civilization of the nineteenth century. They wish to retain the world in the mould in which they had cast it. Hence, with all their virtues, with all their private worth, they do little for our age, and still less for our country, with which they have no sympathy. They can no longer restrain or lead the civilized world, and their successes are confined to uncivilized, savage, or barbarous tribes, or to peoples whose civilization is far below the European in the sixteenth century.

But this is not the worst. The Jesuits have formed the Catholic world, at least the ruling portion, in their own image. They have, directly or indirectly, the forming of our Catholic youth, and to a great extent the direction of our consciences: their theology, dogmatic and ascetic, is that generally taught in our ecclesiastical seminaries, and nearly all who pass for earnest, devoted, and devout Catholics are in some sense Jesuits. They have immense influence still in the Church by means of their past, on which they live, if not by their present labors. Catholics who fail to recognize them as virtually the Church, are looked upon by their devouter brethren as wanting, if

not in faith, at least in pious fervor and holy obedience. Hence it is that the dominant influence of the Church today is thrown in favor of an order of things that it is impossible to recall, and against a social order that it is usually impossible successfully to resist, even if it were desirable, as it is not, to resist it. There is in the Church a party, and it is at present the dominant party, called in Italy, the *oscurantisti*, who make war à outrance on what is called modern civilization. It would be a mistake to suppose that they find their *beau idéal* in the middle ages; they find it rather in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when were consolidated the great centralized monarchies of Europe, and when the ecclesiastical administration was centralized and placed in the Roman bureaucracy. The best, ablest, and most active representatives of this party are unquestionably the Jesuits. It is not strange, then, that the Count de Montalembert finds their organ opposed to him, just in proportion as he departs from the traditional policy of the *oscurantisti*, and labors to place the Church in harmony with modern civilization. The Jesuits belong to the past; he belongs to the present and the future. If he increases, they must decrease; and if he realizes his idea, they must abandon theirs.

M. de Montalembert loves his Church, is earnestly devoted to his religion, and has from his youth devoted himself, his life, and his fortune, liberally and heartily, to the promotion of Catholic interests. He is, as all the world knows, a man of eminent ability, of brilliant genius, of varied and solid erudition—one of the most accomplished scholars, polished and vigorous writers, and eloquent and graceful orators of France. He is an ardent lover of liberty, a zealous champion of constitutional government, and holds that in the modern world the freedom of the Church can be secured, only in the freedom of the citizen. He defends civil freedom for its own sake, and also as the necessary condition of religious freedom. In the so-called middle ages, churchmen sought the freedom of religion by asserting for the Church the supremacy in temporals as well as in spirituals—in establishing a real *clerocracy*, or government of the world by the clergy. But this, had it succeeded, would have annihilated the state, reduced to naught the

lay society, and prevented the development and growth of the people, and the real amelioration of their social condition by their own efforts. Civilization refused to submit to it. The wars between the two orders, which fill the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, ended finally in its defeat, and, unhappily, in the establishment of the great centralized European monarchies, and the subjection, in turn, of the Church to the temporal order in both Catholic and non-Catholic states. The Church had little more freedom in the Catholic states of Europe, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, than she had in non-Catholic states. She was held by the state in a sort of gilded slavery; she enjoyed large revenues, as does the English Church now, but she dared not oppose the court. In exchange for her freedom, she had the sad consolation of having the state exclude, at least so far as the law went, all heretical or dissentient communions. Externally the Church appeared to be protected by the state, but she was in reality simply enslaved, as in a prior age the clergy had sought to enslave the state. The consequence was that religion everywhere suffered.

M. de Montalembert perfectly well understands that the clerical dream of the middle ages cannot be realized. Men will not and cannot be made to submit to the government of churchmen in temporals. The experiment has been tried and failed. The subjection of the Church to the state, of the spiritual to the temporal, is repugnant to the essential principles of religion, for in principle it is the subjection of God to man. He therefore maintains that the subjection of the state to the clergy, as well as the subjection of the clergy in spirituals to the state, must both be rejected, for both are equally hostile to religion and to civilization. Hence he demands a free Church in a free State, or, as we express it, the freedom of the Church in the freedom of the citizen. That is, the recognition by the Church of the freedom of the state in temporals, or in its own order, and the recognition by the state of the freedom of conscience, and its own incompetence in spirituals. The state does not prescribe or tolerate, it protects the religion of the citizen, not as approving or disapproving it, but as, before it, a natural and inalienable right. As before the state all citi-

zens are equal in their rights, so all religions, not *contra bonos mores*, or incompatible with the public peace, embraced by its citizens, are equal before it, and entitled to equal and full protection. Hence, a free Church in a free State implies the liberty of false religions no less than of the true, the freedom of error no less than the freedom of truth,—the precise order which obtains in the United States.

Now to this order, which is the order of liberty, our *obscurantists* are opposed, because they do not believe in liberty or desire it; because they hold it wrong to guaranty the liberty of error; and because they hold that to do it were to cast reproach on the past conduct of the Church, who, wherever she has been strong enough to have her own way, has approved a contrary policy. The *Civiltà Cattolica* admits that there may be times and countries in which it is wise and even necessary to concede liberty to error, as, for instance, where error is so strong that it cannot be suppressed by civil pains and disabilities, and it is impossible to maintain the unity of faith by the strong hand. It would concede it to France, to Belgium, to Austria, to Great Britain, and to the United States, but as a condescension on the part of the Church, not as a natural right before the state, or as a principle applicable to all times and places. And this seems, in fact, to be all that Montalembert has judged it prudent formally to demand. He asserts his free Church in a free State, not as a universal rule or principle, but as a practical necessity, in our times and in most countries, for the promotion of Catholic interests. He apparently shrinks from its assertion as a natural and indefeasible right. But the concession which the *Civiltà Cattolica* says the Church makes is not all we demand, because in it the Church reserves the right to revoke it when she deems herself strong enough, or judges it for her interest to do so. We venture to assert, as a universal principle, that the State is incompetent in spirituals, and that wherever civilization is sufficiently advanced to admit the organization of the state, or, what is the same thing, the civil organization of lay society, every citizen has the natural right to be protected in the free enjoyment of his religion, or the religion of his free choice.

We except from this rule only tribes or peoples in what may be called their infancy or minority, in which they correspond to the period of childhood in the individual. Here some precautions against error other than instruction may be necessary, and some degree of repression may be resorted to, on the ground that the mind is not yet developed so as to have the right to be remitted to its own judgment, or to be in fact held responsible for its own judgment, either before the human or the divine law with regard to tribes and peoples in this state, which is not that of civilization, we will engage in no dispute. For a certain period I have the authority from God to govern as well as to teach my child, and even to require him to conform to my religion. But that period ends when the child has come to years of discretion, and I can then legitimately use only instruction and moral suasion. So, where a people is or has become civilized, the Church must confine herself to her spiritual authority, and make no resort, directly or indirectly, to force to repress error or to maintain the truth. There is no civilized people on earth to which we would not apply, as an absolute rule, the doctrine asserted simply as a practical doctrine by M. de Montalembert. We accept it not as a concession or as a condescension; we demand it as a right, and we maintain not only that it is impolitic, but that it is wrong, to withhold it. The minority past, the nation, as the individual, is free. "But then you condemn the past and even the present conduct of the Church, which you are well aware that as a good Catholic you cannot do." Be not too fast, my good brother. The Church, we concede, has in all ages and nations been governed by pure and holy motives, and done what her authorities judged to be, under the circumstances, the wisest and best; but we have yet to learn that her authorities are incapable of error in their practical judgments, or that the Church herself is, or claims to be, infallible in anything except dogma. The practice of the Church is not the rule of faith, though it may be cited as throwing light on it. The Church has received the *depositum*, the faith once delivered to the saints, and in the preservation and definition of that, as every Catholic believes, and no one more firmly than we, she is, by

the assistance of the indwelling Holy Ghost, infallible. Her dogmatic canons are infallible and irreformable; but we have never heard it pretended that she is infallible in her human legislation, in her administrative canons, or her practical conduct.

The Church, in the sense we now speak of her, means the ecclesiastical authorities, and these have made and continue to make serious blunders, as it would be worse than folly in any one who has studied ecclesiastical history to pretend to deny. A pope has said that England was needlessly lost to the Church by the mismanagement of his predecessor, Clement VII, and we have no doubt that, with a proper degree of prudence, even the East might have been saved, and Protestantism prevented. As to Germany, Scandinavia, and England, there were no dogmatic questions that could not have been adjusted without any serious difficulty. There were bishops in the Council of Trent who differed, before the decisions were arrived at, from the doctrine finally declared by the Council, as widely as did Luther or Calvin. The real source of the defection was in matters of discipline and administration, the former of which was relaxed, and the latter grossly corrupt. There is not much edification in reading the lives of the Popes from Calixtus III to Leo X, inclusive. They live, act, and reign as temporal sovereigns, and apparently think more of strengthening their political influence, and enriching their families, than of feeding the spiritual flock committed to their care.

Nothing is more certain, except in matters of pure doctrine, in what pertains immediately to dogma, than that the Church, that is to say, the authorities of the Church, from the Pope down to the humblest parish priest, are more or less affected by the public opinion of their age or country. The Church has a divine origin, and lives a divine life; but she has also her human element, and lives a human life, often far removed from her divine life. Her divine life is like leaven hidden in three measures of meal, and not all at once, or instantaneously, does it leaven the whole lump. In her human element she is subject to the vicissitudes of time and space, and while she acts upon the world it reacts upon her, and its opinions influence her conduct.

She found the doctrine of civil intolerance with the Jews, where it was in place, for the Synagogue was recruited and continued by natural generation, not by the election of grace; she found it also in the Graeco-Roman world, where it survived as a reminiscence of the patriarchal order, and when she became strong enough she adopted it, for it was already in the minds and habits of the great mass of her children. This is a fact which everyone knows, who knows the history of the Church, and in asserting it we assert nothing, even on the supposition that it is an error, that is not consistent with our faith as a Catholic to assert. All forms of government have been developed from the patriarchal; and the doctrine that authority must suppress error, and protect the truth against it, is of patriarchal origin, and grew out of the fact that the patriarch or father of the family was at once priest and king, and never recognized the majority of any member of his family while he lived. The doctrine itself belongs not to dogma, but to civilization, and, so far as regards the Church, comes under the head of discipline, in respect to which no one pretends that the Church is infallible, or that her rules are irreformable.

That the Church has legislative authority, under the divine law, every Catholic maintains; but it is no part of Catholic faith that she is infallible in her legislation or in her disciplinary canons. Nothing forbids us to maintain, if such be our honest conviction, that any human law, borrowed from the Hebrew and Graeco-Roman civilizations, and incorporated into the discipline of the Church, or at least for long ages approved by churchmen and acted on by civil governments, is unnecessary, improper, or prejudicial to the best interests both of religion and of civilization. We find no trace of the doctrine on which the practice is founded among Christian writers, prior to the first Christian Emperor. Many among the greatest doctors and Fathers of the Church have opposed it, and boldly asserted that the only lawful means of maintaining or reestablishing unity of faith are moral, spiritual weapons drawn from the armory of reason and revelation, and addressed to the understanding, the heart, and the conscience. So at one time, at least, held St. Augustine; so held

the great St. Dominic, the reputed founder of the Inquisition, who used all his influence to prevent the employment of force against the Albigenses, among whom he was sent to labor as a missionary; so held the illustrious St. Francis de Sales, who, if for a moment he called in the troops of the Duke of Savoy to expel the Calvinistic ministers who gave him so much annoyance, instantly repented of his act, and gave himself no rest till the exiles were recalled and re-established in their homes; and so, it is well known, held the equally illustrious Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, who would not undertake the mission for the conversion of the Huguenots, till Louis XIV consented to withdraw his dragoons. We feel, therefore, quite easy as to the past, and have no fear of compromising our orthodoxy by refusing to defend the doctrine, or by openly condemning it, as has been done by the late Archbishop of Baltimore in his learned work on the *Primacy of the Apostolic See*, dedicated to the Supreme Pontiff himself.

That the doctrine we maintain, after M. de Montalembert, concedes the liberty of error, and places it and truth on the footing of equality before the civil authority, we grant, and we would have it so. We do not in this assert the indifference of truth and error, or that a man has the *moral* right to adhere to a false religion. Truth cannot tolerate even so much as the semblance of error, and in the theological order we are as intolerant as any Calvinist in the land, and hold firmly that out of the true Church there is no salvation, any more than there is virtue without obedience to the moral law of God. Nor do we with Milton and Jefferson maintain that "error is harmless where truth is free to combat it." Error makes the circuit of the globe while Truth is pulling on her boots, and no error ever is or ever can be harmless. What we assert is, not what is called theological tolerance, but what is called civil tolerance. Error has no rights, but the man who errs has equal rights with him who errs not. The civil authority is incompetent to discriminate between truth and error, and the Church is a spiritual kingdom without physical force, or the mission to employ it for the one or against the other. The weapons of

her warfare are spiritual, not carnal; consequently, before the secular or human authority, whether of churchmen or statesmen, truth and error must stand on the same footing, and be equally protected in the equal rights of the citizen. All sects should be equal before the civil law, and each citizen protected in the right to choose and profess his own religion, which we call his conscience, as his natural right, so long as he respects the equal right of others. This is the American order, and we dare maintain that it is the Christian order; for when the Disciples proposed to call down fire from heaven to consume the adversaries of our Lord, he rebuked them, and told them that they “knew not what manner of spirit they were of.”

All the doctors of the Church agree that faith is not to be forced, that it must be voluntarily accepted, and that no one can be compelled to receive baptism against his own free will. So much is certain; and hence Charlemagne, who placed before the conquered Saxons the alternative of baptism or perpetual slavery, is never regarded as having conducted himself as a good Christian or as a good Catholic. Yet it is not to be denied that theologians have argued, from the analogy of secular governments, that since by baptism the recipient is born again, and born a subject of Christ's kingdom, he may be compelled by force, when once baptized and become one of the faithful, to keep the unity of the faith, and submit to the authority of the Church, as the natural born subjects of a state may, if rebellious, be reduced to their civil allegiance by the strong hand of power, and, if need be, punished even with death for their treason. But have they not abused this analogy? “My kingdom,” says our Lord, “is not of this world,”—is not a secular kingdom, for the government of men in their secular relations, but is a spiritual kingdom, founded to introduce and maintain in human affairs the spiritual or moral law of God. The Church, which is clothed with the authority of this kingdom, or, in a mystical sense, is it, has undoubtedly over her subjects the authority which secular governments have over theirs, only it is an authority of the same kind with her own nature and mission. Since her kingdom is moral and spiritual, she has and can have only moral

or spiritual power. She can resort neither directly nor indirectly to physical force, for that would make her a secular kingdom,—a kingdom of this world,—and belie her own spiritual nature.

The mission of the State is one that can be executed by physical force, for its mission is restricted to external acts in the social order. The magistrate bears the sword against evil-doers, and his mission is to watch over the safety of society, and to maintain justice between man and man, or to repress and redress external violence, either against individuals or against society itself. In this, physical force, when needed, may be employed, because there is a congruity between its employment and the end to be obtained. But it is not so with the Church. Her mission being to introduce and maintain the law of God in the interior of man, she affects the exterior only through the interior, that is, the external act only through reason and conscience. This is wherefore she is called a spiritual, not a secular kingdom, or kingdom of this world. She teaches man the truth, tells him what he ought to believe, and what he must be and do in order to render himself acceptable to his Maker, his Redeemer, and his Saviour, or to gain the end for which he has been created. She administers to him the sacraments, through which he receives the new birth, is regenerated, restored, nourished, and strengthened in the life which ends in his supreme beatitude or supernatural union with God. But in all this she can address herself only to his moral or spiritual nature, to his reason or understanding, his free will, his heart, and his conscience. All physical force is here out of place, for physical force can affect only external acts, and all the acts she requires, to be of any value, must be internal, spring from the interior, from real conviction and love, and be the free, voluntary offering of the soul. Faith cannot be forced; she can by exterior force compel no one to receive the sacraments, for though they operate *ex opere operato*, they are inefficacious unless they are received with the proper interior dispositions. "My son, give me thy heart." Obedience in the moral or spiritual order cannot be forced, for it must be voluntary, from the heart; and a forced obedience, or an obedience that springs not from

love, and is not yielded by free will, is simply, in her order, no obedience at all. In it the heart is not given. God demands a willing giver, is worshipped with the heart, in spirit and in truth, not with the lips only. External acts, genuflections, prostrations, singing of psalms, and repetitions of the creed, the *Pater-noster*, and the *Ave-Maria*, are of no value if the heart be wanting, if love be absent, and there be not in them acts of free will,—all acts which by their own nature cannot be enforced, or produced by simple external authority or pressure. The Church, then, cannot do her work, cannot produce faith or love, or maintain interior unity, by force, nor could she reduce by force her rebellious subjects to their allegiance and obedience, if she would. The obedience must be voluntary, in the baptized no less than in the unbaptized.

The Church precluded by her own spiritual nature and mission from the employment of force, and the state being incompetent in spirituals, no course is practicable, or even lawful, but that of placing before civil society, before external authority, truth and error on the same footing, and using for the promotion of the former and the correction of the latter moral power alone. Let the state leave the Church free to wield her moral power according to her own divine nature against error, false doctrines, spiritual disobedience, or spiritual defection or rebellion, and it is all that in the Divine Economy is required or admissible. The state can demand only the faithful discharge of one's civil duties, and it can punish only civil offences, and it has no right to make that a civil offence which is not so in its own nature. It has no right or competency to discriminate between the Catholic and the Calvinist, and, if each demeans himself as a good citizen, it is bound to maintain for each the same rights, and to place both, in its own order, on the same footing. The responsibility of the religious error it must remit to the individual conscience, leaving each man to account, in the spiritual order, for himself to God, the only Master of conscience. The spiritual offences being in their very nature such as cannot be redressed by physical force, the Church can use only moral power against them, that is, arguments addressed to

reason and conscience. If these fail, she can do no more, and must, as the state, leave those whom she cannot convert to answer to God for themselves. She may, undoubtedly, use moral discipline to correct her delinquent subjects, or to advance them in virtue, and go even so far as to excommunicate those she judges incorrigible, that is, so far as to exclude them from her external communion. She may thus deprive them of many spiritual advantages; but she cannot exclude any from her internal communion unless they first exclude themselves, and she must raise the ban of excommunication from her external communion whenever the excommunicated demand it, and give satisfactory evidence of interior submission. Here her coercive power stops; and even so far her coercive power is moral, not physical, and the moment it becomes physical it is not in her mission. When the priest rides into the mob, and disperses it with the blows of his black-thorn stick or his horsewhip, he may do a very meritorious act, but he does it not in his priestly capacity, but as a peace officer, or as a chieftain of the clan.

The doctrine we contend for, and to which *La Civiltà Cattolica* objects, or which it permits to be held only as a concession or condescension of the Church to the exceptional circumstances of particular localities, has its foundation in the very principle of the Divine Government itself. The Spirit of Christ is the spirit of liberty. God governs the moral world by moral power, never by physical force. He made man free, endows him with reason and free will, that he might have moral worth, be capable of virtue, and merit a reward; and he governs him according to the nature he has given him, as a free agent, and never forces his reason, or does violence to his free will. He governs him as a free man and not as a slave, for he desires his love, and accepts from him only a rational and voluntary service, *obsequium rationabile*, as says St. Paul. The Church, whose mission it is to introduce and maintain the law of God in human affairs and the hearts of men, must imitate the Divine government, and no more than God himself attempt to force reason, or by physical violence constrain free will. She is restricted by the very law of her existence to moral

means, and can operate only through reason and conscience. God never suppresses error by the exertion of his omnipotence; he leaves the mind free, and corrects error only by the exhibition of his truth, and wins the heart by displaying his moral beauty. He lets the wheat and the tares grow together in the same field, "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain upon the just and the unjust." This is the law for the Church, and she must bear with error and disobedience as God himself bears with them.

This law, which we call the law of freedom, is universal, and law for both Church and state. The state itself has no right to use force, except to repress or redress external violence, to maintain and vindicate the rights either of individuals or of society against aggressive external acts. Beyond this, all physical force on the part of the state even is unlawful, unauthorized by the law of God, from whom all power is derived. Except in relation to external acts of violence, acts against individual rights, and the rights and peace of society, no government governs legitimately save by the concurrence of the free will of the governed. Hence all despotisms, all arbitrary governments, or governments that do not exist and govern by the free will or free assent of the governed, are repugnant to the law of the Divine government, and therefore are usurpations, without legal authority, and incapable of binding the conscience. Such governments have indeed existed, and been approved and defended even by churchmen, as well as by infidels; but they have done so by misapprehending the principle on which the patriarchal government rested for its justification. The authority of the patriarch is acknowledged as absolute indeed, but it is held to be that of the father over his child, and assumed to be tempered by parental affection and experience. It is wise, just, legitimate, while the governed are infants, incapable of speaking for themselves, but the reverse when the *infans* becomes able to speak, when the child has attained his majority and become a man. Within certain bounds it is just in the government of the family, but never in the government of a state, composed of adults, of members who have arrived at manhood. Here all arbitrary government is unlawful,

and only republican government in some form,—elective government, or the government of the people by the people themselves,—is legitimate, or in conformity with the principles of the Divine government. Hence most justly does Count de Montalembert demand a free Church in a *free State*, and maintain that only in a free state is a free Church, or a Church unfettered by the civil authority, practicable, as a free state itself is practicable only with a free Church. There is no freedom for the state under a clerocracy, such as was attempted in the middle ages, and none even for the Church; for spiritual interests are subordinated to secular interests, and the clergy sacrifice or subordinate the spirituals of the Church in order to maintain her temporals, or their own temporal possessions and power, no less than politicians, as the history of what is strangely enough called the “Ages of Faith,” but too amply demonstrates. Under Caesarism neither state nor Church is free, for in relation to both Caesar’s will or caprice is the law. He can use the law to oppress the Church, and the Church to sustain his oppression of the people. The Church in Russia has no more freedom than have the Russian people, and it had no more freedom in France under Louis XIV or Napoleon I than had the French people themselves. In Great Britain the progress of religious freedom and that of civil freedom have advanced *pari passu*. So is it in Austria; as the Church is emancipated from the shackles imposed by the State under Joseph II the State becomes constitutional; and as the State becomes constitutional and free, the Church becomes free to act as a moral or spiritual power, according to her own constitution. In this country both the Church and the State are free, because here men are governed as freemen, not as slaves, or because here the manhood of the nation is fully recognized.

But the party represented by *La Civiltà Cattolica*, to some extent by the *Dublin Review*, and the first three volumes of our own Review, do not like this, for they, in fact, desire neither a free Church nor a free State. They do not believe in republican government, and they desire a civil government which establishes the Church as the law of the land, and uses its whole force, if needed, to protect her, and to

suppress error or dissent. In the United States, they sympathize to a man with the Southern Rebels, not because they love negro slavery, but because they hate the Republic, and wish to see it broken up and its influence destroyed. In France they to a man favored the reestablishment of the Empire on the ruins of the Republic, because they flattered themselves that the new emperor would favor exclusively their church, suppress her enemies, and permit her pastors to bask once more in the sunshine of the Court. In Italy they to a man reject the freedom offered to the Church, because it is offered alike to the sects, and is coupled with constitutional liberty in the state; and if the state has to some extent treated them harshly, it is because they have demanded more than equal rights, and have insisted on special favors to themselves, or on having the government of the country exclusively in their hands. They regret the loss of their former privileges, and believe the Italian world is rushing to the devil because they have been deprived of them, as many people among ourselves fancy that our Constitution will be destroyed, liberty lost, and the country ruined forever and a day after, if negro slavery comes to be abolished. We doubt not the orthodoxy, the honesty, the sincerity, or even the benevolence of these people; but they are like those Jews whom our Lord rebuked for not being able to discern the signs of the times, and who crucified him between two thieves, because he came not precisely in the way they had made up their minds that he was to come, or because he came not in the form, and with the signs, they had expected. They see not that there is more of Christ in what they oppose than there was in what they have lost, and so bitterly regret.

The theory adopted by this party, when reduced to its ultimate principle, is, that even Christian nations are still in the age of barbarism, and that lay society, or the people, are still, and are always to remain, in their infancy, and to be guarded and tended in the nursery. They must be kept in leading-strings, and in no respect be trusted to their own reason and conscience. They are to be treated with all gentleness, with all a father's and all a mother's love; to have plenty of dolls, toys, hobby-horses, wooden swords and wooden

guns, miniature drums and flags, plenty of playthings and amusements, pictures, statues, music, processions; but never to be treated as free agents, or to be allowed to speak for themselves. In Church and State they are to be cherished and tenderly cared for, but held to be *infantes*, or mutes, incapable of speech. They cannot think or speak for themselves, and are not to assume the responsibility of their own acts. Supposing the people to be, and always to remain, infants—to have no majority, never to become of age, or to arrive at man's estate—this opposition to civil and religious liberty is reasonable and just. The regimen demanded is the proper regimen for children who have not come to the years of discretion, and perhaps also for savage and barbarous tribes, or nations still in their infancy, not yet brought into the family of civilized nations. We will not say that it was not in some measure proper, even in the barbarous ages which succeeded the overthrow of the Western Roman Empire by the Northern barbarians, and prolonged by new barbarian invasions from the East and the South till the eleventh century, though, perhaps, even in those ages it was at best only partially proper, because, in point of fact, the Graeco-Roman civilization did not wholly perish with the Roman Empire itself, and even the conquering barbarians brought with them many elements of civilization—and of a civilization superior to the Graeco-Roman in its most palmy days. But, be this as it may, nations as well as individuals have a majority; one day they become of age, and are no longer to be treated as minors. They pass from childhood to manhood, and when they have reached their majority, and are men, both Church and state must recognize the fact, acknowledge their freedom, and seek to govern them as men—as free men, not as children or slaves. This doctrine is not new for us, and was amply set forth, though timidly, in our pages for July, 1849.

Modern Christian nations, whether orthodox or heterodox, have unquestionably attained to their majority, and all attempts to remand them to the nursery are only productive of evil. They cannot succeed. Lay society has attained to manhood, and can be governed only under the regimen of liberty, as free rational agents, who can speak,

who have the rights of men, which authority must recognize and respect as inviolable. They must be governed through their own reason and conscience. It will not do to treat the nation that breaks away from external unity, and rushes into schism and heresy, as a truant child, to be scourged back, or given up as incorrigible. Force against it is out of the question, except to repress actual violence. Its natural and civil rights remain unaffected, for it derives the former from God through nature, and the latter from God through the people. This we want frankly acknowledged by both ecclesiastics and politicians. So of individuals, whether the majority or minority of the nation, who fall into what the Church condemns as heresy or schism. Natural and civil rights, not being derived from God through the Church, remain the same in both the orthodox and the heterodox, and among these rights is to be reckoned the right of conscience, or right of each one to choose and profess his own religion. All that is to be asked for the Church is, that she be free, by appeals to the reason, intelligence, and conscience of her rebellious subjects, to convert them if she can, and that they be free, in the face of all external authority, to return to her communion if they see proper. This freedom we demand for the Church, not on the ground that she is the Church of God, but on the ground that she is *our* church, *our* religion, *our* conscience, and we are men and citizens, and all men and citizens are equal before the law. This equality of all men and citizens demands equal liberty and protection for the Church and the sects, and for truth and error. The error is always to be deplored, as is every abuse which man makes of his liberty; but its responsibility rests upon the individual, who is accountable for it to no human tribunal, for conscience is accountable to God alone. God gives to every man the means of salvation, and urges him, by all the force of divine wisdom and love, to use them, but leaves him, nevertheless, free to reject them and damn his own soul if he chooses; and what right has Church or state to be more strict than God? And why should either shrink from imitating the example of his government?

The great error of the *oscurantisti* is in persisting in governing men

as children. Because the faithful are required to be docile and child-like, they conclude that they are to be retained in perpetual childhood, and never to be allowed the freedom of manhood. Liberty has its inconveniences, we admit, and it requires far less wisdom and virtue to govern men as slaves, than it does to govern them as free men. Men of very small minds, little knowledge, and less virtue, can be despots, and lord it over God's heritage, whether in Church or state; but to govern not as lords, but as pastors, or to govern free men as free men, through their freedom, intelligence, and their moral convictions, requires men of character, of large minds, rare intelligence, rare wisdom, and rarer moral worth,—something divine. Liberty is sure to be abused if recognized, but its abuses never exceed, never equal, the abuses of power. It was not the excesses of liberty, but the excesses of power, that constituted what is called the Reign of Terror in France. Frenchmen were freer under Napoleon than they were under the Convention, or the Committee of Safety. We have ourselves, when shocked or disgusted at the misuse men make of their liberty in our Republican country, allowed ourselves to use expressions in favor of a regimen less free, which we regret, and which must not be taken as our deliberate, settled convictions. If the reader comes across any such expressions in any thing we have written, let him blot them out. They are only the impatient utterances of a transient feeling, of a momentary indignation at the abuses of liberty which we saw daily and hourly before us. Men are permitted to declaim against the abuses of a good thing, without being held to reject the good thing itself. We demand government, and strong government, in both Church and state, but in either a government that recognizes and protects the rights of manhood,—that respects instead of crushing out the natural freedom God gives to every man.

There is no doubt that liberty, in whatever order we assert it, will be abused. Men left to their own reason and conscience, in spite of the teachings and admonitions of the Church, in spite of the Holy Scriptures, in spite of divine revelation and the interior operations of divine grace, in spite of all the moral and spiritual influences that can

be brought to bear on them, will abuse it, will fall into pernicious errors, into deadly heresies, and even glory in disobedience. Let no one flatter himself that liberty will never be construed to mean license, or that it will lead to or secure entire unity of doctrine, guard against all dissent, or result in offering to God the pure worship he requires. We know this well. But at all this risk it is better to have liberty than despotism, or else God would not have created man a free moral agent. It is better that men should sometimes err than that they should never think; that they should sometimes act wrong, than that they should never act at all. The great Apostle to the Gentiles tells the faithful to be men: "Be ye no longer children, but be men; howbeit, in innocence be children, but in understanding be men." In the primitive ages there was none of this excessive government and over-direction of the faithful, which render them so weak and timid at the present day. More, far more reliance was then placed on the Christian's own understanding and conscience. He was carefully instructed in his Christian faith and duty, strengthened by the Sacraments, and then left to act as a free, intelligent, conscientious man, who had an interior light that in all ordinary cases could be safely trusted. Hence the faithful, though recruited in great part from the slave population and the humbler classes of society, were men, thinking, reasoning, heroic men, capable of giving a reason for their faith, and, when need was, of dying for it. There was life, moral and intellectual activity of mind, deep energy of soul, which, with God's blessing, converted the world. Heresies and schisms there were, but there were also able and accomplished champions of orthodoxy and unity to meet and vanquish them; and we may say that no heresy or schism has ever been extirpated by the exertion of physical force. Protestantism survives in France, and Catholicity in Ireland. Force may make hypocrites, and, by alienating men from the truth, drive them into infidelity; never can it make sincere and earnest believers. No; mind must be met and conquered by mind, not by brute force.

Even in the middle ages, the modern nursery system hardly obtained. In the bosom of the Church, among the faithful, there was a

freedom of thought and action, a reliance on reason and conscience, on self-direction, so to speak, which has been unknown or condemned for the last two hundred years. There was much barbarism, much violence, and there were terrible crimes in those ages, but, as Montalembert has well remarked, in his *Moines d'Occident*, there was more manliness, more strength and elevation of character, than in our times, and if there were great crimes, there were great expiations. There was very little of the weakness, the effeminacy, or the sentimental piety of our days. The party represented by *La Civiltà Cattolica* speak of those ages as "Ages of Faith," as Catholic ages, and regret them. But whatever advantages they had over subsequent ages, they owed them to their greater freedom, to their greater reliance on the individual reason and conscience. The Jesuits had not then invented or perfected that marvelous machinery now in use, which so effectually emasculates the soul, and keeps us at best mere children in the nursery, hardly daring to decide what slip or frock we shall wear for the day, till we have consulted our ghostly father or our spiritual director. We owe our weakness, our lack of self-reliance, of robust faith and manly piety, of strong and elevated character, to our lack of liberty, to our being kept always in leading-strings, and treated as children not to be trusted out of sight of the tutor or governess. What is the consequence? The strong and robust, those who feel themselves men, and have the right to be men, and to think and act as free men even in religion, grow cold in their affections for the religious society, and, confounding faith and piety with the human machinery in vogue for sustaining them, and the Church with a party in the Church that seems to lack all human sympathy and all respect for human rights and human progress, turn away with wrath or disgust, and seek refuge in infidelity or indifference, as men in despair sometimes kill themselves. Under your safeguard system you have no mental activity, or none that has the courage to show itself. Your great men are reduced to silence, or die of broken hearts, and only the voice of mediocrity can be heard. Any other voice is judged unsafe, heretical, revolutionary, or, at best, offensive to pious ears.

You see this and deplore it, but, unhappily, labor to remedy it only by new and more vigorous applications of the machinery that has produced it.

Now, both reason and experience prove that we cannot, if we would, keep the nations in perpetual childhood, or remand them to childhood when once they have attained to their majority. We urge, then, the frank abandonment, on the part of the rulers either in Church or state, of the nursery system, and the equally frank adoption of the regimen of liberty. It seems to us worse than idle to resist the spirit of liberty which now moves and agitates nearly all civilized nations—which has created a constitutional Italy and a constitutional Spain; is creating a constitutional Austria, convulsing the Christian populations of Turkey, emancipating the Catholics in Great Britain and Scandinavia, the serfs in Russia, and the slaves in America, and in the name of which the United States have under arms and in the field more than half a million of men. We must accept modern civilization, and, notwithstanding all its infidel and materialistic tendencies, accept it in on faith. After all, if analyzed, this modern civilization will be found to be at bottom, not a revolt against Christianity, nor even against the Church as a spiritual kingdom, as so many worthy people suppose. It is only a revolt against a human authority that seeks to govern men as slaves, not as free-men, and is really more Christian, more catholic than the system it seeks to supplant. It opposes all employment of physical force or secular authority in matters of faith and conscience, and demands for every man the recognition, by all human tribunals, of the liberty that God gives us—a liberty which neither the state, nor the Church in her human legislation, can either grant or alienate,—or, in other words, the full and frank recognition of man's right, before all human authority, to civil and religious freedom. This it demands in all modern nations, Catholic and non-Catholic, for non-Catholic States have been, and still are, even less tolerant than Catholic states. The United States is the only nation in the world, where the majority of the people are non-Catholic, that has not a religion established and supported by the state, or in which

all religions are placed on an equal footing before the law. Great Britain tolerates dissent from the national church, but does not recognize the right of dissent; and barbarous laws against recusancy still disgrace her statute-books, though rarely enforced. Civil liberty has made progress in most modern states, but in every country, not excepting our own, it has even yet to struggle to sustain itself. Yet the result is not doubtful, and victory will at last declare itself for the new order of civilization.

The civil and religious liberty, involving the complete separation of Church and state, regarded as governments, which modern civilized society demands, does not, as some suppose, necessarily imply political atheism or a godless state. Religion is by no means, because the state does not establish it, excluded from civil society, and the Church is united with the state through the faith and conscience of the citizen, if the state, as it should be, is republican in its constitution. It would be godless only in case it was an absolute monarchy, in which Caesar can say, *L'état, c'est moi*. But the State being republican, though it professes officially, or enacts no religion, has always in its laws and administration all the religion held and cherished by its citizens. The republican state, or government of the people by the people themselves, must express in its laws and administration, in the long run, the intelligence and will of the people, and, therefore, just so much of religion, of faith and piety, as enter into that intelligence and will; which is all the union of Church and State that is compatible with liberty, or that is really practicable. So far the union is dialectic, living, and indissoluble. But as all citizens are equal, and each has an equal right to assert his own religion, it follows necessarily that the people can bring their religion into the laws and administration only so far as it is common to them all. What each has that is peculiar to himself remains as a part of his individuality, respected by the state, indeed, but incapable of expressing itself in the positive action of civil society. Hence religion only, so far as it is catholic or common to all, can be expressed or recognized in the acts of the government, which is all that is necessary, and to which

no one can object. All sects would be free, but the state would be really catholic.

Let no one take any alarm at this. The enemies of religion must understand, that if they require the state to use its power against religion, or to suppress it, they violate the first principle of civil and religious liberty. Religious liberty does not mean the liberty of infidelity to use the state or the civil power to suppress religion. The state, under the control of infidelity, and establishing atheism, is, to say the least, as hostile to religious and civil liberty as the state under the control of the clergy, and establishing the Roman Catholic Church. The French Convention, decreeing that “death is an eternal sleep,” violated as flagrantly both civil and religious liberty as does a Catholic State when it deprives Protestants, or a Protestant state when it deprives Catholics, within its dominions, of the free exercise of their faith and worship. The man who denies Christianity has no more right to insist that the state shall give civil effect to his denial, than he who affirms it has that it shall give civil effect to his affirmation—nay, he has altogether less right, because civilized nations are Christian, and nations are really civilized only so far as they are Christian nations. All civilization has its origin and ground in Christian principles or ideas; and the infidel, whatever he may be practically, places himself doctrinally in opposition to civilization itself, and, therefore, to all human development, and individual and social progress. Infidelity is really a return to barbarism, from which Christianity has rescued us. We ask no civil pains and penalties to be enacted against it; but we can consent to none in its favor. Humanity has the right to go on under the law of development, whatever the protests or efforts at resistance of the *oscurantisti*, whether they are churchmen or infidels, and the most thorough-going of all obscurantists are those who reject the Christian religion.

Those of our friends who fear that to accept modern civilization would be to favor schism, heresy, or infidelity, would do well to bear in mind that Christianity, in itself, is one and catholic, and that all Christian nations belong to one and the same family, have the

same Christian idea, and are, each in its way, developing and laboring to perfect one and the same order of civilization. The real unity of Christendom, if weakened and obscured, has not been wholly lost. The central life of Christendom, the idea in its purity and integrity, Catholics, of course, hold, is in the Church in communion with the See of Rome, under the pastoral care of the Pope; but they neither hold, nor are bound by the faith to hold, that all life which flows from the central fountain, or which emanates from Christ, who is the Idea of Christendom, is arrested at the external or visible boundaries of the Roman communion, and that there is no Christian life outside of its pale. All civilization is, in some sense, catholic; but all civilization is not confined to so-called Catholic nations. The civilization of Great Britain is, in some important relations, more catholic than that of Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, or Spanish and Portuguese America. The Church has lost many nations from her external communion, but the world is more catholic today than it was before the Protestant revolt or even the Greek schism. Neither faith nor charity has failed, or been diminished, and the progress of modern civilization is the real expression of both. No man who understands Christianity can exclude from Christendom the principal Protestant nations, or the nations that adhere, like Russia and modern Greece, to the schismatical Greek communion. We cannot look upon these as heathens, and treat them as aliens from the Christian family. We may often find in these not less catholic truth, save in words, the sense of which is little understood even by Catholics themselves, than we find in many Catholic nations. They are heterodox and externally schismatics, but their civilization and ours is one and the same in principle, and doctrinal and sacramental unity will follow as soon as Catholic nations purge themselves of their sectarianism, understand more fully that Catholicity is catholic, and accept and adhere to the regimen of liberty.

It is necessary to distinguish, in modern civilization, what is central, real, living, from what is merely accidental, temporary, or only simply apparent; and when this is done it will be found that it is es-

entially Catholic and Christian. Our good souls who are frightened at it, who recoil with horror from it, or anathematize it with so much unction, as does Father Taparelli, Father Curci, or even Father Félix, would do well to study it a little closer, and to ask themselves if they have not failed to give to the Christian dogma its catholic sense and application. They seem to us to seek their Lord among the dead, not the living, and to look for his body in the tomb wherein it was laid by Joseph of Arimathea. They should know that our Lord is risen, and is not to be sought among the tombs. All the words and deeds of our Lord, all the facts of his history, have, aside from their particular sense, a universal sense, applicable alike to all ages and nations. The apparent hostility of modern civilization to Christianity, or its apparent unchristian character, lies in the fact that even churchmen overlook this universal sense and application, and confine themselves too strictly to the particular sense. They accept the Christian dogma, but understand not that every dogma is a catholic or universal principle, and therefore fail to recognize it, when they find it under any other than the particular form in which it is stated in the teaching or definition of the Church. They keep to the letter, forgetting that the letter killeth, and that it is the spirit that quickeneth. The truth is not the sign, but what the sign signifies.

Modern civilization, with all its errors and defects, is, at bottom, the aspiration of the nations to Christ, and is the result of their serious and earnest efforts to realize the Word made flesh, or the Christian Idea, in their social life. No similar civilization is to be found in nations that have received no Christian instruction. The modern demand for liberty is only the assertion of the free will taught by Christian theology applied to our social relations. The demand for the amelioration of the condition of the poor and more numerous classes, or the effort to put the poor in the way of helping themselves, is only a catholic exposition of the precept to give alms; and the movement to place them on a footing of political equality with the rich and prosperous, is only the attempt to fulfill the word of our Lord to the Precursor, "the poor have the Gospel preached unto

them." Even democracy, to which the age so strongly tends, is but an earnest effort to realize in society the unity of the race, human brotherhood, and the natural equality of all men, asserted in the Incarnation and Redemption. Your unbeliever, our atheist, whatever his speculative errors, practically follows not seldom the law of Christ, and is a good Christian as a friend, a neighbor, and a citizen. Auguste Comte and his disciples, though they speculatively deny God and vent the grossest sophisms about religion, yet assert the Divine existence under the form of the principles or laws of nature, and hold it man's duty to conform to them, to expiate by his sufferings the faults he commits, and to labor for the development and progress of his race. They reason badly, and have no philosophy, yet they are, intellectually considered, only carried away by a reaction against an exaggerated supernaturalism, and a false theology, which separates God from his works, as a clockmaker is separated from his clock. Unquestionably, in modern civilization there are unchristian and even antichristian tendencies, but these are accidental, and may be separated from it, and would soon disappear were churchmen to accept it, and instead of warring against it, to labor to supply its defects, and restore to it the equilibrium it now lacks. Certainly to do so were the surest and quickest way to put an end to unbelief, and to modern heresies and schisms.

We do not forget here the question of the salvation of the soul, which, after all, is the great thing, since heaven is our end. We hold as firmly as any of our brethren the dogma, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, but we by no means hold that we are to consign to perdition all who are not visibly in her visible communion. In every age and nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him. Not everyone who falls even into dogmatic error is damned. All error is the effect of ignorance, and ignorance, when not culpable in its cause, is excusable. I hope through God's mercy to be saved, but I have not the presumption to pretend that I am free from all error, even in relation to Christian dogma. If all error ensures damnation, who can be saved? The greatest and best men that have ever lived

have erred, and a man may err without being a heretic. He only is a heretic who rejects the known truth, or voluntarily neglects to use due diligence in seeking for the truth. There are, probably, fewer heretics and schismatics in Christendom than is commonly supposed. The direct labor to convert the individuals we believe in error, or to bring them into our visible communion, is, perhaps, not the best way either to advance orthodoxy or to save the soul. Most of the schisms and heresies, if not all, that the Christian deplures, originate not in pride or obstinacy, in hatred of the truth or impatience of legitimate authority, as is too often pretended, but in the fact that the Church is coupled with an obsolete phase of civilization, and that in the changes that have taken place, her authorities really do not give to the soul, to the understanding, to the human element its rights. The individual must now, to a great extent, be reached through civilization, and the labors most effective in developing civilization, and making it express the real Christian Idea, will be in the end the most effective in saving the souls of those who are now out of the way. Christ must be formed in society as well as in the individual, and through society the individual must be united with him.

The Christian idea has, hitherto, received from the clergy, whether orthodox or heterodox, a one-sided development. The ascetic and mystic side of Christianity has been insisted upon to the detriment of the social. Heaven and earth, instead of being regarded as parts of one whole, related to each other as medium and end, have been treated as opposites, and what is given to the one has been counted as so much taken from the other. The highest form of Christian life on earth has been assumed to be that which approaches nearest to the life of the saints in glory. Hence the Christian ideal, the ideal of Christian perfection on earth, has been confounded with the monastic life, and, in the monastic life, with the contemplative life. The saint tramples the world beneath his feet, counts this life nothing, suppresses his human instincts and affections, and strives to live, while a mere *viator* or pilgrim, as if he had arrived at home, and become a *comprehensor*—the grand error of both Brahminism and

Buddhism. We do not, of course, pretend that this error has ever received the official sanction of the Church, that it has ever been warranted by her authoritative teaching, or that the great masters of spiritual life have failed to warn us against it. The Holy See has never favored it, and has always labored to soften the ascetic rigorism adopted by the founders of religious orders. Yet there has always been a tendency among the devout in this direction; and as nearly all the spiritual reading of the faithful has been for ages furnished by the monastic orders, who were, or profess to be, dead to the world, its virtues and affections, this tendency has been strengthened and become practically predominant in the minds of the faithful. Yet this whole system is one-sided, sophistical, and not seldom mischievous. It mutilates Christianity, and tends to separate in Christ the Divinity from the humanity. This world is not the end for which man was created, but the way to that end lies through it. It does not stand opposed to heaven, but is related to heaven as the means to the end, and the end is attainable only through the means.

This exclusively ascetic view, which has practically prevailed, has led to the neglect of civilization, and to its depreciation in its relation to the salvation of souls, or the elevation of the race to union with God. If I can only save my soul, what need I care for civilization? Men have supposed that nothing should weigh with them but their individual salvation. Yet St. Paul did not so think. He said he could wish himself separated from Christ for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh, showing in the strongest manner possible, that disinterested love which places the good of others above even our own, and which is far removed from that cold-hearted egotism that says, "No matter what becomes of the world, of society, of human life and its affections, if I only save my own soul." The truth is, no man who so feels and so thinks is in the way of saving even his own soul. The commandments, without fulfilling which no man can inherit eternal life, place love to our neighbor on the same level with love to God. Hence the social element, which has love to our neighbor for its basis, and which expresses itself in what we call civilization,

is as Christian and lies in as high a plane as the ascetic element. In barbarous ages, or where there is no free State, the development of this social element is, no doubt, obstructed, and hence the reason why such undue prominence has been given to the Ascetic, and why the labors of Churchmen for civilization have been indirect rather than direct, or why they have labored to reach civilization through the individual, rather than the individual through civilization. Hence a reason why we demand a free Church in a *free* State, where both elements may be developed *pari passu*, in dialectic harmony.

Now, if we study modern civilization, that is, the civilization struggling to establish itself, not that which is struggling to hold its old place, we shall find that, at bottom, it is nothing else on the one side than protest against this exclusive asceticism, and, on the other, the assertion of the rights and position of the lay society. It protests against the false mysticism to which exclusive asceticism always gives birth, and asserts that Christian life is a human-divine life, and that man is not pure spirit, or pure spirit inhabiting a body, but the union or complex of soul and body, as implied in the fact that our Lord, in assuming human nature, assumed a human body as well as a human soul, and in the last article but one of the Creed, "I believe in the resurrection of the body,"—*carnis resurrectionem*. No doubt modern civilization, like all reactions, has a tendency to run to the opposite extreme, and, in its turn, to undervalue the ascetic, the mystic, the personal culture hitherto predominant in the Christian world; no doubt it tends to be exclusive, and, therefore, sophistical, but this is a point to be guarded against, for all exclusiveness is opposed to truth, since all truth is catholic. Yet underlying this modern civilization, and pervading it as its informing and moving spirit, is the principle that this world has its place in the Christian order, and civilization its work in the economy of salvation, or that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.

Taking what is substantive in each element, and rejecting in each its exclusiveness, or rejecting what is sophistical and accidental in each, and bringing both into dialectic union, we have the truly catholic order, and a really catholic civilization, together with the prin-

ciple and conditions of the unity and peace of Christendom. We, in this way, secure unity of faith, unity of charity, unity of the sacraments, unity of discipline, unity of communion, without requiring any one to give up anything positive that he really holds and desires to retain, or to accept anything to which he is or ever has been really opposed. There is no compromise of principle or surrender of any positive condition required. All parties are right in what they affirm, and none err except in what they deny. Their affirmations are catholic, for none other are possible; only their denials are exclusive, sectarian, sophistical. The word *catholic* asserts unity as well as universality, for nothing lacking unity can be universal. That which you assert to be universal must be one and the same, for no addition of one thing to another can ever give you universality, any more than the accumulation of finites can give you infinity. It is not without a profound meaning, therefore, that the true religion, or the Church of Christ, is called *Catholic*. It is so called because it is catholic in itself, in its principles, and because what is not catholic is not true, is not of the Church of God, and can be no art of true religion. What are called false religions, are religions only in so far as they are one and catholic, for there is and can be but one religion. All Christendom repeats daily, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church—*sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*," and the word *catholic* is not technical, naming a particular church, sect, or congregation, but an adjective applied to express the quality, nature, and character of the Church herself. Christianity itself is catholic, and hence St. Vincent of Lerins gives us as the criterion or mark of Christian faith, the fact that it has been believed always, everywhere, and by all. Men can all agree only in what is true.

The trouble now is, that the profound significance of the word *catholic* is unheeded,—that the word is taken in a technical sense, and made the rallying-cry of division instead of unity. This is because not all who are called Catholics are really Catholics; for many of them restrict Catholicity to their own external communion, and recognize no Catholic truth outside of it, and consider it their duty to condemn

the world outside as all wrong, to convict it of error, instead of recognizing the truth it really has, and seeking to enlighten it and to supply its defects, by presenting it the truth in its unity and integrity, or the truth it has not in dialectic union with the truth it has. These people seem to think, because the Holy Ghost dwells in the Church into which they have been incorporated, that his operations are confined to them. They fail to note that, though the Holy Ghost speaks to men in the Written Word, and in the external authority of the Church, when teaching or defining the faith, he speaks also to them through reason and conscience, common to all men. Peter marveled, no doubt, when he found the Holy Ghost was given to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; but when he saw his manifest operations, witnessed the effects of his presence, he recognized them for what they really were, and in the joy of his heart exclaimed, "Who can forbid water that these be baptized?" The Holy Ghost is God; God the Consummator; and his presence is therefore universal, as universal as that of God the Creator, or God the Mediator. He is in the new phase assumed by civilization, no less than he was in the old, and, rightly understood, the new developments, which frighten so many of our friends, and make them think the world is about to end, are only a step forward in the great work of consummation. The feebleness of character so marked in our modern conservatives, whether in Church or state, is owing to the fact that they do really, without knowing or intending it, resist the Holy Ghost, and force him to work against them, not with them. The living, beating, aspiring heart of Christendom is not with them, is against them, and on the side of the men who represent the progressive spirit of the age. Only the voice of these, the radicals, as they are called, fetch an echo; and, even when not free from many sad errors, their voices stir the souls of men, and kindle in them noble aspirations, and fire them with heroic daring. Had the President of these United States been one of these men, instead of being a feeble and timid conservative; had he been able to plant himself firmly on the principle of progress, without feeling that he must shuffle backwards and forwards between

the party of the past and the party of the future, he would long before this have suppressed the Rebellion, and restored the Republic to unity and peace. It has been a far more difficult task to conquer him than to conquer the Rebels.

We have gone thus at length into this argument, in order to show that neither the friends nor the enemies of religion have anything to fear from adopting the great principle of civil and religious liberty, and asserting a free Church in a free State. We now add, that this regimen of liberty, however it may be resisted and delayed, is inevitable. The struggle may be protracted through long years; there may be still, for more than a generation, a state of war, in which alternate successes and defeats may await each party; but victory is sure at last to crown the party of liberty and progress, for on its side are humanity, and, what is more than humanity, humanity's God. Why, then, war against it? *La Civiltà Cattolica*, which might better be called *La Civiltà Acattolica*, apparently resists, only because it wishes to preserve the old system in Rome and Italy, where the introduction of the new would destroy much old machinery, and break up many old habits. But we are aware of no part of Christendom where the retention of the old régime does so much harm as in Rome and Italy. Leave the old there, and *La Civiltà Cattolica* and its party would permit us the regimen of liberty everywhere else, as a concession to our weakness, our intractableness, or to a local and temporary necessity. But we cannot accept as a concession what we demand as a right. Say what we will, Rome is the centre and capital of Christendom, and while the ecclesiastical authorities there maintain the old order and resist the new, or even refuse indignantly to accept it as a deliverance, it is impossible to give the necessary assurance to the friends of civil and religious liberty elsewhere that the Church is not herself really opposed to them, and that she will not, the moment she feels herself strong enough to do it, revoke her concessions, and insist on the re-establishment of the old system everywhere.

We belong to the Catholic Church; we love her as our mother, and we mean to conduct ourselves towards her as an obedient son.

But we distinguish at Rome, as elsewhere, between what is divine and what is human; between what God has established and what men have invented. The Pontificate is divine, and it speaks with divine authority. It, and all that immediately pertains to it, we accept as infallible, to be by us believed, obeyed, loved, and neither judged nor disputed. But the men at Rome are human, and the human at Rome is neither more nor less respectable than at Paris, London, Vienna, or Washington. If we have the right to defend civil and religious liberty, so far as asserted in the Divine Government of men, and as not forbidden by any dogma of faith or law promulgated by Divine authority, at Washington, Baltimore, New York, London, Mechlin, Vienna, the Hague, St. Petersburg, or Paris, we have the right to defend it and insist on it at Rome, providing we do not do it, as we are not at liberty to do it anywhere, in a disorderly manner, or in a turbulent and seditious spirit. As long as Rome repels the regimen the world now demands, it can be looked upon as only provisional and temporary elsewhere. Here we differ from our friends the illustrious Count de Montalembert, and the learned, intrepid, and venerable Bishop of Orleans, who are apparently satisfied with the practical concessions *La Civiltà Cattolica* says may be made. We know no reason why Rome and Italy should be excepted, unless they put in the plea of infancy, the only ground on which the old system, in our judgment, is defensible.

We enter into no discussion of the Pope's temporal sovereignty, the last stronghold of the old system of Prince Bishops; but we must be permitted to say, that it seems strange to us that the wise heads at Rome do not see that the Pope holds that sovereignty only on sufferance, or because at present it does not suit the plans of the Emperor of the French to allow the new Italian kingdom to have Rome for its capital. The Emperor wants an Italy strong enough to be a useful ally, but not strong enough to be a dangerous enemy. So he maintains the Prince-Bishop at Rome and the Austrians in Venice. But the sentiment of the great body of the people of Christendom is against his temporal sovereignty, whatever may be the pastorals of

their Bishops, issued in obedience to the mandates of Rome. When Pio Nono a few years since undertook to raise an army, and bid for volunteers from all parts of the Catholic world, to recover his revolted provinces, and to defend his sovereignty against the armed invasion of Sardinia, very few flocked to his standard, and those who did so, did not cover themselves with glory. The Pontiff is strong; the Prince is weak. We are all ready to die for our spiritual Father; but we have not heard of a dozen soldiers who went from the United States to fight for the Prince. The Italian kingdom, *aut fas, aut nefas*, is every day becoming consolidated and stronger, and, as far as men can foresee, if not prevented by France, will before long, in spite of the Tiara and the Quadrilateral, embrace the whole Peninsula, and be in reality, as well as in name, one of the great Powers of the world. If the Roman Sovereign relies on the address of the Bishops assembled at Rome, on the occasion of the canonization of the Japanese martyrs, he will most likely be deceived, for these Bishops have comparatively little power over their flocks save in spirituals, and we are sure that in their address they did not represent the sentiments of the great body of the Catholic people, especially of that people who must do the fighting, if fighting is to be done. Where, then, is he to look for human support? He can look only to diplomacy; only to the embroilment of the European nations in a fierce and general war, from which religion would be sure to lose more than it could possibly gain.

Indeed, it seems to us that Rome feels that her position is insecure. Her whole conduct indicates it. *Non possumus* is the cry of weakness, not of strength. We hear no longer from Rome the voice of Hildebrand, of Innocent III, nor of the stern old Sixtus Quintus. The excommunicatory bulls issued venture to excommunicate no one by name, and, seemingly at least, fall without effect. The scholars and *savans* of Rome explore the catacombs and devote themselves to the study of antiquities, as if they had no promise of the future. If a living man appears he must be silent, or be silenced. No voice of generous inspiration comes to us from the Eternal City; no voice of encouragement to those of us who are toiling day and night, with

our heart's richest devotion, to advance the interests of religion and civilization. It is much if we are tolerated,—if we escape an interdict. We have found nothing more disheartening than the Letter of the Holy Father to the Archbishop of Munich, in relation to the Congress last September in Munich of a large number of the most distinguished Catholic scholars and authors of Catholic Germany. It is replete with the spirit of fear, and betrays a total lack of confidence in the human mind. The only determination we discover in it is to persist in the warfare against the irrepressible instincts of civilized humanity. Rome speaks only to repress; she has ceased to speak to encourage. We hear not from her, "Forward!" and we find her landing only those who are foremost in the work of repression. All this indicates that she feels herself insecure, and lives in constant dread of some great and terrible convulsion.

Our readers know that we are no revolutionists in either Church or state; that we respect vested rights, and that we hold that the Pope has as valid a vested right to the sovereignty of the Roman States, as any prince has or can have to the sovereignty of his dominions. We are not aware that his sovereignty has escheated either to his people or to Victor Emmanuel. But vested rights, not being natural rights, are not indefeasible. They may be forfeited, and if not forfeited, they may be alienated or ransomed. The Pope can alienate his authority as Prince by restoring it to the people, or for a just ransom, if he sees proper; and so the *non possumus* is really *non volumus*. The Roman sovereign can do as he pleases; but he knows little of a real movement party who flatters himself that, when it finds vested rights in its way, and the owner refusing to put them to ransom, it will not, if strong enough, take them without ransom. The Pope need not then be surprised to find his Italian countrymen, aided by his own subjects, one day taking from him his Roman Principality, without stopping to say, "By your leave." It seems to us, therefore, as there is no reasonable prospect of resisting permanently the movement and retaining the Principality, at least without grave detriment to the highest religious and social interests, it would be wise and prudent for the Holy Father

to abandon it for a reasonable ransom and proper guaranties for civil and religious freedom—for a free Church in a free State, as offered by Count Cavour. It is easy to denounce us for saying this. It will not be so easy to prove that what we say is not true, or that it is disloyally said, or with a heart not as devoted to the Church as that of the sovereign of Rome himself.

But we simply add, in conclusion, that we have in what we have said only defended our own American order of civilization, and the rights conceded and claimed by our own nation, as is in our province, and in our duty as the conductor of a periodical that professes to be National. In the order we have defended, we have the fullest confidence, and we hold it to be not only national, but Catholic, because in accordance with the law of God, or the principles of the Divine Government.