



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.


We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>


BERKELEY
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA













D. A. Morrison

ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S


LATTER LIFE:

FROM 1856 TO 1876.

BY

HENRY F. BROWNSON.

DETROIT, MICH.
H. F. BROWNSON, PUBLISHER,
1900.



B 908
B 641.7
v. 3

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. THE CHANGE FROM BOSTON TO NEW YORK. —M'CABE.—IRISH POLITICS.	1
II. MONTALEMBERT.—VEUILLOT.	25
III. LECTURES.—THE CHURCH AND THE REPUBLIC. —THE UNIVERSALIST REVIEW.—ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.—THE MISSION OF AMERICA.—THE CATHOLIC CLUB. — BISHOP SPALDING. — O'CONNOR.—KENRICK.—SOME CONVERSIONS.	57
IV. SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.—THE DRED SCOTT CASE.	93
V. THE AMERICAN REDEMPTORISTS.—CONGREGATION OF ST. PAUL THE APOSTLE.—APPLETON'S CYCLOPÆDIA.—THE CONVERT.	111
VI. THE JESUITS OF ST. LOUIS. — THE JESUIT PHILOSOPHY. — CONTEMPORARY FRENCH WRITERS. — CATHOLIC EDUCATION. — THE IRISH UNIVERSITY,	136
VII. POLITICS. — GREAT BRITAIN. — FRANCE.— STATE DESPOTISM AND FREEDOM. — CELTS AND TEUTONS. — THE ROMAN STATES.—DR. FORBES AND ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.—CHURCH DESPOTISM.	167
VIII. RESIDENCE IN NEW JERSEY. — TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.—CRITICISMS BY MONTALEMBERT, DUMONT, McMULLEN, LUERS, AND ELDER.	196
IX. AN ARTICLE ON IRELAND.—THE ATTEMPT TO GET PROPAGANDA TO CONDEMN THE REVIEW.—CUMMINGS, HUGHES, AND BARNABO.—TENDENCY TO LIBERALISM. — HECKER'S DEMOCRACY.—SPECULATIONS ON HELL.	241

M867592

X.	THE CHURCH NOT A DESPOTISM.—BISHOP WOOD'S INTERDICT.—LIBERAL CATHOLICISM.	270
XI.	M. J. SPALDING.—THE PROTESTANT REFOR- MATION.—PHILOSOPHICAL CORRESPONDENCE. —CATHOLIC INTOLERANCE. - - - -	309
XII.	BUCHANAN.—SLAVERY.—SECESSION.—DIS- LOYALTY OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS. - -	341
XIII.	DISLOYALTY OF CATHOLICS.—PIUS IX'S IN- TERVENTION.—BROWNSON NOMINATED FOR CONGRESS.—CHARLES SUMNER.—EMANCIPA- TION.—STATE RIGHTS.—LINCOLN.—FRE- MONT.—ROSECRANS. - - - -	375
XIV.	PLANS OF PEACE DEMOCRATS.—HUGHES MAKES ANOTHER ATTACK.—THE JESUITS.— WAR TROUBLES.—HEALY'S PORTRAITS.— HAMILTON AND LINCOLN.—MONTALEMBERT. —DISCONTINUANCE OF THE REVIEW. - -	410
XV.	AN ANNUITY.—A REPLY TO FROTHINGHAM. —"THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC."—BANCROFT. —RECONSTRUCTION. - - - -	442
XVI.	BANCROFT'S ADDRESS.—POLITICAL COMMENTS FROM BROWNSON'S LETTERS TO HIS SON.	479
XVII.	THE AVE MARIA.—THE CATHOLIC WORLD. —THE NEW YORK TABLET. - - -	497
XVIII.	SETON-HALL COLLEGE.—CORRESPONDENCE.— DISSATISFACTION WITH HECKER AND HEWIT. —REFUTATION OF ATHEISM.—MRS. BROWN- SON'S DEATH.—REVIVAL OF BROWNSON'S REVIEW. - - - -	548
XIX.	THE LAST SERIES OF THE REVIEW.—HUGHES. —SPALDING.—MONTALEMBERT.—WOMAN- WORSHIP.—FR. HILL.—THE NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL ORDERS.—REMOVAL TO DE- TROIT.—AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.—END OF HIS LIFE. - - -	583
	GENERAL INDEX. - - - -	619

BROWNSON'S LATTER LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHANGE FROM BOSTON TO NEW YORK.—M'CABE.—
IRISH POLITICS.

As soon as the October number of Brownson's Quarterly Review for 1855 was printed, the Editor, Orestes A. Brownson, completed his preparations, and carried his family, his household effects, and his Review to New York.

Hardly suspected by him, the change of residence was to effect a gradual alteration in Brownson's tone in his writings and public discourses. No one could have greater love of natural scenery, of an unimpeded view of the sky, the fields, the rivers, than had Brownson; and for him to give up the free air and rugged hills of New England for the confined streets of our mercantile metropolis no compensation could be offered by the attractions of a social character to be found in New York, for which he lacked both the taste and the habit. He felt his mind cramped when he had to do his writing in a "study" of small dimensions, just as men born and bred in flat and crowded localities are less free in their thoughts and less lofty in their aspirations and sentiments, than natives of more rugged lands.

But the change which affected Brownson far worse than any other, was the substitution of the influence of such of the clergy with whom he was most intimate in New York for that of the Bishop of Boston. Fitzpatrick was conservative, perhaps too conservative; but as a consequence, he was always sound in his doctrine; but Brownson was beginning to feel that the Bishop had gone too far when he insisted on a complete disruption of his theological and philosophical convictions, which had led him to the church, and the doctrines he was engaged in setting forth as a Catholic reviewer; because, although Catholicity rested for him on external authority, it did not rest on that authority alone; it was besides an internal conviction, resting on the intrinsic authority of principles, thoughts, aspirations, and tendencies, which he had long before he was received into the church, and which he affirmed were Catholic. These principles and thoughts, which he had arrived at by the free and independent action of his own mind, he found necessary to meet objections which he could not find met in any works within his reach, and which he could not meet on the theological and philosophical system taught him. But a deeper study of the scholastic theology and philosophy enabled him better to interpret the analytical language in which they were expressed, and not only to perceive the truth with clearness and explicitness, but also to embrace it in its synthesis, and to see the process by which that synthesis is reached and verified.

To defend Catholicity by adducing intrinsic evidence as well as external authority, had too much the appearance of novelty to meet the approval of the Bishop of Boston; and it was only after removal to New York that

Brownson was encouraged, by those whose opinion he valued in that city, to adhere to the plan he entertained of allowing his mind to act more freely and independently.

Heretofore in treating of matters pertaining to theological science, he had taken his thoughts mainly from books and teachers, and his chief labor had been to give them full and complete logical expression. The logic, the language were his; but the premises were received from others, on whom he felt it prudent for him to rely, rather than to discuss those great questions from his own knowledge and personal convictions. In asserting, therefore, the intellectual freedom, which he had from the first claimed that the church allows, demands, and secures, he accepted all in his writings before he was a Catholic which he had arrived at by the free and independent action of his own mind. His principles, thoughts, aspirations, and tendencies were the same as when they brought him to seek admission into the church, though perhaps not then so complete, or their reach so clearly and fully apprehended. To this change from the course Brownson had followed during his Catholic life in Boston, we owe the profoundest and sublimest of his writings.

Aside from his intention of assuming greater freedom and independence in the discussion of theological and kindred questions,—a change which could only become very gradually apparent,—the Reviewer, in beginning the thirteenth volume of his journal, intended no change in its general character from what it had been for the eleven preceding years.

Reviewing his career since he became a Catholic, Brownson was aware that the chief complaint against his Review had been that it was too severe, that it was harsh, and ultra. Many of his Catholic readers thought that he was too hard upon Protestants, and that he needed not push certain Catholic doctrines quite so far,—not that he was ever heterodox, but now and then a little too orthodox or too Catholic for the times. Some complained that he made Catholic faith and morality the test of the merit or demerit of a literary production, and others thought that he ought to commend every work written by a man who called himself a Catholic. Now and then he was accused of being hasty, passionate, ill-tempered, and hostile to a large class of residents of foreign birth or descent. His accusers did not consider, perhaps could not understand, the embarrassment in defending and advocating Catholicity before the American public caused by the assumption of Irish editors that Irish and Catholic were synonymous terms, and likewise Anglo-Saxon and Protestant, and by their invoking Catholicity to save the Irish nationality, and Irish nationality to save Catholicity. Thus the Catholic religion had for Irishmen very much the character of a national religion, and they were prone to think of it more as the Irish than as the Catholic religion. All this might work admirably in Ireland, but did not work admirably when the Irishman came here, where it could obtain only by carrying his nationality along with his religion, for that is to introduce his religion as a foreign religion, and to offend the nation by setting up a foreign nationality. The thing to be done here is not to make a foreign nationality the vehicle of sustaining and spreading Catholic-

ity; but to convince the un-Catholic people that Catholicity may prevail here without detriment to American nationality. Brownson understood the difficulties of the case: he understood how hard it was for those who had never dreamed in their lives, nor their fathers before them for many generations, of making the distinction so necessary here, and he did not expect all to make it. But while with a certain portion of them the tendency was to seek to catholicize by irishizing, he who was free from the trammels of an un-American nationality had tried to meet the controversy between Catholicity and Protestantism in the form in which it existed here. The Irishman had not to prove the compatibility of his Catholicity with the preservation of his nationality, for his difficulty lay in distinguishing them one from the other; the difficulty with the American Catholic was of an opposite character, to convince his countrymen that they could be Catholics without ceasing to be Americans; and this difficulty was increased by the intense foreign nationalism of the greater part of his Catholic brethren, who did not perceive or relish what he was doing, and fancied that he must fail in his respect to it, or moved by an intense contrary nationalism he must needs be trying to prevent Irishmen from being what God and nature had made them. It was not, however, his dislike to the Irish, nor to their nationality that moved him, but a desire to satisfy his countrymen that they could receive the religion of the Irish without receiving the Irish nationality, that is, making themselves Irishmen. It had been from the outset this desire that led Brownson to pursue the course he did, and which so frequently brought him into collision with the feelings of his Irish Catholic friends. He wished

to prove to the American public that he could not only be a Catholic and remain unchanged as an American, but that he could speak as an American free from all foreignism without losing his standing in the Catholic community. The result showed how far he was mistaken. He had by no means lost heart or hope, and he was sure that if he could but lay his mind and heart open and get his Irish Catholic friends to read them as they were, his success would be certain; because he knew that he neither thought nor felt anything which would in the slightest degree displease them. His great difficulty was to express himself so as not to have his meaning misapprehended. It seemed to him that his friends showed a sad lack of capacity and a sudden lack of generous confidence in him, by their interpretations of the articles he wrote, as he believed, in the true interest of his fellow Catholics of foreign birth. He believed it necessary, however, not for his own sake, but for that of his un-Catholic countrymen, to let them understand that an American in becoming a Catholic does not renounce, as they pretend, his nationality. If he ever insisted on his Anglo-American character, it was not to set himself up above foreign-born Catholics, but to gain a hearing and some credit with his own countrymen who were not Catholics. He was sorry to find his friends construing what he stated as simple matters of fact into charges against Irishmen or Irish Catholics; yet he believed that Irish Catholics, unless they ruined him by their foolish suspicions, would yet be satisfied that, according to the measure of his ability, they had no warmer or better friend in the country.

Somewhat different were his feelings after the Know-nothing excitement began to subside. "The church," he then said, "has got a strong foothold here, and the opposition which we have encountered the last two years, and still encounter, will prove of immense advantage to us, in bringing our church prominently before the public, in stimulating the faith and zeal of Catholics, who know and love their country, to exert some influence in demolishing the Irishism introduced by the immigrants who neither know the country nor love it. I love the Irish for their attachment to the faith and for many amiable and noble qualities, but they are deficient in good sense, sound judgment, and manly character. They lack honesty and truthfulness, and are unreliable. They can do nothing in a straight-forward, manly way. They are slaves or tyrants, and do not understand what it is to be freemen, and the only freedom they can understand is the freedom to make you conform to them. Yet they are the majority of the Catholic body in this country, and have all the important sees and parishes. Their effort is to make the church an Irish church, and the American an Irish nationality. The Know-nothing movement enables us to defeat them, and to consult the welfare of the young; who almost all grow up Americans—hitherto at the expense of their Catholicity. More Catholics have emigrated to this country than are now in it, by at least fifty per cent. This is owing in a great measure to the effort of the Irish to keep the church a foreign church here, and the opinion they have done their best to foster that to americanize is to protestantize."

To another friend he wrote: "The intense hostility of the Irish to the English, far more intense here than in

Ireland itself, is perhaps, one of the great obstacles Catholicity has to encounter in the United States. I need not tell you that the Irish have noble traits of character, nor that to them we are chiefly indebted for our churches, our clergy, and even our Catholic population; but they have done little or nothing to convert the country, or to recommend their religion to the American people. The church has not taken much hold of the American mind. The Catholic influence counts for nothing. The Irish influence on our politics is great, and most disastrous. There is probably not a worse governed city in the world than New York, and New York is governed principally by Irish grogsellers. The Irishman here seems to understand nothing by politics but the gaining of office for himself and his followers."

A Reviewer is usually a critic, good or bad, kind or unkind, competent or incompetent, and must often appear as a fault-finder, as stern and unfeeling, and yet he may have a warm heart in his bosom and a genial smile on his lips. Brownson had not the reputation of being a good-natured critic, and was supposed by many to be sharp and bitter, cold and unrelenting. In the long course of his critical labors he, no doubt, dealt many severe blows, and made himself many enemies among those whose literary productions he did not appreciate so highly as they or their partial friends had done. Severe criticism is to an author very much as the "*spretæ injuria formæ*" is to a woman who piques herself on her good looks, and in Brownson's case it was a principal cause of his unpopularity and of the hostility aroused against him. A marked exception to this was the case of William B. MacCabe, editor of the Weekly Tele-

graph, of Dublin, though, after all, it was his political course, and not his literary productions which Brownson found fault with.

In the Review for October, 1855 * referring to Irish politics and the quarrel between the *Tablet* and the *Telegraph*, Brownson cast blame on both Lucas and MacCabe. Of the latter he said, he "regretted to find him laboring to bring national prejudices to bear against Mr. Lucas," and further on, "We have a high esteem for Mr. MacCabe, the distinguished author of *The Catholic History of England*, but we must remind him, and we do so in all kindness, that there are things to be pardoned in him as well as in the editor of the *Tablet*. In fact, none of us are faultless enough to be inexorable to what we may regard as the faults of others. We hope that these remarks will be taken in the spirit in which they are made. We wish to see an end to the dis-edifying divisions among our Irish Catholic friends, for almost everything in the present crisis depends, under God, on their united, firm, bold, energetic, and manly action."

MacCabe, though satisfied of the correctness of the part he had taken and of his conduct towards Lucas in all respects, preferred to explain his position and his motives in a private letter to his critic, rather than make a public reply. His letter on this occasion and a second within a month or two later, throw much light on the very complicated and, so far as Americans are concerned, very little understood subject of Irish politics, at least as seen from the writer's point of view.

* *The Know-Nothing Platform, Works*, vol. XVIII. p. 378-9.

WEEKLY TELEGRAPH OFFICE, DUBLIN.

7 Lower Abbey St., December 3d, 1855.

My dear sir:—I am about to trouble you with a very long letter, for what I am afraid you will consider a *very Irish reason*, because of the great kindness with which you, on one occasion, expressed yourself with regard to me, when referring to me, as the author of *Bertha*, you declared I was “a Catholic after your own heart.”

It is an Irish reason, and the true cause of my writing you a long letter in consequence of the allusion made to me, by name, in the last number of your *Review*, in the article *The Know-Nothing Platform*.

There never was a compliment paid to me so grateful to my feelings as that which you expressed in reviewing *Bertha*. Instead then of replying publicly to what is said of me in “The Know-Nothing Platform,” I wish to manifest my respect for you by showing you in a private letter, that you mistake the position I occupy in this country, and that you do not apprehend fully the question which put me into a hostile position as regards the late Mr. Lucas.

My firm conviction is, had you been living in Ireland, as I have been, for the last four years, the very course I have pursued, you would have adopted. That your greater abilities would have contended for the same principles I have been contending, but with this difference that as you would have fought for them more ably, so would your triumph have been more decisive, more marked and more rapid.

The whole sum and substance of the last of these conflicts is compressed into the enclosed extract of a let-

ter written by the Rev'd James Maher, P. P. of Carlow-Graigue, uncle of the Archbishop of Dublin. I pray you to read it. Having read it, I will not add one word in vindication of my conduct for opposing Mr. Lucas with all the energy I could command.

But then it may be said that though I was right in opposing, I was wrong in the manner of opposing him; for instance, in "laboring to bring national prejudice to bear against" him.

Look to the facts. Mr. Lucas had, when in England, quarrelled with Cardinal Wiseman, quarrelled with the Catholic Bishop of London [Southwark?], quarrelled with the English aristocracy and gentry, and found his paper so badly supported in London, that he was glad to transfer it to Dublin. He was neglected by them until he began denouncing the Irish Catholic gentry, abusing Irish priests, quarrelling with Irish Bishops, and when, at last, he denounced publicly the Declaration of the Irish Bishops, clergy and gentry against Convent Legislation, and was, in consequence, hooted down at a public meeting in Dublin, then it was, and not until then, that the very Rev'd Canon Oakley and some other Englishmen proposed a public testimonial in the form of a subscription for him.

Had this project of Canon Oakley's been attended with success; had there been an universal movement in England in favor of it, the consequences, in my opinion, would be an irreconcilable quarrel between the English and the Irish Catholics.

How was such an evil to be prevented? I conceived that the only way of doing so was by showing the odious position which Mr. Lucas "as an Englishman" had taken

up in Ireland, and thus warning English Catholics to be careful that they did not do anything which would as a body identify themselves with him. And taking that course, I rendered the project of Canon Oakley abortive. The testimonial was a failure,—a failure in every way,—as a subscription contemptible, and so utterly a failure that though the address to Mr. Lucas was published in the *Times*, those who got it up did not venture to publish the signatures to it.

What I feared was the English prejudice against the Irish; and my belief is that, had I taken another course, that prejudice would have burst forth, and there would have been now, and for another century, an irreconcilable quarrel between the English and Irish Catholics. This much in explanation of a policy of which you have disapproved.

And now one remark as to the political course pursued by Mr. Lucas. He was in his paper and in parliament always abusing Aberdeen and those other statesmen who opposed the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and he praised in his paper and complimented in Parliament Lord Palmerston, whilst at Kells he openly expressed his admiration for Mr. Disraeli, and bid his hearers—Irish Catholic Tenant farmers—look with hope and confidence to the Tories for the settlement of their question—the Tories being a party which never yet were in power in Ireland, that there was not a despotism of Orangemen established. The great mistake of Mr. Lucas was that he brought the notions and prejudices of his country into Irish Catholic politics, that he sought to popularize Toryism amongst those who by themselves individually, or through their families, had been the victims of Toryism

and the Orange Janizzaries. The great crime of Mr. Lucas was his inordinate ambition. He fancied that by allying himself with Mr. Duffy—a Mazzini in politics, and a Gioberti in religion, and with Dr. Gray—once a Protestant tract-distributor, that they with their three newspapers, *Tablet*, *Nation* and *Freeman*, could establish a system of "terrorism" in Ireland, and by press denunciations terrify candidates, members, and constituencies, and so monopolize the Irish representation, making and unmaking members of Parliament as O'Connell was once able to do.

Observe how in turn each class and grade of society has been denounced. First, the Irish Catholic members—such of them as would not sit on the same side of the House with Mr. Lucas and Mr. Duffy—then every Irish priest who opposed their political views—lastly such Catholic Bishops—and so we had the corruption committee before Parliament, and lastly the mission to Rome.*

I am endeavoring to give you a faithful picture of the occurrences of the last four years. Had you been in Ireland, and saw things as they appeared to me, what course would you have adopted? Would the fear of calumny, of abuse, of misrepresentation, of unceasing slander, of untiring vituperation, have induced you to be silent? I am sure it would not. You would, as I did, have been an opponent to Mr. Lucas and his adherents. This I did, and yet you say "there are things to be pardoned in me as well as in" Mr. Lucas. I do not pretend to be free from error. I am free, God is my witness, of

*Frederick Lucas's Mission to Rome was for the purpose of urging Pius IX to use his influence with the Irish bishops in his favor; but he was compelled by ill-health to go home, where he died a little before the date of MacCabe's letters.

intentional error. But now let me tell you my position, and *how* I came to be mixed up with Irish politics, during the last four years.

I was ten years connected with the Irish press. I then went to London, and was seventeen years a *Parliamentary Reporter* on the *Morning Chronicle* and *Morning Herald*. I left Dublin with some reputation as a Catholic writer. I increased that reputation by writing the *Catholic History of England*—a work, I need not say, written in direct contradiction to English prejudices, and beyond all other things, to a prejudice very prevalent previous to publication—namely that the low church as now existing in England, and the Anglo-Saxon church were identical. I gave the proof in that work. I did not write for popularity or for profit.

Such was my position in London when I was applied to, and the offer made to me to become editor of a Catholic paper to be established in Dublin. To that offer I acceded on these conditions, first a guarantee for three years of the same income I had in London—£ 500 a year—second that if I became editor I should be absolute and uncontrolled in the conduct of the paper, as much so as if I stood in the same position as its sole proprietor. Third, that the paper to be started should be sold for *three pence*—the price of all Catholic papers being then *six pence*, and my great desire being to supply the Irish Catholics in the manufacturing districts of England with a paper the same price as the infamous anti-Catholic and infidel newspapers of London. These conditions were agreed to. All were literally fulfilled; but at the close of the third year when the guarantee expired, I was asked to take less than the £ 500 a year.

I agreed to do so, and upon asking what sum it was proposed to be reduced to, I took less than was offered, and am now a loser of £ 200 a year, that is, I have £ 200 a year less than if I had remained in London.

In coming to Dublin I made the determination to hold myself aloof from all persons and parties, to look at events as they arose and to give upon them an unbiassed opinion. That I have done. I live altogether out of society; so much so that though here now for four years I do not know twenty persons I did not know seventeen years ago. I never sat at the same table with any one of the persons with whose names the *Telegraph* has been identified, and for whose conduct it has been made responsible.

These are facts; and yet how have I been treated? When Sadlier and Keogh took office their paper was the very next day denounced from the altar by the Rev'd Thos. O'Keefe at Callan. It has been denounced from the altar by the Rev'd Mr. Mullen, whom you may have seen in America canvassing for the University; it was at one time publicly burned in the streets of Kells, by a Rev'd Mr. O'Reilly—not, because there was anything in it *contra bonos mores*, but because it was said to be Mr. Sadlier and Mr. Keogh's paper—Mr. Keogh having as much to do with it as you have, and Mr. Sadlier never having interfered in its management, but having got other members of Parliament to join with him in establishing it.

This treatment of the *Telegraph* I have never alluded to publicly, because if I did an injury would be inflicted on religion, it would be made use of by the enemies of our faith, and I prefer bearing the wrong than give a triumph to the enemies of Catholicity.

This, then, my dear sir, is my position. I have never taken personally any part in politics. No matter what party may be in or out of office, I can neither gain nor lose by it. I have not even an interest in the *Telegraph*, for I refused taking a longer engagement than for a week, and am ready any day to throw it up, if the proprietors were to seek to put into it anything of which I disapproved, or to prevent my giving expression to my own convictions upon public men or upon public measures. Under such circumstances my opinions ought to be honest, for they certainly are disinterested; and yet, because my conscience has told me I ought to oppose certain men, and certain measures, I have seen my character for integrity assailed, I have seen my reputation as an author impugned, and I have seen the same men who formerly praised the same book (*Bertha*) abusing it. We are not what men think us to be; but what God knows us to be. I can bear with equanimity the unjust attacks of such papers as the *Nation* here, and of the *Citizen*, *Irish American*, and *Truth Teller* of New York, but I do confess there are a few that I wish could know me as I am, and if you were not one of those few, be assured I would not trouble you with this long letter. If you have favored me by reading it, then I will pray of you to accept a *Third Edition* of "*Bertha*," which was just issued from the press, a copy of which will be forwarded through Mr. Dolman.

Ever, my dear sir, with sincere gratitude,

Your friend,

WM. B. MACCABE.

MR. BROWNSON.

In his answer, Brownson said: "I had no intention of offering an opinion on the merits of the controversy between you and the late Mr. Lucas, and indeed, as I seldom see the Tablet, I know little of the controversy itself, except what I gathered from your own columns. I believed and still believe, that Mr. Lucas was sincere in his Catholic faith and in his regard for the interests of Ireland. But I never sympathized with him, and in his mode of pursuing even good ends he never pleased me. There always appeared a sort of gruff John Bullism about him, by no means to my taste, and his violence towards bishops and clergy had long since prevented me from reading his paper.

"I should never have said what I did had I not felt that I could say thus much without being misunderstood by you." Regretting that his remarks should have caused pain, especially to one whom he looked on as a friend, he discussed Irish politics at some length, giving his own impressions and inviting the expression of his correspondent's. To this MacCabe replied:

Vernon Avenue, CLONTARF, DUBLIN, January 31st, 1856.

My dear Dr. Brownson:—I am most grateful to you for your most kind letter; and when you say in it that I think you have not done me justice on the Lucas controversy, you will take the first opportunity to make me ample amends, I reply to you, as far as I am personally concerned, I do not wish you ever again to allude to it.

All I cared for was not to be mistaken by you. All that I wished for was that my exact position should be known to you. As to the public—the political public—I have nothing to do with it, and personally am as little to

the politicians in Dublin as in New York. My world is in books, my society is composed of the old monkish writers; and I am never seen by anybody but at home, and for a couple of hours each day in the *Telegraph* office.

I am most unwillingly a writer upon Irish politics, and nothing but a fixed conviction that I saw in the career pursued by Lucas, Duffy, &c., the same course which was adopted in Rome in 1847, for the purpose of preparing the way for an anti-sacerdotal, anti-episcopal, and anti-papal revolution, would have induced me to take the decided part I did against them.

Believe me when I say this, that I am convinced that I felt more deep pain in having to write against them than they did in reading what I wrote. I have been sacrificing my own feelings, doing violence to my nature, in so acting upon my own convictions.

These miserable Irish politics are a torture to me; but being placed in the midst of them, and a journal being put at my command, it would have been an abandonment of duty, if when I saw mischief doing, and greater mischief impending, I did not endeavor to neutralize the one, and prevent the other.

You have reached the source of these mischiefs when you say, "I think it a misfortune for Catholic Ireland that the clergy have so much to do with politics."

It is our misfortune—the misfortune you mention—it is one of the consequences flowing from the long and effective operation of the Penal laws. These Penal laws could not prevent the growth of a poor, serf-conditioned population; they could not prevent the clergy keeping alive the fire of religion in the hearts of that population; but these same laws did most effectually extinguish a

Catholic gentry and prevent the growth of a Catholic middle class. It is since the relaxation of the Penal laws that a Catholic gentry—gentry by wealth, though not yet, with rare exceptions, with intelligence and education,—have grown up amongst us. It is since then, I might say, within the last thirty years, that we have had anything like a numerous Catholic middle class; and this middle class are for the most part engaged rather in acquiring wealth than information. Of the 32 counties in Ireland, there are I believe 8, I am sure there are 5, in which there is not to be found a single bookseller's shop. The shopkeepers do not read books, and the farmers—wealthy farmers—do not even read newspapers. This is the general description of them, and like every other general description, there are exceptions. The land is held by a hostile race: the landowners, the magistrates are Protestants, the descendants of Cromwellians; they regard themselves as a conquering race; thus there are two Irelands in Ireland, the Anglican Protestant Irish, and the Catholic aboriginal Irish—in the estimation of the former, the Red Indians of Ireland.

Now look at our position, with the Penal laws repealed,—no Catholic gentry, no Catholic middle class, and an intelligent, educated, haughty, and tyrannical conquering race—with no one independent enough by his position to protect the Red Indian masses but their priests. Such has been our situation in Ireland. The people would have been, to use the expression of an Irish Lord Chancellor, “ground to powder,” if it were not for the priests; and so the priests, as a portion of the duty imposed upon them, had to become politicians.

Bear this fact in mind—from 1793 the Irish Catholic population had the franchise. They were 40^s freeholders. In what way did they exercise that franchise? As the negroes do their hoes, for the profit of their masters, and in obedience to their command. By hundreds and by thousands they voted at elections for the *Beresfords* and other opponents to Catholic Emancipation. In 1825, the Catholics offered to the Tories *conditions* to get emancipation. One of these conditions was the abolition of the 40^s freeholders. These conditions were rejected, and *then* it was that O'Connell called upon the priests to stir up the population, to make of themselves politicians to win religious freedom. They did so, and at the general elections in 1825, the 40^s freeholders voted at Waterford, Louth, &c, against their masters, the landlords. They did the same in 1828 in Clare, to return O'Connell, and Emancipation was won. And from that time to this, the priests have been politicians. We have an upstart (I do not say this disparagingly, but as the fact) gentry, an upstart middle class, and in too many instances they are both disposed to cringe, and flatter, and bend and bow before the conquering race. The only *speechifiers* with independence are the priests, but then here is the great mischief that has followed from this state of things. The priests themselves are not educated for the position they hold, nor for the power they can exercise. They know their religion, but they know nothing of the world. Reared with parish notions, they go into Maynooth as students, they pass through their course, not being allowed to read even a newspaper whilst there, and then they go back to their parish where, because they are priests, they are revered and find themselves

in the midst of a poor ignorant population. Seeing themselves the first men in their parish, they think that the world is like that parish, and that as they are obeyed there, so ought they to be obeyed everywhere else. They thus read a Dublin newspaper, and these Dublin newspapers have for the most part grown into importance out of *profitable agitation*—agitations, for instance for *Catholic Emancipation*, then for a *Repeal of the Union*, and then for an undefined *Tenant Right*. I have said a *profitable agitation*, that is, an agitation *profitable for the newspapers*. You may guess how profitable when I was able to quote on one occasion an extract from one of the accounts of the old Repeal association by which it appeared that in less than 2 months £240 was paid to the *Nation*, and £220 to the *Freeman* for extra copies circulated through the country. This independent of advertising accounts. These papers are always exciting priests and people to ask for something which will not be conceded. Thus for instance they have been abusing Sergeant Shea for bringing in a Bill which would give to the tenant all he could fairly ask for; and if you look to the papers of this week you will see they have called upon Mr. G. H. Moore to bring in a Bill which they know will never pass.

The consequence of this state of things is that the great body of the young priests have mixed themselves up with the Dublin newspaper agitation. They have become violent politicians, impracticable politicians, and the result has been disedifying conduct, and disedifying language on the part of Irish priests. One Archbishop, the Papal Delegate, seeing the evil of these things, has endeavored to put an end to them. He has in his own

Diocese recalled the priests to the performance of their religious duties alone, he has prohibited priests going from one parish to another making agitation speeches, and hence the mission to Rome, and all these sad scenes that have been occurring, and that occupy so much space in the *Telegraph* of last week as well as this. He is supported by the Primate and most of the Bishops. He is opposed by Archbishop McHale and two of his suffragans.

I have troubled you with a long letter, because I wished to give you an idea of how it is priests have become politicians in Ireland; and why it is their persisting in continuing so is leading to mischief to religion, to the country, and to themselves.

Do not, my dear Mr. Brownson, refer to me in connexion with Irish politics; for my heart is not in them; but should you in New York meet with my *Catholic History of England*, mention my name in connexion with that or with *Florine*. These are the things I desire to be known by, and remembered for. Politics and newspapers are my detestation. I live by them, not *for* them, and am pining for the hour when I shall have done with them for ever.

Believe me, with sincere regard, and grateful thanks for your kindness,

Your devoted friend,

WM. B. MACCABE.*

*A letter written nearly two years later by W. F. Finlason from London, attempted to give Brownson an insight into the spirit of the English and Irish Catholic press. Though the writer shows more resentment than becomes an impartial judge, and moreover Brownson was more likely to form his own judgment of periodicals which he was in the habit of reading than to take it from another, yet there is some truth in what Finlason wrote: "It has been my disappointment to find that among English and

It was not long before MacCabe's independence of the owners of the *Weekly Telegraph* in the management of that journal brought about his retirement, and the loss of his means of livelihood. His next letter to Brownson mentions this fact.

DINAN, Côtes du Nord, FRANCE, April 1st. 1859.

My dear sir:—It is no news to tell you that I have long since ceased to be editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*.

As the editor of a Catholic journal, I acted at all times and on all occasions in strict accordance with the maxims of St. Paul—"Speak ye the truth every man with his neighbor," and the moment that an attempt was made to interfere with me—that the paper I conducted

Irish Catholics, purely papal principles, or my understanding of them, have met with little sympathy. In England this came from the exclusiveness and peculiar characteristics of the Oxford school, combined with the torpid, un-Papal character of old English Catholicism. In Ireland the incurable passion of the priesthood for party politics and their consequent distaste for Papal Rescripts restraining them have produced the same results. The Newman clique has almost monopolized the Catholic literature of England; and though I was for some time a contributor to the *Rambler* and *Register* as well as the *Dublin Review*, the cliquishness of the two former led me to throw them up, and the *Dublin Review* now changes hands, very likely to fall into the same clique. If so, I shall leave it. Up to this time there have always been one or two articles of mine in it. Two this No. Two the last. The series on English history is mine, Madeleine Smith, Mayo Election and Exeter Hall, Trial by Jury, &c. With the *Register* my rupture is as recent as this week, and in the No. of tomorrow [Jan. 1, 1858] you will see the cause. It will speak for itself. The inconsistency of the paper excites the contempt of every earnest Romanist. A few weeks ago, I was entrusted by it with the reviewing of Maguire's book, and the writing of some leaders on the subject, in which, as is my wont, I wrote most strongly upon Papal views. Last week I was held up to ridicule as an ultra-Romanist. The result was that I indignantly withdrew, and you see my answer. The truth is, you were right in saying these men are only half converted, and have never grasped Papal principles. One came on the Hampden case, another on the Gorham case, a third on the Denison case, or on some paltry partial issue; not one of them upon the only real substantial issue, Papal authority. Hence they care nothing for the Pope. A quarter ago, I wrote in the D. Review the article "Bad Popes," which curiously enough both schools (i. e. the Anglican and Irish) combined to abuse for the reason already hinted at, the Dollinger school of low-Catholics in England, the Savonarola school of hot political priests in Ireland, equally saw themselves satirized, and were equally enraged."

should cease to speak *my own* honest sentiments and convictions, that moment I resigned my position.

This resignation was a great pecuniary loss to me. It broke up my home; and I may say, that one of its consequences was to send my eldest unmarried daughter, Victoria, to America, as she wished to see if the accomplishments and acquirements she possesses—her knowledge of music, French, &c., would not enable her to make out an independence for herself, as a teacher. With these honorable and laudable motives she is now in New Orleans, La., but in a letter received from her yesterday she tells me that she feels much the loss of good letters of introduction.

Upon reading this passage in her letter I thought of you, I remembered your great kindness to me—the opinions you had expressed of me—the last number of your Review that I have seen was that containing the notice of *Adelaide*—and remembering that you are as well known in all parts of the States, as I am personally unknown, it occurred to me that if you could confer a favor or render a service to my dear child, by supplying her with letters of introduction to those who might be useful to her, and aid her in her honest endeavors you would for the sake of the father so assist his daughter.

Besides this—you are yourself a father—and will therefore feel interested for a brave-hearted girl who has faced the dangers of the ocean, and has not feared the perils of a strange land in the endeavor to lighten the burden on his shoulders.

I do not, my dear sir, say one word to you on the injustice that has been done to me, and one of the consequences of which are thus so strikingly presented to

you. "He that dissembleth injustice is wise; the learning of a man is known by patience; and his glory is to pass over wrongs." Apply these observations to those who should have been my friends, and then guess why I am silent.

I send this letter to my dear child to be forwarded by her from New Orleans, and when she is sending it, she will give you her address. And sure I am as that I am writing to you, so will you favor her with a letter in reply.

Believe me ever your grateful and sincere friend,
WM. B. MACCABE.

DR. O. BROWNSON.

Brownson was able to send letters which Miss MacCabe most gratefully acknowledged the receipt of and found of great assistance.

CHAPTER II.

MONTALEMBERT.—VEUILLOT.

THAT Brownson's most prized friends were hardly less liable to incur the censure of his criticism, when they fell short of his standard, than strangers or opponents, though the censure might be more sugar-coated, was shown in a judgment of Montalembert at the beginning of his New-York residence. There was no one with whom he was more in sympathy, or whose good opinion and good will he more highly valued. Their correspondence had been confidential and friendly. The last let-

ler he had received from the Count was written in November, 1855, and was in the usual tone of that writer's letters, as follows:

LA ROCHE EN BRENY (Côte d'or), November 1st, 1855.

My dear and honored friend:—I really feel quite ashamed at not having sooner thanked you for your most kind and interesting letter of last January, and for the renewed and increasing gratification which I derive from the perusal of each successive number of your Review. You must forgive me on account of my numerous domestic and other engagements, and once for all be convinced that, whether silent or otherwise, I look upon your friendship and sympathy as one of the greatest privileges which Providence has conferred upon me. Since I received your letter in February, I have been much taken up, and in the first place by a conscientious study of all our military organization in order to be able to denounce the Emperor's attempt to re-model in a despotic and mercenary spirit the admirable system of our army, which I did however ineffectually in a long speech which I took care to send you through Bossange. I next proceeded on a long wished for visit to England, where I had not been for the last sixteen years, and from whence I have returned with greater confidence than I had expected in the future prospects of that great nation. You know I always think you are too severe on England, and apt to forget the eminent service which your own Anglo-Saxon race has done to the freedom and dignity of Human kind. The results of my observations in England I have consigned in an essay which will be published in the next number of the *Correspondant*. This last mentioned

periodical has also taken up of late all my time; but I have at length succeeded, not without great difficulties, and great personal and pecuniary sacrifices, in *reorganizing*, and renewing this old Catholic Review so as to make it the focus of our old Catholic doctrines and of all those efforts and labours which are not engulfed in that vortex of fanaticism and servility, the *Univers*. A new series has begun with the October number, and will be carried on under the joint direction of M. de Falloux, the Prince de Broglie, MM. Foisset and Lenormant and myself, together with the countenance of the Bishop of Orleans, the fathers of the Oratory, &c. The present number contains a most masterly refutation of one of Cousin's principal scholars by Father Gratry, who is more and more rising into eminence, and certainly writes better than any living man in France on philosophical matters. M. Foisset's paper on Ozanam you will also much like. We shall most likely inherit Villemain and Pontmartin from the wreck of the *Contemporaine*, who as you know has been bought up by the Imperial police. And we hope to receive into our haven of truth and independence all those who wish to steer clear of Veillot's ravings and of Buloz's rationalistic monopoly. Now, my dear Mr. Brownson, we must go hand in hand with you and your Review. You must let me know how we can safely and speedily send you over our monthly numbers, and you must direct Mr. Dolman * to send another copy of your Quarterly to the *bureau of the Correspondant*, 29 *Rue de Tournon*, Paris, as mine is to be sent after me in the country. Although we stand in need of translators to an incredible degree, I intend that each of your numbers

* Mr. Brownson's London Publisher.

shall be the object of attentive study and extracts in the *Correspondant*, being as I am more than ever convinced that no Catholic publication is carried on with so much vigor and reason as yours.

A man called *Henry de Courcy*, but who writes under the assumed name of *C. de la Roche Héron*, who is employed in some commercial concern (of glass importation I believe) at New York, and who is constantly abusing America and the Americans in the *Univers*, has *denounced you* in this self-same *Univers* as being my correspondent and writing under my dictation! This will not, I trust, deter you from going on as you have done till now, and renewing your most valuable efforts to rescue the cause of Catholic truth from the clutches of those who are doing their best to ruin it in both Hemispheres, and who have unfortunately laid but too strong a hold on the Catholic Press in England and Ireland.

I in vain inquired at Dolman's for the Nos. 22 and 24 of your *second* series, he had not got them; so that if you can lay hold of them, pray send them over to me, in order that my library may contain your *complete* works.

I now refer to your three last numbers (not having yet received the October one), which I look upon as so many *letters-patent* from you to your friends and admirers *dans les Deux Mondes*. In the one for *January* I was particularly struck by your excellent judgment on Radowitz, * a man whom I have known since 1834, and whose premature death prevented him from reconquering the dominating situation he had for a time occupied in Germany and was undoubtedly entitled to. Your

* The Articles on Radowitz were by the Editor's Son, who had been appointed "Assistant Editor."

strictures on France in the article on *Russia and the Western Powers* * are both true and powerful, although, as I have already stated, my most legitimate *grievances* against Napoleon III do not induce me to deny that he has acted with justice and prudence in the beginning of the war and up to the Vienna negotiation in last May. Although the success which has attended the Crimean expedition is most conducive to the consolidation of a policy which I look upon as the bane both of religion and society in France, I can but adore the decrees of that unerring Providence which has fixed upon this moment to humble the pride and dispel the *prestige* of Russian despotism.

Your judgment in the April number on Donoso Cortes is perfect † and nothing can be more useful than to sift and extract, as you do, what is true and just out of Liberalism and Socialism instead of consigning the invincible spirit of modern Humanity to a blind and sweeping proscription. An admirable passage on *American Charity* in the "Questions of the Soul" ‡ I shall try to get translated for the *Correspondant*, as well as that on Traditionalism p. 228, 230. Deeply do I regret that it is impossible, under our *existing* legislation, to publish your most eloquent denunciation of Cæsarism and new-fangled Catholic Servilism which you have subjoined to the translation of my fragment on the Roman Empire in your July number. Nothing can be more to the point, nothing could be of greater use to our poor deluded clergy. But we are exactly and more than ever in the predica-

* Works, Vol. XVI. p. 427.

† "Liberalism and Socialism," Works, Vol. X. p. 526.

‡ Works, Vol. XIV. p. 538.

ment you point out in p. 32 i. A stroke of the pen from the head policeman at the Ministry of the Interior can put an end to the existence of the *Correspondant* or any other independent paper without the possibility of any judicial complaint or resistance. The Catholic paper of this department, *Le Spectateur de Dijon*, was but the other day condemned to an *avertissement* (the first step to a downright suppression) for having lamented the religious policy of Piémont, the *Emperor's ally*, while the *Presse* is allowed full liberty to publish 41,000 copies every day of Mde. Sand's obscene and blasphemous Memoirs. I should have liked to discuss with you the paper on *Italy and the Christian Alliance* * as I think it quite preposterous to maintain that *Protestant* nations, such as England, Holland, and Sweden have lost their political liberty, which is but too true of *Catholic* states like Spain, Portugal, and Italy, during the three last centuries. But time and space preclude me from so doing. I must stop, and remain your ever obliged and devoted friend and servant,

Le Cte de Montalembert.

You will, I trust, have remarked that the Austrian *concordat* would never have been *granted* nor even *asked for* if during twenty years, from 1830 to 1850, the Catholic party in France and Belgium had not debated and morally carried the questions of right and liberty which the Church had itself almost given up in all Catholic and monarchical countries since the 17th century. And these salutary debates would never have been possible without the constitutional and political freedom which is now done away with in France.

* An Article contributed to the Review by Rev. John T. Roddan.

Brownson's answer was written soon after.

NEW YORK, December 25th, 1855.

My dear Count:—I hardly know how to thank you for the letter of the first of last month. It was only too kind and flattering, but it has solaced me, and given me new zeal and courage. Your sympathy and approval are very dear to me, and to have won them makes me feel that I have not labored altogether in vain.

You will see that I have removed from Boston, and taken up my residence in New York, which is our commercial and ecclesiastical metropolis. My address is simply "New York, U. S. A." I think I shall be here more free to advocate our old constitutional doctrines, and I am nearer the friends on whom I have chiefly to rely.

You may well imagine that the reorganization of *Le Correspondant* gives me great pleasure. I have received the first nos. of the new series, and have noticed it in my *Review* for January. I shall do all in my power for its circulation here. You will see when you get my Jan. No. what I think of the movement.

Père Gratry is certainly an extraordinary man, and a most able philosophical writer, but I do not quite understand his doctrine of induction, or if I do, I do not precisely agree with him. He was good enough to send me his *Connaissance de Dieu*. I have not seen his *Logique*. Since writing my notice of his reply to M. Saisset, I have read M. Saisset's article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. As against M. Saisset Père Gratry is successful; but I have signalized a point on which I wish he would give me some information. I would open a

correspondence with him, but I can write only in my own language, and I do not know that he reads English. You will see the point, and will you do me the favor to call his attention to it, and ask him to write me on it, for he is a man from whom one does not feel comfortable in differing?

The Prince de Broglie is a writer after my own heart. I like him exceedingly. By the way, I regard Père de Valroger as one of your best philosophical writers. His *Etudes sur le Rationalisme* is a masterpiece in its way.

What has become of your *Life and Times of St. Bernard*? You cannot regard the pious but weak affair of the Abbé Ratisbonne as a substitute. The Abbé has made a good book for the Christian but by no means the book we want. It can hardly interfere with yours.

I shall read with great interest your essay on England. I think you have a little touch of Anglo-mania, but after all, not much more than I have. Yet we in this country do not like the Anglo-French alliance, and our sympathies are now very much with Russia. For myself, save as a question of the balance of power, not for Europe only, but for the world, I care not how much Russia is humbled, if effectually humbled. I am quite willing to see France predominant in the East, but I do not wish to see England any stronger there than she now is. I am not satisfied with Austria. The Concordat is good, but I am afraid it will operate much evil by its influence in keeping Catholics chained to the car of absolutism. I fear the young Emperor's centralization measures. The Concordat will be kept so far as it binds the church; so far as it binds the state,—perhaps so.

Austria, however, is taking a politic step in cultivating the friendship of this country, where she needs a much abler minister.

We have here the same battle to fight that you have, and thus far I have had to fight almost single-handed. Our Catholics have been cast in the mould of absolutism, and our Irish clergy confound obedience with servility. They cannot understand the submission of a people to the church from love and intelligent conviction. All manliness and independence is heresy or schism, or what is worse than either, *un-Irish*. . .

O. A. BROWNSON.

With these friendly feelings towards Montalembert, Brownson read the articles in the *Correspondant* for November and December, 1855, on England's Political Prospects, *De l'Avenir politique de l'Angleterre*, and found himself differing on nearly every point from the author, and set forth in his Review for April, 1856 * his own views in a kindly but forcible manner. Montalembert certainly went to the very extreme in his admiration for English society and the English constitution. The aristocratic element of the British government attracted his special admiration, and his aim was to model the constitution of France on that of her transfretal neighbor. The aristocracy of England (which possessed such charms for the French count who lamented that aristocratic France, which wounded mortally in the Fronde, expired on the 4th of August, 1789; and though galvanized into reappearance under the restoration and the July monarchy, vanished like a spectre at cock-crow, in

**Montalembert on England*, Works, Vol. XVI. p. 489.

February, 1848) is, no doubt, all that Montalembert thought it, wealthy, cultivated, and enlightened, perhaps the most vigorous in the world; and in its broadest acceptance may include the military and naval, the civil and ecclesiastical officers of the country. But below these are classes not likely to come under the notice of a foreign nobleman, the great mass of the peasantry and operatives, as well as the petty thieves and nondescripts living no one knows how, more immoral, brutish, and ignorant than the inhabitants of the island at the time of Julius Cæsar's invasion. Montalembert attributed the industrial activity, the commercial and manufacturing prosperity of England to her political constitution; Brownson admired that constitution for the English people as suited to their tastes, prejudices, pride, and flunkysism; but maintained that it was the people that made the political constitution, not the political constitution that made the people what they were. The attempt to fasten that constitution on other nations had been tried, and with disastrous results in Portugal, Spain, Sicily, and Naples, and even in France in 1789, in 1814 and 1815, and finally in 1830. But when Montalembert, the long-honored Catholic leader, excused, and almost praised, the English Church establishment because he happened to find it an element in a political constitution which he admired, Brownson began to fear that he was for the moment more absorbed in the political than the Catholic question, and warned him to be admonished by Gioberti's fall through his Italian patriotism and love of constitutionalism first cherished for the sake of religion, and La Mennais's lapse into heresy and rebellion against the church, through his

anxiety to relieve Catholicity of its apparent alliance with the despotic courts of Europe. He called the essay a mistake, and not what was expected of one who had accepted and loyally served the Republic of 1848, and supported the *Coup d'état* of 1851, and urged his friends to sustain Louis Napoleon. Though the Count had not willed the empire, the Reviewer thought him under obligation to accept and respect it as the will of the French nation, leaving it to time and events, and the efforts of the wise and patriotic of the nation, to amend whatever in it might be faulty.

Montalembert must have read this criticism with equal surprise and indignation, if one may judge from his next letter to Brownson, which was as follows:

MAICHE (DOUBS), ce 8 Juillet, 1856.

Je n'affecterai pas, Monsieur, d'ensevelir dans le silence les sentimens de surprise et d'affliction qu'a fait naître en moi la lecture de votre article du mois d'avril dernier sur mon *Avenir politique de l'Angleterre*. Je vous demande, au contraire, la permission de vous les exprimer sans détour, et de me servir cette fois de ma propre langue, pour n'être pas exposé à mal rendre ma pensée en traitant de matières aussi graves que délicates.

Toutefois, avant de réclamer contre ce qui m'a paru souverainement injuste et imprudent dans votre critique, je dois et je veux vous remercier de l'attention que vous avez bien voulu consacrer à mon travail. C'est toujours un honneur pour un livre et pour un écrivain que d'être examinés et appréciés par une plume comme la votre. Croyez bien du reste que le désaccord que vous avez

manifesté entre vous et moi au sujet de l'Angleterre ne m'a étonné ni mécontenté. Vous me reprochez de l'avoir jugée trop favorablement ; vous me semblez à moi la juger beaucoup trop sévèrement. Peut-être la vérité est elle à égale distance de nos deux opinions. Quoiqu'il en soit, je vous prie de remarquer que vous faites au peuple anglais un plus grand honneur que moi. Vous supposez que c'est un caractère qui a fait ses institutions et qui par elle a créé la grandeur incomparable de son rôle historique ; tandis que selon moi, ce sont ces institutions qui ont créé, racheté ou atténué les défauts immenses de son caractère national, et toutes les nations Catholiques auraient pu rivaliser avec cette grandeur, si elles n'avaient pas misérablement sacrifié leurs vieilles libertés pour se laisser exploiter et énerver par l'alliance mortelle du despotisme et de la religion.

Mais ce ne sont là que des points secondaires, sur lesquels les appréciations sont libres, et les dissidences sans inconvénient. Il en est tout autrement de vos jugements publiquement exprimés sur les relations des Catholiques français avec le nouvel empire, et des reproches que vous adressez à ceux qui comme moi ont eu l'honneur de servir l'église dans des jours difficiles et prétendent garder cet honneur intact au milieu de la prostration à peu près universelle de leurs contemporains.

Et d'abord, j'ose croire que si vous trouviez nécessaire de me donner un avertissement sur ma conduite politique, il eût été plus convenable et plus équitable de me le faire parvenir sous la forme d'un avis confidentiel que de me l'adresser publiquement. Les relations intimes et sympathiques qui ont jusqu'à présent existé

entre nous devaient, ce semble, vous faire une obligation de suivre cette voie, au moins pour commencer, et de ne pas faire succéder immédiatement à votre lettre particulière du 25 Décembre, qui témoigne de l'accord le plus complet entre nous, une réprimande publique tellement acerbe et compromettante pour moi qu'elle a été jugée digne d'être reproduite ici par l'organe le plus discrédité et le plus virulent de la police impériale, la *Revue Contemporaine*. Vous n'ignorez pas sans doute que la législation actuelle de la presse en France rend impossible toute réponse par la même voie, toute discussion publique des actes de l'empereur ou des institutions politiques qu'il a créés. Je suis donc condamné à rester, aux yeux du public, sous le coup de vos critiques. Je m'en console par la pensée que je pourrais dans cette réponse confidentielle, m'exprimer avec une liberté que comporterait difficilement une publicité quelconque.

Vous dites avec raison que l'on doit marcher *avec* le sentiment national et non pas *contre* ce sentiment, et que je me suis toujours efforcé d'en agir ainsi pendant tout le cours de ma carrière politique. Cela est vrai: et c'est précisément parce que j'ai vu le premier entre les chefs de l'ancienne majorité conservatrice, que le prince qui s'est emparé du Trône de France avait pour lui le sentiment national, que je me suis efforcé de faire triompher sa cause par toutes les voies légales et honnêtes. Personne n'a plus franchement, plus courageusement défendu cette cause. J'ai tendu la main à ce prince quand personne, parmi les hommes considérables de mon pays, ne voulait compter avec lui; j'ai été son témoin, son champion dans les moments les plus critiques. J'ai bravé tous les préjugés, toutes les rancunes; je me

suis compromis avec tous les partis ; et cela non seulement avant le coup d'état du 2 Décembre, mais même après ; et tant que la lutte entre lui et le socialisme m'a paru douteuse, sans toutefois approuver les moyens injustes et inutilement violens qu'il a employés pour triompher.

Pourquoi donc n'ai-je pas continué à lui prêter l'appui que je lui avais donné jusqu'au mois de Janvier, 1852 ? Pour deux raisons souveraines ; parce que ma conscience éclairée par sa conduite, m'a éloigné de lui, et parce que lui-même a refusé nettement mon concours.

Trois grands faits m'ont ouvert les yeux sur le caractère et le système de l'Empereur :

1° Malgré mes conseils et mes instances, il a refusé d'user de sa dictature pour compléter l'œuvre de la liberté d'enseignement, et pour abroger les lois incompatibles avec la liberté de l'Eglise décrétées par son oncle sous le nom *d'articles organiques du Concordat*. Ni alors, ni depuis il n'a rien fait pour dérober à l'action continuelle de ces lois la liberté des conciles, des associations charitables, des ordres religieux ; il s'est contenté d'en atténuer l'exécution comme cela avait déjà eu lieu sous les régimes précédents. Il n'a donné à l'Eglise aucune garantie, aucun droit, rien que de bonnes paroles et des faveurs pécuniaires, ce dont l'épiscopat et le clergé se sont contentés, au grand détriment de leur réputation et de leur avenir.

2° A une dictature qui pouvait être provisoirement nécessaire, mais qui devait être essentiellement temporaire, il a substitué, par la constitution du 14 Janvier 1852, une *autocratie* permanente, qui, sous les dehors hypocrites de la souveraineté du peuple, et d'un suffrage

universel où les électeurs ne peuvent ni s'éclairer, ni concerter, *ni choisir* leurs représentants, place l'omnipotence gouvernementale entre les mains d'un seul homme, sans contrôle, sans garantie pour aucun droit individuel ; sans publicité pour aucun grief ; en un mot, le système que vous avez si bien nommé le *césarisme*, que vous avez flétri plus énergiquement que personne, et que vous ne sauriez ni admirer ni recommander aux Catholiques sans démentir tout ce que j'ai lu de vous depuis que je vous connais, et jusqu'à vingt passages de cette même livraison *d'Avril* où vous me reprochez de ne pas l'accepter et de ne pas le regarder comme *inviolable*.

3° Des institutions, quelque mauvaises qu'elles soient, peuvent être améliorées : leur valeur dépend surtout des hommes qui les mettent en œuvre. L'Empereur aurait pu facilement faire estimer et accepter les siennes, s'il en avait confié la gestion aux hommes éminents par le caractère et par le talent que la France renferme en si grand nombre. Or, c'est précisément le contraire qu'il a fait. Huit jours après la promulgation de sa constitution, sans provocation, sans prétexte, sans utilité quelconque, il a décrété la confiscation du patrimoine séculaire des princes de cette maison d'Orléans dont le chef lui *avait fait deux fois grâce de la vie!* Il ne pouvait avoir d'autre but, en commettant cet attentat, que d'éloigner de toute participation dans son gouvernement tous les hommes considérables qui avaient servi la France sous le règne de Louis Philippe, et tous ceux qui, sans avoir été jusque là revêtus de fonctions publiques, avaient quelque souci de leur bonne renommée en même temps que du droit public et privé de la

France. Il a dressé ainsi les fourches Caudines de la spoliation à l'entrée de sa carrière, afin de forcer tous ceux qui voudraient le servir à lui sacrifier d'avance leur conscience et leur honneur, afin d'écarter pour toujours ceux dont l'âme droite et fière pourrait lui opposer quelque résistance.

C'est le lendemain de ces décrets que d'accord avec quelques amis, je me suis démis des fonctions provisoirement honorifiques qu'il m'avait conférées ; et depuis lors je ne l'ai plus revu. Mais je sais de *science certaine* qu'en apprenant ma démission il a dit à une princesse de sa famille, " Je suis enchanté d'être débarrassé de M. de M. ; il n'aurait fait que de me gêner."

Je passe sous silence les procédés personnels qu'il a eus envers moi. Après avoir accepté avec empressement les services nombreux que je lui avais rendus pendant que sa fortune était encore la plus incertaine au monde, dès qu'il a été sur de la victoire, il s'est conduit envers moi de façon à me donner le droit d'affirmer devant Dieu et les hommes que la délicatesse et la reconnaissance sont des sentiments étrangers à son cœur, et qu'on a eu bien raison de lui donner pour devise : *Plus de bonheur que d'honneur.*

Ces procédés, qui ont dû déterminer mon attitude envers l'Empereur, ne pouvaient pas, je le sais, faire loi pour d'autres que pour moi, mais ils n'annonçaient que trop sa conduite ultérieure.

Il a parfaitement réussi à éloigner de lui tous ceux dont l'adhésion l'eût honoré, ou qu'il n'a pas su humilier en se les imposant. Nous avons un vieux proverbe ainsi conçu : *Dis moi qui tu hantes, et je te dirai qui tu es,* Ses plus fanatiques apologistes sacrifient volontiers son

entourage. Mais qui donc est responsable de cet entourage ? Aucune nécessité parlementaire, aucun engagement politique ne le condamnait à subir tel ou tel comme cela arrive souvent aux souverains constitutionnels. Il est le seul maître de ses choix, et pouvait choisir librement dans tous les partis, dans toutes les opinions, dans toutes les classes, s'il l'avait voulu. Il eut facilement et promptement rallié tout le monde à deux ou trois exceptions près. Au lieu de cela, qu'a-t-il fait ? Passez en revue tous les hommes qu'il a investés de sa confiance dans l'ordre politique, qu'il a appelés aux premières fonctions de l'état, vous n'en trouverez presque pas un qui soit honoré de l'estime publique, ou qui ne soit signalé par quelque éclatante palinodie ou quelque vilain tripotage d'argent. Pour me servir de votre propre expression, dans votre dernière lettre, à propos des peuples de l'Europe méridionale : "The good are incapable, and the capable are bad." Il a institué un gouvernement *malhonnête*, et infligée ainsi à cette France, qui s'était placée si haut dans l'estime du monde, la plus cruelle injure en faisant supposer que cette grande nation ne pouvait plus produire d'autres notabilités que des agioteurs ou des apostats.

Cet ostracisme prononcé par l'Empereur contre tout ce qu'il y a de grand et d'illustre en France, a été noblement et courageusement accepté par tous ceux qui en ont été l'objet. Pas un d'entre eux n'a fait acte de soumission ou d'adhésion au pouvoir absolu ; pas un n'a déserté ses principes ou ses antécédens ; pas un n'a consenti à passer sous le joug ; pas un ne s'est détaché du faisceau des anciennes gloires de la France libre pour aller grossir le cortège du vainqueur. Ils ont laissé ce

rôle aux Pastoret, aux LaRoche Jacquelain, aux Doudeauville, qui sont la risée de la Cour impériale elle-même. Et cependant il peut paraître dur d'être privé de toute participation aux affaires de son pays, quand on y a pris part pendant dix, vingt, trente ans, avec honneur et éclat. Quoi de plus cruel pour des hommes publics que de végéter dans l'oubli, dans l'obscurité, dans l'inaction, dans le néant, sans crédit, sans influence, sans occupation, en butte souvent aux vexations des subalternes ? Je ne parle pas même de ceux qui languissent dans un illégal exil, comme nos plus illustres généraux, ou qui luttent contre les désagrémens d'une honorable pauvreté, tout en sachant très bien que d'énormes traitements, des dotations, des décorations, toutes les satisfactions de la vanité et de la sensualité seraient la récompense de leur défection. Un homme comme vous, Monsieur, est fait pour comprendre et pour admirer de pareils sacrifices ; bien loin de rester hostile ou indifférent à une telle attitude, vous deviez savoir un gré immortel à ceux qui l'ont prise et qui l'ont gardée, et vous pourriez répéter ce qu'a dit *l'Edinburgh Review* dans un article consacré précisément à l'ouvrage même qui vous a tant déplu, "que la conduite actuelle des hommes d'Etat appartenant aux anciens partis politiques de la France était le symptôme le plus propre à encourager ceux qui espéraient encore dans l'avenir de la liberté sur le continent."

Vous devriez, surtout, j'ose le dire, savoir gré à ceux d'entre ces hommes qui sont Catholiques *avant tout*, du service qu'ils rendent à la cause Catholique, l'empêchant d'être identifiée partout avec la cause de la réaction absolutiste. Si j'étais seul de mon bord, je ne

parlerais pas avec cette confiance, mais je me rassure quand je vois autour de moi et dans la même voie que moi tous les anciens champions de la liberté Catholique (à la seule exception de Mgr. Parisis), tous ceux qui de 1830 à 1850 ont porté le poids du jour et de la chaleur, Mgr. Dupanloup, M. de Falloux, MM. de Riancey,* Beugnot, Vatimesnil, Lenormant, &c., toute cette intrépide phalange que vient de renforcer si utilement le Prince Albert de Broglie, l'homme le plus distingué de la génération. Je suis fier de compter toujours parmi eux, de rester avec eux à l'abri de la contagion de cet esprit de servitude et d'égoïsme pusillanime qui a envahi notre pays, et de maintenir ainsi les droits de la conscience et de l'honneur.

Car enfin, vous le savez et vous le croyez comme nous, Monsieur, la défense des intérêts de la religion ne doit jamais impliquer les sacrifices de la conscience et de l'honneur. Le grand Comte de Maistre, que vous admirez comme moi, écrivait en 1807, "*Vive la conscience et l'honneur, Cætera Diis permittenda.*" Et il ajoutait, "*l'Europe est à Bonaparte, mais notre cœur est à nous!*"

Ce que je dis de la défense de la religion, je le dis à plus forte raison de l'accord avec les masses, avec le sentiment populaire. Il faut en tenir grand compte, il faut autant que possible marcher avec lui, mais il ne faut jamais lui sacrifier la conscience et l'honneur, surtout, il ne faut pas le regarder comme infaillible ni comme invariable, dans un pays aussi mobile que la France. Vous avez raison de dire que l'Empereur possède en ce

* Messieurs de Riancey were not so much to be depended on as this seems to indicate. Only four years later the present writer incurred their ill-will by a well-meant attempt to bring about harmony between them and the party of Montalembert.

moment l'affection des masses. La raison en est simple : il représente à la fois la première passion de la démocratie française, qui est la *révolution*, et son premier besoin, qui est l'*ordre*. Mais il a contre lui l'intelligence, les classes éclairées et instruites. Son principal confident, M. de Persigny, m'a dit en Janvier 1852, "Nous gouvernons *sans* les classes aisées et éclairées, et au besoin *contre* elles." Ce ne saurait être là un gouvernement normal ou durable. Napoléon I. l'a reconnu et l'a dit un jour à Fontanes : "*A la longue, l'esprit a toujours raison du sabre.*"

Ne vous laissez pas d'ailleurs tromper par la prospérité apparente dont jouit la France. "Les bienfaits du pouvoir absolu sont courts," a-t-on dit avec raison, "et il empoisonne les sources même qu'il ouvre." Le régime actuel développe parmi nous un double fléau : dans les classes supérieures, l'esprit de spéculation et d'agiotage et le luxe scandaleux, qui est l'une des formes les plus révoltantes du matérialisme ; dans les classes inférieures, la convoitise socialiste, sous une forme bien autrement sauvage et menaçante qu'en 1848, ainsi que démontrent les procès récemment jugés à Angers, à Paris, et partout. Bien loin de réconcilier la société moderne avec les principes d'autorité, il déshonore ce principe en l'identifiant avec la compression et le mensonge ; et il énerve la société elle-même, en supprimant la respectabilité individuelle, en détronisant le sentiment de l'honneur par le nivellement, en fermant la vie publique à tous ceux qui veulent y entrer la tête haute, en rendant inutiles les plus nobles facultés pour laisser la prédominance aux plus vils calculs.

Soyez convaincu que mes amis et moi nous en sommes parfaitement convaincus que la démocratie est destinée à regner exclusivement dans notre siècle, et que nous sommes à mille lieues de rêver la reconstruction d'une aristocratie quelconque ; mais comme je l'ai dit dans mon livre, il y a deux démocraties : et nous ne cesserons jamais de préférer la démocratie intelligente, honnête et libérale à la démocratie abrutissante et servile qui sert de prête-nom au despotisme.

J'en aurais encore beaucoup à dire ; mais j'aime mieux vous renvoyer à l'écrit de M. de Falloux intitulé *Le Parti Catholique, ce qu'il a été, ce qu'il est devenu*. Vous ne pouvez vous dispenser de le lire pour vous mettre au courant de la véritable situation des choses chez nous. *L'Univers* vous aura déjà porté la réponse que M. Veillot a tenté de faire à cette accusation foudroyante. Je me borne à vous affirmer que M. Veillot a *menti* en disant que le refus de *l'Univers* d'entrer dans la *fusion* est la seule ou la principale cause de notre dissentiment. Aucun des directeurs ou collaborateurs du *Correspondant* n'a pris une part quelconque à la fusion entre les deux branches de la maison de Bourbon, et jamais ni directement ni indirectement il n'en a été question entre les rédacteurs du *Correspondant* et ceux de *l'Univers*.

Quoique je ne puis plus, après ce qui s'est passé, compter sur cette sympathie que j'étais si heureux de rencontrer chez vous, je n'en continuerai pas moins à vous lire avec un vif intérêt. Je vous prie toujours de m'envoyer votre recueil et surtout un deuxième exemplaire de la livraison *d'Avril* que je n'ai eue que par Dolman. Je recommande à toute votre attention le

livre que vient de publier M. de Tocqueville sur *l'ancien régime et la révolution*, et plus encore celui du Prince de Broglie : *L'Eglise et l'empire au IVe siècle*. Vous y verrez ce que pensent et ce que font les âmes libres et honnêtes dans notre pays.

Votre dévoué serviteur,

LE CTE. DE MONTALEMBERT.

Soon after receiving this letter of the Count's Brownson began a reply in the following conciliatory style:

NEW YORK, August 1856.

My dear Count:—I deeply regret that any act of mine should have given you a moment's pain, or tended in the least to embarrass you or your friends. If I had reflected that you would find it difficult to reply to me through the French press, or had for a moment foreseen the use the Imperialists would make of my remarks, I should have contented myself with writing you my views in private. This is what I should have done, and I find it difficult to forgive myself for having done otherwise. I must throw myself on your charity, your generosity, and your devotion to free speech and publicity for the best excuse you can find for me.

You will observe that some things have changed since my remarks were written, and will discover from my July number that I had not waited for your letter to qualify in some respects the observations made on the Emperor à propos of your essay. I have changed none of my principles, nor my policy. But you know that I want to see no more revolutions in your country, and though I like not Cæsarism better than you do, I think

the true policy of France is to abandon the Bourbons and sustain loyally the Napoleonic dynasty. I am as sincerely devoted to constitutional government as yourself, but I think you should seek it through Imperialism, and not in opposition to it. The course you and your friends are pursuing either will succeed or not. If it succeeds, you make a revolution, and restore the Bourbons. If it does not succeed, you lose your labor, compromise yourselves, and retard, instead of advancing the cause you have at heart.

I may be wholly wrong, but much as I dislike the Imperial policy, and little as is my confidence in the Emperor, I wish him to be sustained on the French throne, as the best thing for France, Europe, and the world now practicable. In a word, my policy is to accept him, sustain him, and do the best we can with him. I own that some of my remarks were made with a view, as far as my influence could go, to defeat every effort that might be made against him, either in favor of the Bourbons or in favor of republicanism. I love France, but I dislike the Bourbons, and I look upon the Henri-Cinquists as imbeciles. I am a republican, growing every day more so, but I see no chance for a republic in France for a long time to come. Nothing remains but Bonapartism. I don't like it, but I believe it the best thing practicable within your reach.

Such is the conclusion which at this distance and with my imperfect information I draw with regard to French politics. It may be a silly conclusion, but it is an honest one.

What is the true policy for the friends of constitutional government in France? Let me tell my thought

freely. Your first effort, it seems to me, should be to refute and brand political atheism, and renew, not in the spirit of opposition, the high-toned Catholicity of what you have well termed *la renaissance catholique*. You can in your country get at freedom only through Catholicity. You must separate, in the interest of religion rather than of politics, Catholicity from despotism. . .

Here the writer breaks off, probably interrupted by some visit; and the letter remained unfinished, possibly lost among his papers. He may, when he thought of the matter afterwards, have had a confused sort of belief that he had sent it. At any rate, it does not appear that he sent any reply to Montalembert's last letter till the May following, when he probably wrote very much in the tone and in substances of what is given above, if one may judge from the Count's next letter.

EVIAN IN SAVOY, September 4th, 1857.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—I hope I need not tell you how satisfied and delighted I have been with your letter of May 24th, I should have done so much sooner had not the lamentable state of my health precluded me from the chiefest and dearest of my pursuits. I am afflicted with a painful and very premature infirmity, which has necessitated difficult surgical operations, and obliged me to try *three* different sorts of mineral waters since last May; so that at the relatively early age of 47, I am condemned to lead the life of a septuagenarian invalid. All my labors and correspondence are either interrupted or deferred by this unfortunate state in which I am. I had hoped that the last number of the *Correspondant* would have taken over my answer to you in the shape of a notice on your July number; but this too failed on ac-

count of my absence from Paris and the laziness of the man to whom I had given you in charge. However, "ce qui est remis ne sera pas perdu. L'harmonie est pleinement rétablie entre nous," and I can but express to you my heartfelt gratitude and admiration both for the frank and manly way in which you have given satisfaction to my appeal, and for the most excellent and judicious reflexions you have published on our situation. Let us both persevere in doing our best for the great cause of christian freedom, as long as it may please God to spare us here below. I must again beg your pardon for any unmeasured expressions which may have escaped from my pen in my last, and which you are generous enough not to notice; but I trust we are both devoted enough to truth and justice above all things, to be able to bear with a real friend's observations and criticisms, even when they are exaggerated or erroneous, as sweet St. François de Sales used to say: "Le bon conseil doit être reçu *trempé au fiel comme confit au miel.*"

The *appel comme d'abus* declared against the Bishop of Moulins with its most unwarrantable revocation of the four Gallican articles of 1682, has, I believe, opened the eyes and hearts of some *few* members of the French clergy; even the *Univers* itself, although more fanatic and more absurd than ever, in its onsets against every person and everything dear to the spirit of modern times, seems to have softened down into something like lukewarm adhesion to the imperial despotism. But the baneful influence of Veillot (whom you so graphically and so truly depict) and his crew, on the mind of the clergy in France and elsewhere will not be cured so easily or so speedily as it has been created. The poor

Bishop of Moulins, *abandoned by all his colleagues*, has been obliged to give way. The base pandering of the Emperor and his censors to the worst passions and prejudices of revolutionary France, personified in the songster Béranger, does not seem to have called forth any sort of observation from any Catholic dignitaries. The conduct of the clergy in the late elections has been to the highest degree subservient to the meanest agents of autocracy. You must not look upon me as an *impartial* witness, since I have been defeated in these same elections, chiefly by the instrumentality of the clergy of my department, who, true to the spirit of the *Univers*, look upon me as a *dangerous* man, and with some few exceptions, have preferred a perfectly unknown candidate, whose only qualification in their eyes was his being a *chamberlain of the Emperor*. However, I hope you know enough of me to suppose that I can but congratulate myself on no longer belonging to that *mutum et turpe pecus*, in which I have sat for five empty and tedious years, where my voice met with no echo, and where my speeches, "few and far between," were systematically garbled and mutilated in the official *compte-rendu*, while no other versions can be published under penalty of fine and imprisonment. But setting aside the painful conduct of the great bulk of the clergy in these elections, they have given the saddest insight into the real state of French society. Nothing can equal the extent of intimidation and corruption exercised by and on the immense army of governmental agents, *except* unfortunately the shameful subserviency of the rural population to this pressure from above. It is not so much the despotism of the imperial system which is to be reprobated as the

•

shameful and perverse hypocrisy with which it pretends to uphold a shadow of electoral freedom and universal suffrage. In the towns where the influence of officials is much less powerful the opposition candidates were everywhere in the majority,—but alas, *quelle opposition!* Almost exclusively socialist, so that this far-famed *restaurateur de l'ordre et du principe de l'autorité* has not only abstained from granting to the church any of those liberties which she seemed to long for under Louis Philippe, but he has *not in the least diminished* the danger against which his dictatorship in 1852 was thought necessary by me and many others. He has done nothing but destroy all the *personal, local, and moral* influences by the help of which France was enabled to weather the storm in 1848 and 1849. The next outbreak of Socialism will meet with no sort of living obstacle except the army. *Le Bas-Empire et les Prétoriens*: such is our real state, and such the paragon of political excellence according to those Catholic renegades who have become the loudest and basest panegyrists of absolutism. Let us, my dear sir, put up with their contumely, for we are a living reproach to their baseness. They must say of each of us in the language of Scripture: “*Contrarius est operibus nostris, et diffamat in nos peccata disciplinæ nostræ. Gravis est nobis etiam ad videndum. Tanquam nugaces æstimati sumus ab illo, et abstinet se a vitiis [vitiis] nostris tanquam immundus [ab immunditiis].*” Sapiens. II. 16.

The *Correspondant* is going on as well and indeed better than could be expected, under such circumstances; we have now 2350 subscribers, a most astonishing number in France for such a serious periodical, but as we

have received *two* warnings, we may be hourly *suppressed*, and deprived even of our *name*, like the poor *assemblée nationale*.

You will have perhaps noticed my last speech at the annual solemnity of the *Institute*, which has given rise to a lengthy war between the *Débats* and the *Siècle*, in which this last mentioned mouth-piece of the revolutionary party has come out most bare-facedly on the side of the *Emperor!*

Believe me ever yours most truly,

CH. DE MONTALEMBERT.

I am only here at a watering place on the Lake of Geneva for a few days longer. Pray always write to me in Paris, 40 Rue du Bac. Pray send a copy of your July number to the *Correspondant*, and if possible, for the future also, in order that the necessary extracts may be *cut out* for translation, as I do not like to *dépareiller* my collection, however incomplete it be. If you take in the English Catholic monthly paper called *The Rambler* pray read the article for August, under the head of *The French Emperor*. Nothing can be a more perfect picture of the state of things in France.

The *Correspondant* for April and May, 1859, contained Falloux's essay on *Le Parti Catholique*, recommended in one of Montalembert's letters. It was a history of the unhappy division of Catholics in France, and a rebuke to the *Univers*, whose conductors were the promoters of that division. To this Veillot hurriedly replied in a book with the same title, a copy of which was also sent to Brownson, who read it with every wish to think better of the author than he had done. But he was only further confirmed in the estimate he had formed

of him; he declared that it was violent and unjust, written in the temper of a fanatic, and in great part irrelevant. It proved fully enough that Veillot and the French prelates who followed his leadership did not intend to sacrifice the liberties of the church; but not that they had not sacrificed them. No one had questioned their intentions, their good faith; but the justifications of Veillot to be a leader had been questioned, and the result he had achieved was the damning answer. When the French bishops threw themselves at Napoleon's feet, ignobly surrendering their own dignity and the freedom for which the Catholic party in France for twenty years had been struggling, it was little to the purpose to say that their intentions were good, or that their leaders were in good faith.

With his book Veillot sent this letter :

Monsieur:—Je ne sais pas l'anglais, et je suis privé de lire vos savants écrits; mais je sais que vous êtes un bon et vaillant Catholique. A ce titre j'ai beaucoup de sympathie pour vous et j'espère que vous en avez un peu pour moi. Il y a eu quelque hostilité entre nous ou plutôt entre nos œuvres. Personnellement je n'y suis pour rien. Dans tous les cas ces contestations ne doivent nous diviser irrémédiablement, et nous ne pouvons oublier que nous sommes enfants de la même Mère, et soldats du même drapeau. Veuillez donc Monsieur agréer comme une marque de cette estime solide que j'ai pour vous le petit volume que je vous envoie et un autre plus considérable par les dimensions qui le suivra de près. Vous y trouverez l'appréciation, à mon point de vue, et à celui de beaucoup de Catholiques, des questions qui

nous divisent en France. L'aigreur et l'injustice s'y sont malheureusement beaucoup mêlées, surtout dans ces derniers temps, à cause de la politique et du gallicanisme. Au fonds, il n'y a rien de bien sérieux et la grande majorité est je crois du côté où je marche. Ce qui est sur, c'est que je suis de bien bonne foi de ce côté là, et que j'y vois la totalité de nos évêques, moins deux ou trois.

Agréez, Monsieur, l'assurance de mes sentiments de très haute considération,

LOUIS VEUILLOT,

Rédacteur-en-chef de l'Univers.

PARIS, 28 Août, 1856.

This note was kind and respectful, conceived in a conciliatory spirit. Brownson was never able to repel any overtures, even of a bitter enemy, to peace; but though he read *Le Parti Catholique* with softened feelings, and began his answer in the most peaceful expressions, he frankly told Veillot that he should oppose his identifying, as far as his influence extended, the cause of Catholicity with the cause of absolutism, and goes on:

"This is very embarrassing to us who live under republican and constitutional governments, and are daily and hourly called upon to defend the church against the charge of being hostile to civil and political liberty, especially embarrassing is it after having had in 1848 and 1849 to defend authority against the licentious democracy of your Socialists and Red-Republicans, which threatened the very existence of society. As the conductor of the most influential Catholic journal in the world, you should be on your guard against compromis-

ing the Catholic cause out of your own country as well as in it, especially as you profess to place the Catholic question above every other question.

“I do not complain of the party you represent for supporting the empire, but you must pardon me for thinking it did not do what it might and should have done to obtain a constitutional recognition of the freedom of the church before proclaiming the Empire. The church has no legal freedom in your country, and holds her rights at the mercy of the Emperor. You have only his personal will as the guaranty of either civil or religious freedom. The Emperor has not repealed, but has resolutely refused to repeal the Organic Laws annexed by his Uncle to the Concordat of 1801. What security have you that on the first occasion they will not be enforced? I love civil and political freedom, but I have no fears for that when the church is free, and no hope for it when she is not free. The glory of the constitution of my own country is that it recognizes and guaranties the entire freedom of the church.

“These, sir, are my principal complaints against the *Univerts* and its party. I state them frankly, not unkindly. I love France, and honor the French clergy, but I should feel still more respect for the latter, if they were a little more independent in face of the Prince, and if they sometimes recollected that Catholic France is not the whole Catholic world. Nevertheless I should be happy to see your journal and my own good friends. You have many enemies, both among Catholics, and non-Catholics, and I can make great allowance for provocation as well as for human imperfection. I too have my enemies, and a severe contest to maintain, against greater

odds than you have to encounter, and to maintain it single-handed. Perhaps I need sympathy more than you and that the sneers at me in the *Univers* are not over and above Catholic.

“With yourself personally I have much in common. We have both come to the church through infidelity, and have both been obliged to gain our respective positions by our personal exertions. We ought to be friends, and can be so as far as depends on me, for I ask nothing of any man to be his friend but simple justice. Before receiving your letter I had inserted a note in my Review defining my position towards your journal. I belong to no clique in my own country or in any other. I have but one object in view, that of serving Catholic interests to the best of my ability.

“With every wish for your health and happiness, I subscribe myself with all sincerity, your obedient servant,

“O. A. BROWNSON.

“Editor Brownson's Quarterly Review.

“NEW YORK, Oct. 6, 1856.

“Louis Veuillot, Redacteur en Chef de l'*Univers*.”

No doubt Brownson, writing this letter, sincerely wished for peace with the *Univers*; but it was certain that hostilities must continue between them so long as each retained his nature and his views of despotism and freedom, and one worshipped the first and the other fought for the last, and it was only a short time before they were as openly opposed to one another as ever.

CHAPTER III.

LECTURES.—THE CHURCH AND THE REPUBLIC—THE UNIVERSALIST REVIEW.—ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.—THE MISSION OF AMERICA.—THE CATHOLIC CLUB.—BISHOP SPALDING.—O'CONNOR—KENDRICK.—SOME CONVERSIONS.

THE Catholics of New York manifested their welcome to Brownson, on his coming to reside among them, by an invitation to lecture, and by crowding to hear him in such numbers that the Tabernacle on Broadway was far too small to hold them all. M. T. Cozans was the business manager; Charles O'Connor was prominent among those who sold tickets; and his name as well as that of nearly every prominent Catholic, lay and cleric, was on the invitation to the lecturer. Brownson felt encouraged to exertion, and his friends were not disappointed, even as reported in the papers and read by those at a distance. The lecture was more than usually admired. Witness the following from Judge Hilton.

CINCINNATI, 4 March 1856.

Dear Doctor:—I have read your lecture on "The Church and The Republic" delivered in the Tabernacle, N. Y. as published in the *Pilot* with delight; The *slight corrections* of the report as published in the *N. Y. Times*, *Freeman's Journal*, &c. add to its clearness and force very much. I would be glad to see this lecture published in cheap pamphlet form, for universal distribution throughout the length of the Republic. Every leading mind and man of thought in the Republic should have a copy of it. You have, ever since I have known or heard of you, written many things upon that subject. It was

your problem in the *Democratic Review* and in your discussion with O'Sullivan; but nothing that you have ever written on that subject has been so clear, consistent and logical throughout as this. It is perfect in itself and brought to the comprehension of the most ordinary intellect. The difficulties you state and their solution was the great problem of Calhoun, of Kent, of Story, and of all great writers on constitutional law and civil polity in all ages.

And here you have given the most clear and satisfactory conclusion. The elements are brought together and so arranged as ultimately by their harmonious action and reciprocal coöperation creating such a society as God wishes. His church, the great arbiter of the sacred rights of humanity, constituting its peace and joy, creates the moral and social order God intended for man.

As you say, here is to be developed or realized the highest and most worthy position man has ever gained as a social being, if those constituent elements of government are recognized, heard, and submitted to. The evil in man which in the beginning (and to the end) warred against God, will resist it. But the great truths of God have been and will continue to be recognized more and more. She will always be however the Church Militant

If this lecture is printed as I have suggested, I would like you to send me on 100 copies, and I will settle with you for them.

Hoping you may ever retain good health and strength, and the choicest blessings of God, I remain very tru y yours,

G. H. HILTON.

P. S. I take the *Freeman's Journal*. I was sur-

prised it did not contain your lecture with its best corrections. Mac [Master] is a funny fellow. He thinks he's a wonder. Well, there are some clear points in him, and some very weak ones. But his paper is not what it should be. Wasn't you surprised to see Archbishop Hughes' miserable apology to Protestantism in his lecture at Baltimore!!

You are courteous, yet firm, just what Protestants admire, and wins respect and conviction.

Brownson had not for many years written his lectures before their delivery, with the single exception of his address at Mt. St. Mary's college in 1853 * but he always made some preparation. His method in this regard is somewhat indicated in a letter to the Reverend Augustine F. Hewit, then on the mission with Hecker and Walworth.

NEW YORK, March 17, 1856.

Rev. and dear father:—Your brother, Dr. Hewit, gave me a programme of a proposed lecture by you on the Papacy, with a request from you that I would, if I approved it, direct you to the proper authorities to consult. I like the programme very well, but I know no special authorities for you to consult. You know the theologians far better than I do, and for myself I rarely consult special authorities, except for the dogma or the principle.

I believe the most efficient method for us to pursue in dealing with the American mind is to draw as much as possible from the free activity of our own. We must, with our general knowledge of theology and history and our own experience, study out ourselves Lectures and

* *Liberal Studies.* Works, Vol. XIX. p. 481.

Essays. They come fresher, and will be better adapted to the minds we must address.

My own conviction is that our true policy in dealing with the American mind is to study first to ascertain, not its errors, but the truth it still maintains, and to show it that that truth can find its unity and its integrity only in the Catholic Church. We must find our *point d'appui* in the sound principles it still holds, and lead it by arguments, drawn from those principles, of the justness of which they can judge without going out of themselves, to the conclusion to which we wish them to come.

Prayer, meditation, and reflection are better means than reading to prepare us to do this. The American people are a reasoning, but not a learned people, and they want not the old arguments, but new ones, and such as they can appreciate off-hand. I think Father Hecker has the right view on this subject, and after his, the next best is Father Walworth's, that of direct appeal to conscience. My own method, I believe, is the worst of all, that of logic.

We have satisfied the American mind that we are able logically and historically to prove our religion. What the theologians call motives of credibility we have proved we have. The difficulty to be overcome is not logical or historical; it is the feeling that after all, though these motives are conclusive, yet to believe on authority is to reject reason. The error we have to combat is that the church [suppresses reason; and what we have to convince them of is that there is no opposition] * of

* The words in brackets are inserted to correct the sense; the original words were on the other side from the signature, which has been cut off, probably, for some autograph hunter.

revelation to reason and of grace to nature, and that there is a real correspondence between them, and that the assertion of the one in no way abridges the rights or circumscribes the sphere of the other. This, I think, is at present our work, and that our success under God depends on our success in performing this work.

Forgive me for the liberty I take, and regard what I say as only my own thoughts which, after all, may not be worth considering. You know the American mind, you know the Protestant world by your own experience, and all I would say is, rely on your own experience rather than on books.

The above-given letter was several months in reaching Hewit in his peregrinations. June 28th, 1856, he wrote from Baltimore: "Your kind and welcome letter, for which I thank you sincerely, was delayed in the P. O. until last week, through a defective direction. I am in great measure convinced of the correctness of your views, and those of Fr. Hecker. The chief difficulty with me is to carry those principles out into their minute details and their practical application. I find, however, that occasionally when I speak from the results of meditation and experience, in an ardent and off-hand manner, that I produce much more effect than with those labored arguments that better satisfy my own judgment. For example, I lately preached at the dedication of a Church on this subject, the Triumph of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century, and over the English race. The end at which I aimed was to show that the Catholic Religion is adapted to our age and country, and able to dominate over them as much as in the 4th

or 10th centuries. I would like to know if this is one of the class of subjects which you refer to."

Hecker wrote to Brownson from Richmond, Va., April 12th, 1856: "It delights me to know that you will deliver the Lecture on the subject you mentioned. Let me remind you of what you know, that if your second Lecture tells as well as the first, the future is yours. You can talk to the American people mind to mind, heart to heart. I have no doubt that you will give that care to your preparation which your present position before the American public demands. You stand before our people as an American and the champion of Catholicity. The reconciliation which has taken place in your own heart between these is to take place also in the nation. Never before had you such a task. The nation's destiny and the interests of God's Church are at stake. Let recollection, prayer, meditation, Our Lady, enter into your preparation.

"F. Hewit and I have just closed a mission at Norfolk. We really concluded it Sunday evening. The three first evenings of this week F. Hewit gave a lecture on each evening. There was quite a curiosity to hear one from me. Tho' I had but a little time for preparation on Thursday evening I gave one 'On the Popular Objections Against Catholicity.' It brought a large audience. F. Walworth was present. He was delighted and declares it was the best lecture he had heard in the U. S. Every one seemed equally pleased.

"I broke new ground, put Prot. on the defense, and appealed to human nature for support. The effect of the Lecture I considered would indicate whether D. Providence intended me to labour in this way or not.

If others are judges there is no room for a doubt. The success far surpassed all my hopes.

“By the way, on the course of Lecture of next fall which you may give, when you come Southward, consider yourself engaged for Norfolk.”

Brownson was also invited to give a course of Lectures in St. Louis in January, in Charleston, S. C., in May, and in Chicago, as well as single lectures in a great number of places, some of which were within a short distance from these towns. While in Charleston he was requested by the Reverend John Barry, administrator of the diocese of Savannah after Bishop Gartland's death in 1854, and consecrated as his successor in 1857, to lecture in Savannah. His invitation is so short and so well expressed as to deserve insertion here.

SAVANNAH, GA., May 15th, 1856.

My dear sir:—As you are now so near to us, would you do us the favour of coming hither, after your engagement in Charleston shall have been fulfilled, and give us one, two or three lectures? All our Catholic people will be delighted to hear you. As we have no Catholic Society, I assume the responsibility of inviting you, and will say to you that all monetary affairs will be made agreeable.

You will be our guest. Please acknowledge the receipt of this, and say when you will come.

Yours devotedly,

JOHN BARRY, Administrator.

O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

The invitation to Chicago was written by Brownson's very valued friend, James A. Mulligan, since so famous in the early part of the civil war, at that time

corresponding secretary of the Catholic Institute. Mulligan also, during Brownson's sojourn in Chicago, drew up an address to the Secretary, which was signed by 36 new subscribers to the Review, Bishop O'Regan leading the list.

After his return from Charleston and Savannah, Brownson wrote out the substance of the argument in his late lectures and published it as an article in his July Review.* Satisfaction was very generally expressed with the doctrine of the article as to the relations of church and state in this country. General Gadsden, our minister to Mexico, saw in it something which might tend to the solution of the same relations in our neighbouring republic. In a letter to Dr. J. P. Chazal, of Charleston, dated 19th August, 1856, he writes:

"I return my early acknowledgments to Dr. Brownson for his kind response to your request. A number of his Review has come to hand, which I have devoured with interest and instruction. As the Mexican Press is now free, I ventured some extracts from the article 'Church and the Republic,' which so corresponded with most of my views that I was in hopes that republication of them here might lead to a study of the question, as the Doctor has presented it, and reconcile the Mexican Church to the same political relations which Dr. Brownson says so accords with the 'wants and wishes' of the Catholic Church in the U. S., and which it is the desire of the Constituent Assembly to establish and maintain in Mexico. The Church, however, still holds so fast to its ancient alliances with the Temporal power, and is so reluctant to surrender one iota of what it considers its

* *The Church and the Republic*, Works, Vol. XII., p. 1.

prerogative that it is much to be feared that the irritating and disturbing discussions on the 16th article of the proposed Constitution, on Toleration, may lead to another Revolution; and, if so, God only can penetrate where it will end; whether in the annihilation of the tolerant party, or the destruction of the intolerant church. If the Church, or its spiritual heads in Mexico, could be induced to take the views of Dr. Brownson, who I presume speaks (if not authoritatively) for the Catholic Church in the United States, and assert or respond to the right 'of every man to choose his own religion, and to be secured in its peaceable and orderly profession,' the church in Mexico would remain supreme 'in its moral power, through the grace of God and individual conscience.' For there is no hostility in Mexico to the spiritual influences, 'to the true-hearted devotion,' which the Doctor so feelingly expresses, 'to that glorious old Catholic Church,' which will rebuild up a regenerated Empire in this land of the Astechs, if the Church will only relinquish its connection with the State. It is this connection which the Liberals desire to break, and if the Church acquiesces in a Christian spirit, she will find true-hearted devotion enough among all who now worship at her altars and partake of her Sacraments. I had thought of sending the number of the Review, after perusal to the Archbishop; but it was intimated that it would not be received as coming from this quarter. But that if Dr. Brownson or any of the archbishops of the U. S. would give it that direction, it might command the attention and promote harmony between the temporal and spiritual elements of order and rule in this now distracted Land of Promise."

The Universalist Quarterly Review of Boston, in an able and interesting, courteous and candid criticism of "The Church and the Republic," attempted to refute its arguments and to show the inconclusiveness of its reasoning in favor of the Church, which led to a reply from Brownson in his *Review* for January, 1857. * This was followed by a rejoinder on the Universalist's part, by which it was admitted on both sides, that to save society on the one hand from despotism, and from anarchy on the other, we must have a third element, namely, the Christian religion, to mediate between the individual and the state, and to restrain one or the other, according to the exigencies of the case, and that to answer this purpose, religion must be a power resting on its own basis, independent alike of both the state and the individual, and able at need to restrain both. To admit that religion to be a power, says the Universalist, must be a church, would be to put himself hopelessly in the power of his Catholic opponent. There remained only for Brownson to prove that the power must be concrete, and not merely abstract; an organism, not an idea; an actual, not a simply possible existence, for in that case his opponent conceded that it must be the Catholic Church. This was done in the final article of the series in July, 1857. †

Meanwhile Brownson was on the point of disagreement with a less frank and open opponent than the Universalist Reviewer. Coming to New York, he believed that he had reason to look upon his Ordinary as likely to prove as friendly in the future as he had sup-

* Brownson on *The Church and the Republic*. Works, Vol. XII. p. 33.

† *Christianity and the Church identical*. Works, Vol. XII. p. 59.

posed him in the past. But anybody who knew the two men, knew that Hughes and Brownson could never labor in the same cause unless at a distance from each other and without ever coming into contact together. Without throwing the blame on either side, it may be as well to let the story of their little difficulties from 1856 to the Archbishop's death in January, 1864, furnish the reader with premises from which he may draw his own conclusion.

At the annual commencement at St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y. in the summer of 1856, Brownson was invited by the faculty to deliver the oration. Some of Brownson's remarks were of the same nature as those contained in his article on "The Church and the Republic." Hughes expressed to him privately, after he had concluded, that though his doctrines were entirely consistent with the Church's teachings, at least such as one might lawfully hold, he was not in accord with their spirit. When the exercises were terminated, Hughes, who had presided, made a final address, in which his hostile and ironical allusions to Brownson were understood by every one, and their temper and spirit were pointed out in the *American Celt*, by T. D. McGee, the editor, who had long been looked on with animosity by the Archbishop. Some weeks later Hughes wrote to Brownson in reference to the matter.

NEW YORK, August 29, 1856.

My dear Dr. Brownson:—During my stay at Watertown, I saw by chance a number of the "American Celt" in which a malicious construction was placed upon my remarks at the late commencement of St. John's College.

I intended at the time to notice the article. But I have not since been able to find the number in which it was contained. I think it is due to myself, not less than to you, to state briefly that in my remarks on that occasion it was farthest from my thoughts to make use of a single phrase or a single word that should be in the least disrespectful to yourself. There was nothing intended as ironical—nothing as censorious, at least as far as you are personally concerned. You are aware that I did not agree with you in some of the statements contained in your address. But that right of difference of opinion is what is mutually acknowledged wherever essential principles of faith and morals are not immediately involved.

The author of the article in question, when he quitted New York, some years ago, was well shorn of his power to do mischief as a journalist. He was however, very respectably and numerously indorsed as a good Catholic and able writer by the ecclesiastical and lay authorities of Boston, * where he received an in-

* Thomas Darcy McGee, the Editor of the "American Celt," had previously edited the "New York Nation," in which he attributed the failure of the "Young Ireland" Rebellion to the influence of the Bishops and Priests in Ireland who dissuaded the people from joining in the insurrection. McGee felt sore on account of the ignoble failure of 1848 and the imprisonment of his friends, and being an out-and-out radical, he wrote violently and offensively. Hughes took up the defence of the Clergy in the "Freeman's Journal," and maintained "that there was no organization, no plans matured, no scheme of combination and concert," and his feelings were those "of indignation, and almost contempt" for the leaders of Young Ireland, for what appeared to him "the evidence of cowardice, unworthy of Ireland, or any country that wishes and deserves to be free." In such condition of things, he argued, "it was a duty which the clergy owed to their people, on every ground of religion and humanity, to interpose and prevent them from being uselessly sacrificed." The Archbishop said some bitter but true things about the Irish agitation, as, for instance, "There is no doubt that a vast amount of money has been received, and a great

creased sanction and endorsement, and has returned finally to New York. Thence he went to Buffalo, where he received an increased sanction and endorsement, and has returned finally to New York without my invitation or consent. I must say that since his return he has not

deal of it from the poorer classes of Irishmen, in this country, within the last few years. So far we do not perceive that it has aided, in any sensible manner, the great object for which it was contributed. We fear that much of it has been absorbed by real or supposed expenses of its collection and transmission to Ireland. We fear that of the amount which reached that country much has been absorbed by numerous officials laboring in the cause of patriotism, as if it were a profession from which pecuniary recompense was to be derived." (Hughes's Works, Vol. 2, pp. 794-5). In consequence of their controversy, McGee went to Boston, where he had edited the "Pilot" before his connection with the Dublin "Freeman's Journal" and "Nation," and commenced the publication of the "American Celt," in 1850, and for nearly two years continued to declaim his radical and revolutionary doctrine, with special hostility to Brownson's Review and the "Pilot," then edited by Roddan. In the beginning of 1852, he was led to apply to Bishop Fitzpatrick to acknowledge the "American Celt" as a Catholic journal, and was by him referred to Brownson and Roddan, who after some probation, expressions of contrition, and promises of amendment, gave their opinion that the Bishop might trust him, and Fitzpatrick gave him the "endorsement" referred to by Archbishop Hughes. How changed McGee became may be shown by his "Letter to a friend,"—supposed to be Thomas Francis Meagher, published by McGee in August of that year in the "American Celt." Meagher had declared that even if the Altar stood in the way of Ireland's freedom, it must be overthrown. McGee tells his friend that a Catholic must know that the test of right and wrong is an exact and infallible standard,—the bishops and doctors of the church. "This I discovered in a way which, I trust in God, you will never have to travel—by controversy and bitterness, and sorrow for lost time and wasted opportunities. Had we studied principles in Ireland as devoutly as we did an ideal nationality, I might not now be laboring double tide to recover a confidence which my own fault forfeited. But I will say it, for it is necessary to be said, that in Ireland the study of principles is at the lowest ebb. Our literature has been English—that is, Protestant, our politics has been French, or implicit following of O'Connell; and under all this rubbish, the half-forgotten Catechism was the only Christian element in our mental constitution. Since Burke died, politics ceased to be a science in our island and in England. The cruel political economy of Adam Smith never had disciples among us; the eloquence of Shiel is not bottomed up on any principle; the *Ipse dixit* of O'Connell could be no substitute to ardent and awakened intellect, for the satisfying fulness of a Balmes or a Brownson."

revived the objectionable principles on which I had to oppose him as the Editor of the "Nation." I regret however that on other questions his writings are oftentimes mischievous. But the power of correction on my part has been very much diminished by the course pursued in regard to him, and especially on occasion of the Lectures of last winter at Newburgh. I suppose that privately he has taken advantage of the blunder which was then committed. I am glad however that he did not make public use of the document which was then placed in his hands. * For if he had I fear it would have led to scenes of uncharitableness, if not of discord, among the clergy and laity of my diocese, which has been so united for many years, I will not say in Catholic faith only, but in Catholic charity and mutual kindness.

I fear much that the time is approaching when this happy state of things will be interrupted by the injudiciousness and sense of low and base pecuniary interests of some of those who have the guidance of what is called the "Catholic Press." Causes of a similar kind have already distracted and divided the great Episcopacy and priesthood of France, England and Ireland. In those countries everything is comparatively homogeneous. But in ours the very primary elements of Catholic social life are so varied and diversified that only by a miracle of Almighty God, the growth and peace of the Church could have progressed and continued so long. I fear, however, that we, in our turn, are destined to experience the shock and perhaps the scandal which unseasonable

*The Complimentary address signed by the pastor, Rev. E. J. O'Reilly and prominent Catholics of Newburgh, N. Y.

discussions in Catholic newspapers conducted by incompetent or selfish editors have brought upon other Catholic communities.

You are aware, my dear Doctor, that as regards yourself and the Review, no substantial change has come over my mind from the publication of its first number. My desire is that it should increase and prosper. You are aware that privately I have been obliged to dissent from some of the positions which you have advanced in its pages. Since its publication in this city it has been my wish that your pen should be unguided by any other head or hand than your own—under, of course, the deep sense, which I know you entertain, of the responsibility devolved on a Catholic layman who conducts so important a periodical as yours.

I am sure you will not take it offensively if I make a few suggestions, which I submit respectfully to your consideration.

1st. I would say that were I in your situation I should carefully avoid every censorious allusion to the nationality of any of our Catholic brethren. It is exceedingly difficult, even with the best intentions, to avoid giving pain to one's best friends either on one side or the other, if those exceedingly tender and delicate topics are alluded to, except in the most incidental and impartial manner, in the columns of our periodical press.

2nd. I would not write or say anything calculated to represent the Catholic religion as especially adapted to the genius of the American people as such. The drift of your remarks at the "commencement" at Fordham was to the effect if the Catholic religion had been or could now be presented to the American people

through mediums and under auspices more congenial with the national feelings and habits, the progress of the Church and the conversion of Protestants would have been far greater. This of course is a pure speculation. But it is a view in which I do not and cannot concur. The Almighty God carries on the work of religion by instruments of his own selection. To them is the blessing given. If those that have labored are not adapted to their vocation He in His own Providence, when they shall have passed away, will raise up others more competent to the task. In the meantime I think all discussions in our Catholic periodicals on this and kindred subjects are premature and dangerous.

3rd. In your situation I would equally avoid anything like notice or resentment of unkind articles in our small Catholic papers. We have all looked upon you as belonging to the whole Catholic Church—as one who writes words of wisdom, eloquence and power for the benefit of all. Under this point of view, it seems to me that you should be and, I hope, you are superior to the petty cavils and squibs of those who assume to criticise you, whether they have capacity to comprehend you or not.

When I began I had no idea of troubling with so long a note. And I must end, as I commenced, by assuring you that I have never deliberately uttered a word or entertained a thought which would be disrespectful to yourself. I remain very faithfully your friend and servant in Christ,

† JOHN, Archbishop of New York.

On the 1st of September, 1856, Brownson wrote in answer: "I never for one moment entertained the thought that you intended in your remarks at Fordham anything unkind or disrespectful to me personally. But I was surprised to hear you make those objections in public to my address, after having just assured me they were only for my private ear. I regretted that, as I had said nothing against faith or morals or which I had not as a Catholic and an American citizen a perfect right to say, you should have felt it your duty to oppose me thus strenuously in public. It was taking an unfair advantage of me. It was opposing to me, a layman, the opinions of an archbishop and that archbishop, of New York. There was no equality in the case. It was crushing me with the weight of authority, in a matter of simple opinion. You must not blame me, if I did feel that I was hardly treated, and an ungenerous advantage given to my enemies over me. You and I cannot debate a question on equal terms before the public, for you cannot address the public in your own name against me without opposing to me the mitre. Your remarks, however intended by you, were an episcopal censure upon me, and I can see no reason why the 'American Celt' had not the right so to consider them."

Hughes replied by a formal repetition of the disavowal contained in his previous letter.

NEW YORK, September 17, 1856.

Dear Dr. Brownson:--I repudiate the malicious construction which one of our weekly papers has put upon my observations at the commencement of St. John's College. There was nothing in my remarks or in my

mind that was intended to be either ironical or disrespectful to yourself. You must be aware that on not a few points I have differed from you in regard to questions connected with your Review. This will not surprise you whose very profession it is as a public writer to differ from others. I may say, however, that no substantial change, in regard to the Review, has come over my mind since the publication of its first number, and I hope that you may be spared many years to preside over its pages with increasing patronage from the Catholic public and, if possible, with increasing utility to religion.

Very respectfully your obedient servant in Christ,

† JOHN, Archbishop of New York.

DR. O. A. BROWNSON.

At this time Brownson had written, and on the first of October, he published an article, *Mission of America*, which was still more offensive to the Archbishop than *The Church and the Republic*. The whole article must have been distasteful to him. For instance the Reviewer says: "If Catholics choose to separate themselves from the great current of American nationality, and to assume the position in political and social life of an inferior, a distinct, or an alien people, or of a foreign colony planted in the midst of a people with whom they have no sympathies, they will be permitted to do so, and will be treated by the country at large according to their own estimate of themselves." Sufficient had already been said about such foreign-born demagogues, as had labored to keep their fellow emigrants foreigners to suit purposes of their own; but Brownson thought that many of

the clergy, even some bishops, were coöperating with them, though their purposes might appear holy; and speaking of the young men in whom is the hope of the future, he says: "O, for the love of God and man, do not discourage them, force them to be mute and inactive, or suffer them, in the name of Catholicity to separate themselves in their affections, from the country and her glorious mission. Let them feel and act as American citizens; let them feel that this country is their country, its institutions their institutions, its mission their mission, its glory their glory."

The article was greatly liked and admired by the class of priests who were hopeful of the conversion of Americans to the Catholic faith, but very disagreeable to that class who looked on themselves as merely chaplains to a foreign colony in this country. Thus Father Hewit wrote to Brownson:

WILMINGTON, DEL., October 13th, 1856.

My dear Dr. Brownson:—Having just had the pleasure of reading your last number, I cannot refrain from writing to express my delight and heart-felt thanks for the article on the "Mission of America." Our young students and the young men generally, who have a strong love of their country and an ardent desire for its conversion, receive it with enthusiasm, and it will stir their hearts within them. I cannot say that I go all lengths with you in looking for a general and long continued civilization of the world under the empire of religion. I have held hitherto, and still hold the opinion that the most perfect realization of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ on the earth took place in the medie-

val period, and that the world is rapidly approaching its termination.* But still I regard the present as an epoch of grace for the world, and I look for a brilliant, though brief period of the triumph of Catholicity before the appearance of Anti-Christ. This is enough to encourage me, and I confide in the Blessed and Immaculate Mother of God to show some signal marks of her power, in return for the great honor which the whole Church has paid her at the present epoch. I look forward to the conversion of a vast number of the best part of our American fellow-citizens with confidence, and I see in such movements as the one in which you are taking so distinguished a part, the beginning of this great work. I even hope for the conversion of the nation as such, though not so confidently. And if God spares my life, I wish to devote it and all my energies to this noble end of the conversion of America. I trust Almighty God will soon give to the American Redemptorists the opportunity of acting more directly on the American people and laboring for their conversion. Let us pray for this noble object, and each one do what he can, with courage, and reliance on our Lord and our Blessed Lady.

With sentiments of the highest respect and regard,
I remain your devoted and humble servant,

AUG. F. HEWIT, C. SS. R.

DR. BROWNSON.

*One should think that if the Providence which rules the world had exhausted its strength in the civilization of the middle ages, it was hardly worth while to continue the revolution of the ages. In fact, it is hardly possible to regard the opinion of those who find perfection in a past civilization as without blasphemy. Though every change is not an improvement, and individuals and nations may decline and perish, yet, on the whole, history and reason seem to prove a perpetual advance in the condition of society.

The Archbishop of New York was not pleased with the "Mission of America," and in the "Metropolitan" first, and then in pamphlet, he published his "Reflections and Suggestions in regard to what is called the Catholic Press in the United States" devoted mainly to Brownson's Review and McGee's "American Celt." He praised Brownson to the extreme in this pamphlet, adding just enough of adverse criticism to indicate his consciousness of his own superiority. The faults he charged Brownson with were three: First, that he was too hopeful of America's conversion; Second, that he thought the progress of the church in this country would be greater when immigration should cease, or at least sensibly diminish; Third, that he made an appeal for young men that was uncalled for.

Replying to Hughes in his Review * for January, 1857, Brownson adroitly shows that they are very much in accord with regard to the prospect of the Church's future here. For the archbishop, in reply to McGee,† maintained that instances of deliberate apostasy with adults were extremely rare, and none of our children had been lost except those who in consequence of the poverty or death of their parents or the inability of the Church to reach them were never instructed in the faith; and on the other hand, "the converts to the Catholic faith in the United States are very

* Works, Vol. XX. p. 50.

† McGee said that "in New York as in San Francisco, Ireland . . . has here and on the Pacific, the discredit of swarming the great cities with a horde of hardy, vulgar ruffians, unmatched in any former state of society . . . Surely, surely, some has a terrible account to give of our neglected first and second generation in the English and American cities." *American Celt*, September 27th, 1856.

numerous," and "we can point to instances in every state, in every diocese, almost in every parish," * of converts from the most intelligent classes, and of the highest respectability. Was not this a reason for indulging cheering hope for the future? However that may be, it is surely better for one who devotes his whole energy to the conversion of a people, to cherish hope of success than to deaden his efforts by despair. The second objection Brownson shows to be a misconception of his position; for even if he had thought as the archbishop seemed to believe, there could have been nothing gained by insisting on it at that time. As to the third objection, Brownson said that if his appeal had not been as needed as he had judged it to be, the worst that could be said of it was that his eloquence was thrown away.

Defending himself against the censures of the archbishop, the Reviewer informs him that, although he may submit to the formally pronounced judgment of ecclesiastical authority, he will not take the sentence of any inferior court as final, but appeal from it to the highest. "We are free," he says, "within our legitimate sphere as a Catholic journalist, and authority cannot censure us, though the father may counsel us, unless we step beyond that sphere and offend against faith, morals, or discipline If the bishop or archbishop who judges in the first instance does us wrong, our remedy is not in disobedience, resistance, or public discussion, but in appeal to Rome, to the highest tribunal of the Church. The law that governs journalists is, we take it, the same

* Hughes's Works, Vol. II. page 694.

law that governs Catholics in all lawful secular pursuits." *

That the articles which displeased his archbishop differed in tone from Brownson's earlier Catholic writings is admitted; in fact, they give signs of a breaking away from the influence which had previously directed his thought. He had at one time almost regarded it as a part of Catholicity to oppose everything to be found in the world outside of the Church. He now determined to dilute his previous conservatism with greater freedom of thought, and to show the outside world that he understood it and accepted the truth which it held. In what is of faith, of divine institution or apostolic tradition, and in all that which the Church declares to be always and everywhere obligatory, he would resist innovation; but he would not look upon Catholic dogma as identified with absolute forms of thought and society, no longer adapted or intelligible to the present age. There is no reason why we in this age should not be as free in our intellectual movements as the old schoolmen were in theirs, and do for our age what they did for theirs. The social and political order which has supplanted that of the middle ages cannot be made to find the truth in the intellectual forms that grew up then, but demands and will have the fresh, living thought of free minds, adapted to meet the new forms of society, the new social arrangements, the new modes of thought and the new forms of error.

Whether the archbishop took notice of this seemingly new departure on the Reviewer's part, and was influenced accordingly in his criticisms, is, of course,

*Works, Vol. XX. p. 70.

impossible to say; but certain it is that he had great, though perhaps not inordinate, love of power, and watched with a jealous eye every individual or combination of individuals that threatened to become too strong for his curb. "I will have no power in my diocese," said he one day to Brownson, "that I cannot control," and after his death Brownson said: "We personally suffered from the jealousy with which he guarded his own authority, and perhaps had some right to feel aggrieved at his occasional public criticisms."

The archbishop charged Brownson publicly with belonging to a small club in New York, composed of priests and laymen, chiefly of foreign birth or parentage, supposed to have in view the carrying of Americanism into the Church. They were angered by the apparent europeanizing of the American Church, as evidenced in our colleges and seminaries. Dr. Cummings and Dr. Manahan were the chief movers in this club, both intimate associates with Brownson; but Brownson was never a member of it, and never met with it but once, and then only as an invited guest, and yet he was made to suffer not a little for his supposed connection with it, and his presumed intention of making his Review the organ of an American party among Catholics. He never knew what the real purpose of the club was, though its principles were such as he was in sympathy with. They contended, and so did he, that an American on his conversion to the church is not required to renounce his American nationality, and that foreign nationalities, domiciled on American soil, should treat his nationality with respect, not as they sometimes found them doing, with contempt.

Cummings wrote his famous article on "Vocations to the Priesthood" and others criticised in Brownson's Review, the management and mode of instruction in our colleges, without perhaps making due allowance for time and circumstances and want of means on the part of the authorities. There had been an immense immigration from Ireland and Germany on our shores. Necessarily our first priests had to be of one of those two nationalities. They came direct from Europe, and our seminaries filled up with candidates for the ministry direct from those countries, many of whom were very unsuitable subjects. The arrogant assumption of many of these priests who failed to see that their own people had changed in many respects, and were not disposed to put up with old-country ways, was annoying to Americans.

Perhaps this was a condition of things that would have righted itself in time: its public exposure irritated those whose defects and shortcomings laid them open to criticism and censure. Cummings's article by the use of one offensive phrase, "cheap priest-factories," aroused most violent passions. The article itself was true from beginning to end, and caused the most excitement and passion by reason of its truth.

In those days our seminaries were filled with Europeans as teachers and seminarists. To-day the contrary holds good. The new class of priests are beginning to tell on the country. Now, our seminaries are made up in large degree of children of the soil, descendants of those early immigrants. Dr. Pise, Dr. Forbes, Isaac Hecker, Sylvester Malone, George McCloskey, priests with whom Brownson conversed much, were not I believe, members of the club. Pise had moved to

Brooklyn after Dr. Power's death about 1849, and had his fights with the Archbishop all on his own account. Forbes too, as it was said, "did his growling all by himself." Hecker was not a great deal in New York at the period of the club, and did not get mixed up with the others in any way to embroil him with authority. McCloskey was friendly with them, but was a man of peace and inoffensive, who would rather laugh at some of their doings than take part in them. All these and also the Reverend Bernard J. McQuaid, who living in New Jersey could not well have joined the club, if he had even wanted to, were in sympathy with the principles of the club as much as Brownson. There was much talk among them of conciliating those outside of the Church by milder polemics, as to manner, and this Hughes regarded as a fling at him.

Just before the publication of his "Reflections on the Catholic Press," the Archbishop administered confirmation at St. Anne's Church and spent the evening afterwards at the pastor's house in Clinton Place. A few gentlemen were invited by Forbes to meet him. Brownson was among them; and the Archbishop, who had brought his manuscript along for this purpose, taking Brownson apart read to him such portions as concerned him. He had written that it was known to Brownson at least, that "several paragraphs" in the Review had not met his approbation. As published in the *Metropolitan*, the expression was changed to "many articles," which was untrue. In the pamphlet the words "several paragraphs" were restored. Brownson did know that Hughes objected to some paragraphs in his writings;

but he did not know what the particular paragraphs, doctrines, propositions, or opinions were to which he objected.

Brownson's relations with the Bishop of Pittsburgh became more friendly at this time. This Bishop, hearing that Brownson was expected to lecture in Louisville, and thinking he might probably be induced to lecture in Pittsburgh in his way, requested the society of St. Vincent de Paul to send the necessary invitation. In a letter dated December 7th, 1857, he informs Brownson of this, and adds: "As to the past, you must allow me to say that you would wrong me or yourself if you ever supposed me hostile to your person or to your Review. I doubted the propriety of some things that were published in the latter and thought them doubly dangerous while the Review was supposed to hold a representative character, but I am far from expecting or even desiring that one holding your position should try to please every one, and there was no time that I did not feel an interest in the Review with a sincere desire to encourage its circulation as much as possible. With regard to yourself I never entertained a doubt of your sterling honesty as well as of your talents and power. I hope you will have the kindness to make our house your home while you are in Pittsburgh.

"Hoping to see you soon, I remain yours faithfully
in Xt,

"† M. O'CONNOR, Bp. Pittsburgh.

"O. A. BROWNSON, ESQ.

"P. S. I must disclaim the authorship of the article in the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, * but I do so only for the pur-

* Reviewing *The Convert*.

pose of adding that had I written one as I intended to do and would have done had I not been unwell, I would have expressed my admiration of the book and my respect for the author even more strongly than the editor."

To enable Brownson the more easily to be absent from home at a season when he was usually busy, the Bishop of Louisville, in accordance with an old promise, made his first contribution to the Review. His letter announcing the preparation of the article is as follows:

LOUISVILLE, October 15, 1857.

Dear Doctor:—I am preparing an article for the January number of your Review, and hope to have it ready in a few days. It is a review of the second volume of Kay's "Social Condition of the People" in Europe, which treats specially of the Common School Establishments of Continental Europe as compared with the state of education in England and Wales. The present paper on "Common Schools" may be followed by *another*, reviewing Kay's first volume, and entitled "Mammonism and the Poor," for the April No. "It does not rain but it pours"—as you will probably say.

The present paper on Common Schools will fill about 25 pages of your Review, and the second one, in which I may review Mayhew's "London Labor and London Poor" along with Kay's first volume, will probably occupy *at least* an equal space.

I am shy of appearing in your elegant pages; but I venture, in the hope that some good may be effected A. M. D. G., and that by complying with my promise made to you some months since, I may relieve you of part of your arduous labors. I was stimulated to an immediate fulfilment of my promise by the concern I felt for your

valuable health, to the impaired state of which you refer in your last number, every word of which I have perused with much gratification excepting only that passage.

I have written all the first sketch of my article; but would wish it to cool for a few days before revising it for publication. Would the first of November be early enough for the January No? I think I could have it ready by that time, or sooner, if you desire it. Please send me your address in case I should wish to send the package by express.

I trust your health is restored, and that you will be able, with the small assistance your friends may render you in writing for the Review, to devote some time this winter to lecturing. We should all be most happy to see and hear you in Louisville. I understand that you will receive a formal invitation from our Literary Association in a few days. I hope you will be able to accept it, in which case you must understand that I have a room ready for you at my house during your stay.

Your faithful friend,

M. J. SPALDING, Bp. L.

DR. O. A. BROWNSON.

When his article was ready, the Bishop wrote again :

LOUISVILLE, November 19, 1857.

Dear Friend:—Having returned home on the day before yesterday, I will send you by to-morrow's mail my first paper reviewing Mr. Kay's work, care of E. Dunigan & Bro.

I had not time to re-write it, and hence have made the corrections in the text, or on the blank page opposite. I hope the printers will be able to make it out, notwithstanding the hasty and imperfect chirography.

As you might not wish to assume the responsibility of all my statements and opinions I have placed my initials at the close of the article. But I will be much indebted to you for any verbal or other corrections you may think proper to make. I discovered several blunders of wording, style, &c., this morning in the revision, and I suppose there may be others. I flatter myself, however, that the paper will be found to be a pretty thorough review of what the author says on the common school systems of Europe, though it has no doubt many faults of style and artistic arrangement, &c. Such as it is I send it to your *sanctum* editorial.

Have the kindness to acknowledge its receipt or ask Messrs. Dunigan to do so, as I would be sorry it should fail to reach you.

I trust your health has improved, and that we shall see you in Louisville this winter.

Very faithfully yours,

M. J. SPALDING, Bp. Louisville.

O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

The Archbishop of Baltimore continued his contributions to the Review. In sending an article for the April number of 1857, he wrote :

BALTIMORE, Feast of Epiphany, 1857.

Dear Sir :—I enclose some views on Prayer Books, which I wish published in your April number, if you feel that they suit your periodical. It is proper to submit

them to the Archbishop of N. Y. as they concern religious formularies. Your publisher has also an interest in the matter. I do not at all *solicit* the publication of them, but send them as an evidence of the interest I still feel in your valuable Review. I have no objection that my initial K. should be put at the bottom, to relieve you from all responsibility or odium, though it may not be advisable to state more distinctly the name of the author, unless to the Archbishop, or others privately. If you think they do not suit your Review, or objection arise from another quarter, you will oblige me by returning the manuscript. I wish you many happy returns of these festivals.

Your sincere friend in Xt,

FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, A. B.

O. A. BROWNSON, ESQ.

The editors and publishers of one prayer-book, at least, were disposed to follow Kenrick's suggestions, as is seen by the following :

EMMITTSBURG, September 29th, 1857.

Dear Sir:—We are making some changes in the St. Vincent's Manual, and desire to make in it all the necessary corrections. Some years ago in your esteemed periodical you stated in the St. Vincent's Manual there were to be found some errors. I cannot remember if you pointed them out or not, nor can I recollect in what number you made the remark on the subject. I would be thankful to you, if you would be kind enough to let me know which are those errors or mistakes, as I am anxious to correct them. I shall receive also with

thanks any suggestion that you would think advisable to make on the subject. Most of the Litanies will be taken away from the Manual.

Your humble servant,

F. BURLAND, C. M.

In May, 1857, Brownson lectured in Baltimore, and soon after his return to New York, had further proof of Kenrick's good will, which is explained in the letter that follows:

BALTIMORE, May 26th, 1857.

DR. BROWNSON.

Dear Sir:—Our friend Geo. Miles, Esq., forwarded to you yesterday, at my request, \$50, which Archbishop Kenrick had given me for you on the occasion of your recent visit to Baltimore. You left the city so early on the morning after your lecture, that I had not an opportunity of giving you the money then. We hoped to have the pleasure of your company for some days.

The Archbishop did not wish me to mention his name in connection with the fifty dollars, but I told him that I should feel myself obliged to disobey him this time.

With my best wishes for your health and happiness, I remain, dear sir, as ever, devotedly,

H. B. COSKERY.

O. A. BROWNSON, L L. D.

Kenrick also wrote most of the article in the Review on the "Mortara Case," Brownson adding a few paragraphs in accordance with O'Connor's suggestion, as follows:

Dear Sir:—You have received, no doubt, the article on Mortara case by Archbishop Kenrick. He had asked me to make any alterations in it I thought fit. I used this privilege, however, only for the purpose of changing a few words, and cutting out one or two passages which I sent him offering to have them returned if he desired it. He has approved the suppression and writes to say “it might be well to refer especially to the Ukase of the Czar Nicholas in 1834 relative to the children of Polish Jews. I had not,” he adds, “the particulars at hand when I wrote. The authority of Story quoted by the Boston Courier for the State’s interference might also be quoted. I enclose the slip.” I have thought it better to send the latter to yourself. You can easily insert it. The Archbishop expresses a wish that some more be added as the article will otherwise be rather short.

Were I to write, what I would think of adding would be to dilate a little more on the right of the State, or rather its duty to recognize the principles of religion that have a connection with civil things when the whole nation, morally speaking, acknowledges them. This could be illustrated in our own case by the civil recognition of the Sunday, the Bible which all claim a right to adopt and teach in state schools in its unsectarian aspect. I would think it well in this connection to show that as we can only recognize the general principles of Christianity the state here does not and cannot justly make those acknowledged by a part of the nation only the basis of its legislation. So far in principle even this country acts on that on which the Pope bases his action in the Mortara case, while it would be wrong for them to adopt Protestant principles in a similar manner.

If you think it well to introduce these or any other views into the article the Archbishop being willing to have it improved will no doubt be pleased. I thought it no harm under these circumstances to say to you what occurred to me in this connection though I am sure the same and other things far better will occur to your self.

Yours faithfully,

† M. O'CONNOR, Bp. Pittsburgh.

O. A. BROWNSON, ESQ.

That Kenrick's and Spalding's contributions to the Review were valuable and well worthy of insertion there, is very certain. But the editor was too lenient in judging many other articles sent by friends, who meant well and asserted and defended very good doctrines, but which in matter and style were wanting in the force, the clearness, or the polish looked for in a quarterly review, and there were some grounds for the complaint of Father Ed. Chevalier, O. M. I. who said in a letter written from Buffalo, July 7th, 1857; "You will forgive me the liberty I take of remonstrating against the introduction of articles in your Review such as the one on *Public Instruction*, signed F. G. [Rev. George McCloskey] in your last number. I do not object to the nature of the remarks intended or of the object aimed at in this article, but to the poor manner in which the subject is handled. I have just read it and I do not see clearer on the subject than before. The cause of it may be my deficiency in the knowledge of English, but I am tempted to believe that the writer has made his article with the help of a grammar from which the pages on perspicuity have

been torn off. I think such articles as this and those in your volume of 56 signed P. [Rev. Edward Putnam] are fit only to injure your Review. I have heard complaints of the same kind from some other subscribers. We would rather pay the double of our subscription and have essays always from your pen or worthy of your pen."

Brownson was very happy at this time by the increase in the number of letters he was receiving from various persons inquiring about the church in an honest spirit of searching for the truth, or asking for instruction. Many letters also bear witness to the conversion of persons to the faith, but are too long to insert here. Hiram McCollum in sending the amount of his subscription for 1857, writes from Lockport, January 7th, 1857. "I am now 19 years a subscriber to your Review. It is to you as the instrument in the providence of God to whom I owe the inestimable grace of faith. Two others who were members of the Congregational Society also owe their conversion to the same instrumentality." One of these named Wilber was "Superintendent of the Congregational Sunday-School."

Father Hecker, in a letter written at Savannah, Ga., Jan. 31, 1857, says: "The enclosed check of \$50 dollars is a little present for you from a friend of yours at the South. The giver forbade me to mention his name, and as he made me his agent to you, I assumed an agency on your part, and expressed your hearty thanks and kindest acknowledgments." Further on, speaking of the Edgefield converts, he writes: "If your labors had but this effect, you should feel new hopes, and labor with new zeal."

The Reverend William Cumming, in a letter dated Rothsay (Isle of Bute), 6th October, 1857, says: "I have been on the point of writing you many a time these three or four years past, were it only to thank you for having completely changed in the right direction my own and many of my companions' views on certain facts in history—for having shown us the *necessity* and I will add the *happiness* of holding fast to the thread that alone can guide us, in the mazes of history, 'Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia.' I was a great Gallican once—God help me—but if I had been asked *why*, it would have been found that *political prejudice* and not *reason* was at the root of it all. Your works gave my mind another bent, which a good Papist professor of theology and as good a professor of history served to strengthen and confirm. I will add, that the professor of history himself (in the Grand Séminaire of Cambrai) in the beginning looked at the facts of history through the untrue mirror of the respected Mr. Gosselin's theories; but after a hard fight in class for some weeks, sustained I admit mainly on *your* arguments, he was induced to study things more carefully, and the result was that he *revint sur lui-même*, studied the *original documents himself*, and finished by giving us a course which many will remember to the end of their lives, on this idea, that we must take the Church's *own interpretation* of her own acts. You have the glory before God of having sowed the good seed deep in the souls of a hundred or two of young priests, who will not have received it in vain.

"How can I and my companions thank you also for the high and manly tone which you have taught us to use in speaking of our Mother the Church? How can

we thank you for the many hours of pleasure and instruction with which you supply us quarter after quarter? I see nothing but enthusiasm for you here among my brother clergymen with the exception of a few of our *Irish* fellow-laborers. They for the most part are incompetent to judge, having never read you except in garbled extracts. Those of them whom I have persuaded to go to the fountain-head, are even more enthusiastic than myself. One of them the other day to my great amusement, got up of a sudden from a perusal of your article on the worship of Mary (1853) and cried out aloud, 'By this and by that, but this man is inspired!!' Now you see I have told you the good your works have done me and others whom I know, with all sincerity. I do not wish to flatter you. I think it below me as a priest of the Church. But amidst so much abuse from open and secret enemies, I want to tell you what some of your friends, even so far away as this, think of your labors."

CHAPTER IV.

SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.—THE DRED SCOTT CASE.

As editor of a Catholic Review, Brownson had ever tried to avoid questions of partisan politics; not merely from regard for the preferences of his readers who were of one or another of the political parties aiming to get or to keep control of the government, but mainly from consideration of the evil sure to result from any attempt

to induce Catholics, as such, to support either party. When the Know-Nothing party, however, was organized as an anti-Catholic party he felt it his duty to oppose it. A Catholic or an anti-Catholic party is un-American in a country where the constitution and laws, and their administration, make no distinction between Catholics and A Catholics, unless an attempt is made to deprive these or those on account of their religion, of the equal rights that have been guaranteed them. Religion should never be dragged into our politics in this country, because our liberty depends on our continuing to regard religious differences as above the jurisdiction of the state.

Another reason why Brownson, in his Review, had kept so aloof from partisan politics, was that the matters involved in these contests had had less interest for him than the philosophical, theological, and historical questions, which had engrossed his thoughts. But with the year 1856 civil and religious liberty, and perhaps even our national existence seemed threatened.

It had been the boast and the peculiar glory of America that its system restricted political power to certain specific, well-defined subjects, and withdrew from the jurisdiction of the state all questions of a purely individual, moral, or religious nature, leaving them to the individual's judgment or conscience, or to the church or sect of the individual's choice. But the great number of European Liberal immigrants, combined with our native Evangelicals, were fast spreading the doctrine that the people are absolutely supreme, that they have jurisdiction in all questions of whatever name or nature that may arise; that whatever we hold to be true and good we have the right to get, if we can, enjoined, and what-

ever we hold to be false or bad, we may get, if we can, prohibited by the civil law;—a doctrine which brings within the scope of the political and civil action of the people every moral and religious question, and strikes a mortal blow at all conceivable individual freedom.

These reasons were sufficient to make Brownson throw his influence in favor of Buchanan, the candidate of the Democrats, and to oppose Fillmore, the candidate of the Know-Nothings, and Fremont, that of the Free-Soilers fused with such northern Know-Nothings as rejected Fillmore. After Buchanan's election, and before his inauguration Brownson, foreseeing the inevitable course of future political events, gave warning of the danger that was imminent. Know-Nothingism was strangled in the elections of 1856. The Free-Soilers were Republicans, but were far from constituting the entire party; and on the other side pro-slavery Democrats, though numerous, were by no means the only Democrats. The slave states constituted not the strongest section of the country; but the slave interest was stronger than any other one interest. It became the policy of the South to combine all the slave-holding states as a solid phalanx around that interest, and to secure them the administration of the government by the aid of one, two, or three of the Democratic free states; against the votes of all the rest, and thus place the government in the hands of the sectional, slave-holding minority. If carried out, this policy would virtually disfranchise, as to the general government, the majority of the American people, and render them the subjects, the slaves, of a particular interest, of an interest of a minority, and of an interest which never should

have entered into the politics of the Union. Southern statesmen ought to have known that the free states would not submit to be thus deprived of their legitimate influence in the affairs of the country, and quietly acquiesce in the domination of some three hundred thousand slave-holders in a single geographical section; but would form a northern sectional party, and having, as was well known, an absolute majority, would in their turn attempt to bring the slave-holding states under the domination of northern manufacturers, bankers, brokers, and stock-jobbers. The large majority of the voters at the north were neither abolitionists nor pro-slavery; they had no disposition to interfere with slavery where it legally existed, but were strongly opposed to any extension of its area. Buchanan had obtained a plurality, but not a majority of the popular vote; the democrats were in a decided minority in the free states, and it was not easy to see where he could look for support for his administration unless to the united South. But he could only retain the South united by supporting the policy of the slave interest. So to administer the government was inevitably to prepare the way for a northern sectional president in 1860.

The question between the slavery defenders and their opponents was now centred on the question of the territories, and Brownson freely expressed his views in accordance with all his speeches and writings on the subject of slavery and abolitionism from his first appearance before the public. He had invariably condemned the institution of chattel slavery; but believing it a local matter which each state had the right to decide for itself without interference from outside, he had strongly con-

demned the abolitionist fanaticism bent on interfering with matters with which it was not concerned.

In January, 1847, Barnwell Rhett of South Carolina, one of the ablest statesmen and most conscientious politicians of his section, delivered an earnest and eloquent speech in the House of Representatives, on the Oregon-Territory Bill, discussing the question of slavery in the territories. Reviewing this speech, Brownson maintained that, although a man may lawfully own slaves where the law permits it, the feelings and convictions of the people of the North are invincibly opposed to the further extension of slavery within the bounds of the Union. So far he was unquestionably right. But he goes on to say with reference to the territories not yet erected into states, that "they belong to all the states in common, and must, in justice, be open alike to the citizens of each, who may wish to occupy them. Congress can make no discrimination between the states, in prescribing the conditions on which the territories may be settled and occupied. If the citizens of non-slaveholding states are left free to settle and occupy them with their property, the citizens of the slave-holding states must also be left free to settle and occupy them with theirs." * The error here is in confounding property in cattle, household goods, &c., which is prior to all civil government and rests on the law of nature, with property in slaves which is derived from municipal law, and consequently is property only where that law is in force. †

* *Slavery and the Mexican War*, Works, Vol. XVI. p. 25.

† How well Brownson and Rhett agreed is shown by the following letter:

My dear Sir:—A friend stopped me to-day in the street, and asked me whether I had seen your article in the last No. of your Review on the

So when Brownson came to write his article on "Slavery and the incoming Administration" for January

Mexican War and Slavery. I answered no, because your publisher had ceased sending me your Review, for want I presume of my remembering properly to pay. He proposed to send it to me, however, and I have just finished reading it.

As to your criticism on the subject of state sovereignty, I believe we differ, if at all, only in words. Dorrism I abhor quite as much as you do. When I speak of the People, and of the People being sovereign, I mean precisely what Mr. Madison meant when he wrote the celebrated Report on the Alien and Sedition Laws. The following are his words: "The term 'States' is used in a vague sense, and sometimes in different senses, according to the subject to which it is applied. Thus, it sometimes means the separate *portions of territory* occupied by the political societies within each; sometimes the *particular governments* established by those societies; sometimes *those societies* as organized into those particular governments; and lastly it means *the People composing those political societies, in their highest sovereign capacity.*" "In the present instance," he goes on to remark, "as between whatever different constructions of the term 'States,' may be entertained, all will concur in the last mentioned; because, in that sense the States ratified it; and in that sense of the term 'States' they are consequently Parties to the Compact, from which the powers of the Federal Government result." Here you see a distinction drawn between the *Government of a State*, which is sometimes called the State, and *the People of a State in their highest sovereign capacity*, who are also called the State. In the latter sense alone, do we State's Rights Politicians, mean when we speak of the States in our discussions of the powers of the General Government. In this sense the "States" are the People of the States, but not its population. "People" is a political and constitutional term. It means the Population organized into a political society—bound together by its Constitution and Laws. Abolish the Laws and Constitution of a State, and there is no people in the state. Every man is a man by himself, but he has no right to control or meddle in any way with his neighbour. The enormity of Dorrism consists in the absurd pretension of there being such a thing as a People of Rhode Island, independent of Constitution or Laws; and the still greater absurdity of a *part* only of the population being that People. Let the word People mean the population bound together by a social organization, by a Constitution and Laws they have made for all, and there can be nothing dangerous in asserting that they alone are sovereign. If their Constitution prescribes the form of amendment, it can be amended in that form. If it does not, then any alteration must be the act of all. There is no majority or minority but within the political organization by which all are bound. It appears to me, in this sense, the People are the Sovereignty within the States as well as the Sovereign power which adopted the Constitution, as Mr. Madison asserts; and whilst ruling themselves by the Constitution and

1857, * he says: "The argument based on the obligation of Congress to protect the right of property, which we used in 1847 . . . is rendered invalid by the decision of the Supreme Court of which we were then ignorant, that slavery exists only by virtue of local law."

In 1854, in the midst of the excitement over the Kansas-Nebraska bill, when the Boston mob attempted to prevent the execution of the fugitive slave law in the case of Anthony Burns (a runaway slave from Virginia, whose master demanded his rendition), Brownson maintained the obligation to comply with the law; for its validity had been settled. But with regard to slavery in the territories under Douglas's bill, he relied upon "a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States." that slavery "is a local institution, and can exist but by

Laws made in conformity thereto, they are not the less sovereign because they obey them. But I must stop, or you will suppose that I am dissatisfied with your article, or your criticism. That you may see how nearly I agree with you in your reasoning and policy, I will direct my son, who is now in Cambridge College, to call on you, and hand you the April number of the Southern Review, in which you will see an article on the Wilmot Proviso, written by me. It was written in much haste after the close of the late Congress in the mornings of six days, and sent off by mail as soon as copied, to be in time for the number then coming forth. So you must make the proper allowance for carelessness of diction, and looseness in reasoning.

Allow me, my dear sir, to thank you for the kind terms in which you have personally spoken of me in your Review. Would to God I deserved it, but I very much fear with all my watchfulness over myself, the general confession I repeat daily in my family, is true in my political as in all my life—"I have left undone those things which I ought to have done, and I have done those things which I ought not to have done; and there is no health in me." But I believe both of us look to the same source for remission from all our sins, of commission and omission. With sincere wishes for your success and happiness, believe me, Dear Sir, yours with high respect and consideration,

September 7, 1847.

R. B. RHETT,

MR. ORESTES BROWNSON.

* Works, Vol. XVII. p. 54.

positive law." As no positive law could be enacted in a territory but by the federal government, and as this bill restrained that government from intervention on the subject of slavery, Brownson very correctly maintained in 1854, that federal "non-intervention necessarily excludes slavery from the territories till they became states." This was a complete change of ground from that of 1847, caused by assurance that the U. S. Supreme Court had decided that slavery was a local institution. When told that the decision of the court did not go to the extent alleged, he answered: "This may be so, but whether so or not is nothing to my present purpose. If the court has not so decided, the opinion is incontrovertible, and although the alleged decision was the occasion of my adopting it, it is not the authority on which I defend it. Slavery is, whether the Supreme Court has so decided or not, a local institution, rightfully existing only by virtue of municipal law. Under the law of nature, there are no slaves, for all men are created equal, and one man has no *jus dominii* over another. Hence all Americans maintain that power in whose hands soever lodged, is a trust, and a trust to be exercised for the good of the governed, for whose benefit the trust is created. Neither the civil law nor the common law authorizes slavery. There remains then no possible legal sanction of slavery but that of municipal law, which has no force out of the municipality. It exists with us, if it legally exists at all, by virtue of the local law of the state, and that law has and can have no extra-territorial jurisdiction. How then is it possible for slavery to have a legal *status* in territory included within no state, and subject, aside

from the laws of Congress, to no law but the law of nature?"

The article on "Slavery and the incoming Administration" was bitterly denounced by the Southern journals, and its author declared to be on the verge of "Black Republicanism." In answer, Brownson showed in his April Review * that from his earliest publications on abolitionism and slavery he had invariably held these views, and always expressed them clearly and forcibly. He had asserted them in his writings and his public addresses in Charleston, and elsewhere in the South, where they had secured him the friendship of eminent southern statesmen. The only change was on the question of slavery in the territories, and he had announced this change in 1854. The real change that caused the surprise of Southern journals and readers lay in the fact that heretofore he had had occasion to defend the fugitive-slave law, and to put down the Abolitionists' proceedings; now the danger that threatened was the attempt of the slave states to extend their "peculiar institution," which he never would have interfered with if they had kept it where by the constitution and laws it was protected from assault from citizens of other States.

The ground on which Brownson opposed the anti-slavery agitation at the North was a ground which compelled him to oppose equally the filibustering movements against Cuba, Mexico, and Central America. It was filibustering coupled with pro-slavery tendencies that he more especially condemned in his article on the Incoming Administration; and the filibustering clauses of the Cin-

* *The Slavery Question once more*, Works, Vol. XVII, p. 77.

cinnati Platform, on which Buchanan was elected, accepted the very principles which justified the anti-slavery party. "All human powers, however constituted," he said, "are in relation to one another independent and equal, and the law which binds the sovereign against intervention binds the citizen or subject,—a fact which our Anglo-Saxon race, through all stages of its historical existence, seems never to have duly considered. It may be called the filibustering race." If the South encouraged filibusters with a view to the acquisition of new slave states, in violation of international law and the independence of states, how could she expect the North to respect international law and the independence of states in her favor?

Immediately after the publication of the article on "The Slavery Question Once More," a committee of highly respectable and influential Irish Catholics of New York were sent to remonstrate with him, and to urge him either to retract what he had said or carefully refrain from alluding to the subject of slavery in his *Review*. Brownson assured them that he was so far from sympathizing with them in their defence of that peculiar institution that it was only his love of the Union and his devotion to the constitution that restrained him from denouncing slavery as fiercely as any abolitionist or free-soiler of the North.

The objections of his Catholic friends at the South were as well set forth in the following letter from a distinguished Maryland gentleman, as in any of the censorious communications he received from that section, where the general notion of the writers was that the

church discouraged the enslavement of the white race, but favored the system of bondage for the darker Africans.

Near Jerusalem Mills P. O.,

THE MOUND, HARFORD CO., MD., March 10th, 1857.

TO O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

My dear Sir:—When I first read the article entitled “Slavery and the Incoming Administration,” which appears to have had devoted to it a larger space than any other subject discussed in your last Quarterly, I deeply regretted its appearance, and then thought the views therein expressed were erroneous, in which opinion I am now more thoroughly grounded since the able and lucid opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the “Dred Case” just pronounced by its venerable Chief Justice Taney.

It was not merely for the error contained in them, that I felt regret at the publication of your opinions, but from the belief that not appreciating your “religious individualism” the non-Catholic population of our Southern States would likely hold the Catholic Church responsible for the Free Soil doctrines so strongly expressed and also forget in your Catholicity the fact of your bearing no great friendship for the Democratic party, and that it was with great reluctance you voted against Col. Fremont.

It is to be deplored that a pen ably directed as yours should be so wielded as in all probability to place the Catholic Church in a position so entirely false as regards her true sentiments in reference to African slavery as it exists in the United States, and also to

deprive her of that favorable estimation she was so rapidly gaining for herself in the minds of so many of the most prominent and distinguished citizens of our Southern States, notwithstanding the fact that the Know-Nothing orators and presses at the South, during the late contest, without exception, attempted to impress it upon the minds of the Southern people that the Catholic Church was inimical to the institution of Negro slavery, and that it was part of its Jesuitical policy to conceal its enmity for motives of expediency, but that in reality it no more countenances the holding of slaves than the Presbyterians and Methodists of the North. This Catholics denied, and in their arguments quoted the canons of the Church, or at least decrees of its councils, and the writings of its most celebrated divines, and were fortunately successful in defeating the machinations of their Know-Nothing enemies. But what is the South to think when it witnesses the promulgation of such sentiments as contained in your article? And what is the Church to gain by the loss of the high ground it occupied, or at least was beginning to occupy in the minds of the Southern people? It is not for me to charge you with a desire to pander to what I consider the sickly fanaticism of the North, for you know as well as any other human being, that in your section of the Union it would be useless for the Catholic to attempt to propitiate its population by the advocacy of any of the passing whims which may for the moment occupy its attention. With its Know-Nothing prejudices and puritanical instincts it sees in the Catholic of foreign birth naught but a servile minion of the priest, and especially if an Irishman scarcely equal in point of respectability

and character to the native-born negro ; and if a native Catholic, particularly like yourself a convert, nothing but an eccentric visionary enthusiast. It is again to be regretted that a Catholic Review such as your Quarterly, containing such matters as the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th articles of your No. for January which every Catholic at the North and South can read with such gratification, and to which he can point his Protestant neighbor with so much pride as the production of one of the most gifted of his brothers in God's Church on earth, should be marred by the 4th article, which actually if found without the marks of its paternity would be pronounced the effort of some pretended Catholic to commit that Church to the advocacy of the false doctrine of free-soilism, or rather incipient abolitionism. I most cheerfully acquit you, however, of any such intention. I believe you to be most sincere, and I truly respect your motives in writing this essay on slavery, and what you believe should be the course of the government in reference to the subject hereafter, but indeed you are wrong, and let me beg of you in the kindest manner to avail yourself of the earliest opportunity to correct the error into which you have fallen. I have not the time nor do I flatter myself that I have the ability to combat successfully the views which you have advanced, but all I would ask is to read them over attentively yourself, and I am sure that you will find much that you will regret having given publicity to. On page 101 you appear to be willing that the question of slavery as regards the territories shall be decided by the Federal Courts. Now as the supreme tribunal of the country has decided that the territory of the United States is property common to the Union, and

that the citizen of Maryland or Virginia has as much right to carry into it his man or his maid servant, as the citizen of Massachusetts or Connecticut has to carry his horse or his ass, and there be protected in his right to hold his property, you certainly will not support with your powerful intellect the Free States if they should determine to madly oppose the organization of other states out of any portion of the territory belonging to the United States merely because they exercise a closely defined constitutional right of allowing their citizens who have emigrated into them while a territory with a certain species of property, of remaining and being protected in it.

You will pardon me if before I conclude this letter I hurriedly make a few remarks in regard to the matter of negro servitude. Altho' not owning or even expecting to own a slave. I have yet to learn either from my church or any other source that slavery as it exists in this country is an evil or a curse, and if it is neither one nor the other in Maryland or Virginia, it is neither one nor the other in Kansas or Nebraska. Common sense teaches me that the African is certainly inferior in both its mental and physical economy to the white or Caucasian race, and must necessarily where found inhabiting the same region where the white rules, occupy the lower position, and for the good of society be under the control of the superior race. To carry out this principle our country has enacted laws in reference to the relations which shall subsist between the two races. These laws do not violate any right human or divine; the Church recognizes them to the fullest extent, considers them perfectly consistent with the decrees of

the Almighty, and I am sure does not desire any of its children, especially those whose position renders them, as it were, or at least looked upon as the medium through which it speaks, to commit it to the doctrine either directly or indirectly, that it is either opposed to the formation of new states recognizing slavery, or that it looks upon slavery as it exists in this country either as an evil or a curse. Far from it, the Church as I have been taught interferes only so far in the matter as to enjoin on the master the most paternal care for the moral and physical wants of the servant, but holds him to a strict accountability for the proper discharge of his duties in this respect, and upon the servant strict obedience and submission to the lawful commands of the Master. Moreover the Church wisely discriminates between a state of servitude eminently patriarchal as the holding of negroes is in this country, and a state of bondage or vassalage, where we find the enslaved of the same race and equal in every respect as regards either their physical or mental attributes to their oppressors, but held in a state of thralldom because they have seen fit to assert their civil and religious rights, or because in spite of persecution they remain true to the dictates of their conscience. Of such slavery anywheres, whether it arises from a religious or a political source, the Church is no champion, and it regrets its existence, desires not its extension, but it fully admits that it is of the devil. As one who sincerely desires the prosperity of the Church in this country I trust that hereafter those who are looked upon as the oracles of our faith may refrain from the discussion of a question which has proved the source of such bitter and angry feelings between those

who should be as brothers and from which our Church and its members have heretofore in a great measure so happily kept aloof. And as one who as sincerely desires the continued prosperity of our country I trust that the late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States will be accepted as the authoritative exposition of the constitution, and regarded by all departments of the government, and by the people, as the law of the land.

With the highest respect I am, my dear sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN CARROLL WALSH.

The decision of the U. S. Supreme Court, to which Walsh refers in this letter was given in the case of *Dred Scott vs. Sandford*, the opinion of the majority being written by Chief Justice Taney, another Maryland Catholic. The opinions of the judges were printed in the N. Y. Herald just as Brownson was finishing his article on the "Slavery Question," and he added to what he had written some comments on the case. Dred Scott was a slave in Missouri under the laws thereof; he accompanied his master to a military post in Illinois, and afterwards returned with him to Missouri, where of course he was a slave by the law of that state, and his action was very properly, as Brownson thought, dismissed by the court. But Taney's opinion on several incidental points, he regarded as unworthy of its source, "Mr. Chief Justice Taney," he writes, "seems to us to proceed on the assumption that the negroes are politically and legally a degraded race in the Union; but such is not the fact. They may be so in some of the states, but they are not so in the Union, nor indeed in all the

states." Truly the states-rights advocates in the South seem to have intended to advocate the rights of sovereignty only for their own states, and not to have considered the Northern states as entitled to equal sovereignty. "We regret," continues the Reviewer, "that in giving the opinion of the court, the learned Judge [Taney] did not recollect what he is taught by his religion, namely, the unity of the race, that all men by the natural law are equal, and that negroes are men, and therefore as to their rights must be regarded as standing on the same footing with white men, where there is no positive or municipal law that degrades them. Here is what we dare maintain is the error of the court. We admit that negroes, but not negroes any more than white men, may be reduced by positive law to slavery; but planting ourselves on the Constitution, and natural right as expounded by the Catholic Church and Common Law, we maintain, and will maintain in the face of all Civil Courts, that where no such law reduces the negro to slavery, he is a free man, and in the absence of all municipal regulations to the contrary has equal rights with the white man. Neither race nor complexion disables a man under our federal system." And he concludes the article by saying: "For ourselves personally, we believe liberty is more interested in the preservation of the Union than even in preventing the extension of slave territory, since, if the slave trade be not revived, the extension of slave territory involves no real extension of slavery. But we regret the decision, for we foresee that it will be impossible to prevent the anti-slavery agitation from being pushed on with new vigor, and with more danger than ever. The decision

will be regarded as an extreme Southern opinion, and the dissent from the majority by the ablest judges from the Free States will deprive it of all moral force out of the Slave States. We almost fear for the safety of the Union. Yet, we believe Almighty God has great designs with regard to the American people, and we will trust in his good providence to carry us safely through the present crisis, the most dangerous that has yet occurred in our history."

It was indeed a crisis. Taney's opinion in the Dred Scott case was the first act of the Southern Rebellion. The civil war was not brought on by Northern agitation; but by the determination of Southern leaders to extend the area of slavery. The agitators in the North annoyed and irritated the South, without doubt; but the majority of the Northern people were too much attached to the Union and the Constitution to permit them to become dangerous. The South needed more slave states for its political security or preponderance; and as Captain Maury of the Washington Observatory said to me in December 1860, Virginia, whose great industry was slave-breeding, must have a larger market for her produce. Men like Brownson throughout the North who had opposed the abolitionist agitation, while detesting slavery, became indignant at the new claim backed up by Taney for the extension of slavery over our territories.

CHAPTER V.

THE AMERICAN REDEMPТОRISTS.—CONGREGATION OF ST. PAUL THE APOSTLE.—APPLETON'S CYCLOPÆDIA.—THE CONVERT.

THE affairs of the American members of the Congregation called Redemptorists, in the latter part of 1857 interested Brownson almost as much as they did those fathers themselves. Not merely was he bound to them by the ties of friendship, but much more by his sympathy with their desire, and even determination, to devote their lives to the conversion of this country. They had resolved that they would no longer continue to be chaplains, as it were, to a foreign colony in the United States, but would undertake an apostolic mission to the real American people. To carry out this plan, it was necessary that one or more of them should visit Rome to obtain the necessary authorization. Hecker was, for several reasons, the proper person to do this, and although the rule prescribed the expulsion from the congregation of any one who should visit Rome without permission of his superiors, when the permission was refused him, Hecker went without it, trusting that he would have an opportunity to explain his motives before being condemned. He tells the story himself in a letter to Brownson.

ROME, September 1, 1857.

My dear friend:—Almost every word of your letter was a prediction. And what has not proved so, may yet become so.

I was condemned and dismissed without a hearing. I demanded a full hearing, and was led to believe it would be granted, but the contrary was decided and my vows relaxed and I dismissed from the Congregation. But I am fully convinced that had a full hearing been granted it would not have helped on our affairs in the least. These good men from their education political and religious are led with bona fide intentions to misconstrue our motives, misinterpret our language, and misunderstand our actions. It is well the crisis has come. Why wait and see the interest of God and our country suffer?

On the whole, and after prayer and reflection, the course pursued I think was the best one. The results will have to show.

I shall not act hastily, but endeavor to be well prepared, and be as sure as one can be of the safety and success of every step.

Your article on my new book, if you will be so kind as to give one in your October number, may be of the greatest service and the highest importance to me here in getting a hearing in high, and the highest quarters. You might insinuate something to this effect if you judge prudent. But not mention a word of my present relations to the Congregation in either your Review or to any person in private. These are not yet settled. Power has been exerted—but it is yet to be seen whether it was rightly exerted.

If you give my book a notice, please send me a half dozen copies as soon as printed of your Review. If the proof sheets could be sent, a copy of them earlier, it might serve me greatly. A stone shall not be left unturned to accomplish what we believe to be the cause of God and His Holy Church in our own dear country.

My resolution is to act with deliberation, advice, and with much prayer and determination. With the copies of the October number, send two of the one with the first article on Questions of the Soul.

Now that my hands are free, I shall act more largely, and shall endeavor to have translated into Italian and published in a pamphlet form or some other way your article "Mission of America." If you yourself could write an introduction, leaving aside what regards Dr. Spalding personally; it would arrive in time. For it only takes two weeks for the mails, and no doubt I shall have to remain here some time, perhaps a long time to do my work thoroughly, but thoroughly it shall be done, God and our Blessed Lady assisting me.

I shall see the book publisher with whom I am already acquainted to-morrow, about the translation and publication of "Mission of America." If you have any suggestions on this or any other points regarding these matters, do write, and speedily.

Allow me to suggest that if you notice my book to mention the dissolution of Protestantism in the shape of Calvinism—the Beechers, &c. and their endeavors to get at Catholic Truth tho they are not aware of it. Make mention that now is the time to prepare the way for the conversion of the American people.

This article may also be published along with the other. If this letter comes late, and you find it necessary to delay some days the publication of your Review to accomplish this, I beg of you do it. Now is the time to strike the blow. For God's sake and the love of our country and its free institutions do not let it pass.

Upon you under Divine Providence depends the success of the great cause we have at heart.

George will see to any expense this undertaking may cost you.

I shall write and inform you of my movements, but we must by all means keep them quiet, work hard, and pray.

Oh! if God grants me to be the means of having our country understood here at Rome, and aiding in preparing the way for its conversion all that I have suffered these few days past will be as nothing.

My address is — Giuseppe Spithöven, Piazza di Spagna.

Pray for me and believe me ever faithfully yours in the love of Jesus and Mary.

I. TH. HECKER.

Brownson was very much annoyed that Hecker should have been arbitrarily dismissed by the Superior-General from the Congregation of the most Holy Redeemer. Later, the dismissal was revoked; but in the mean time Brownson wrote to Hecker that "no American Catholic who cares for the interests of religion will acquiesce in his (the General's) course. Every American Catholic, when once he learns what has been done, will feel himself and his nation most grossly insulted, and will feel that to be a Catholic he must submit to a centralized

despotism. Let your dismissal remain, and let him inflict a degrading punishment on the American Fathers who have agreed with you, it will be the heaviest blow to religion in this country that can easily be given. It will ruin the Congregation. It will cause the very evil your General so much dreads; the division of Catholics here according to their nationality. Americans will scrupulously obey the law in letter and spirit, but no power on earth can make them submit to the imposition of the arbitrary will of any man. It is well that this trait of American character should be known.

“ My review of your book,” he continues, “ had been some weeks printed before your letter reached me, and it was too late to make any alteration or addition. I have reviewed your book neither as a friend nor as an enemy, but as an impartial critic, mainly with a view to refuting the unfounded suspicion that there is an “American Catholic party or clique formed or forming amongst us. You know perfectly well that there is not and never has been any such clique or party, and I have taken pains to disclaim for myself and friends everything of the sort, and to state, if any thing of the sort does exist, I am ignorant of it, and neither you nor your book are in the least implicated in it. You know that we have neither of us ever favored any movement American in any other sense than for the conversion of our countrymen and the prosperity of our religion in the United States. Undoubtedly we see that foreigners mistake our national character and misinterpret us, but we have always been submissive to authority in whose hands soever lodged, and anxious to keep the body one without its having an American side or a foreign side.

“For my part, I assure you that I have full confidence in the wisdom of your project, and though I certainly am less ardent in my hopes of *immediate* success in converting my countrymen than you are, yet I am as thoroughly devoted, in my humble sphere, as any man can be, and as strong in my hopes of ultimate success as you are. I had looked to your Congregation as the great instrument in the hands of God of effecting the conversion of the country. If your plea is heard, if your councils are listened to and followed, I shall continue to look to it; if not, I shall look elsewhere, and trust that Almighty God will raise up some other congregation to whom he will give the honor and glory of adding this great nation to the inheritance of the successor of Peter. Whatever you may read in my Review, be assured of my full confidence in your mission, and in you and the Fathers who have approved it. Do not be discouraged. They are just at Rome, and they will give you a hearing. The Vicar of Christ is there, and He will protect you. I am sure your motives were good. I am sure the end you proposed was laudable, and I cannot believe it possible for you to fail. I enclose a brief introduction to the *Mission of America*.”

The new book of Hecker's, which he wishes a notice of, was the “Aspirations of Nature,” the aim of which was to show that all men naturally aspire to religion, and that the aspirations of their nature can be satisfied in the Catholic Church, and nowhere else. Brownson's review of the book was already written when Hecker's letter was received, and even if it had not been, he did not see how he could honestly have made it more acceptable to Hecker than it was. He did not approve of

Hecker's seemingly making reason the criterion of revelation, according to the principle he asserted that "what contradicts reason contradicts God," but believed it more reverent and less dangerous to say, what contradicts God contradicts reason, and make revelation thus the criterion of reason. Furthermore, although the former expression is true in itself, in practice men reason as they are, confounding their habits and prejudices with reason itself, and conclude that whatever contradicts them contradicts reason. Hecker asserted, in the next place, as a fact that the majority of the adult population in this country professed no religion; and this fact he attributed to the keenness of their intelligence which had seen through the hollowness of Protestantism, and rejected it from a conviction that it is essentially unreasonable and false, dishonorable to God and unfit for man. Brownson, without admitting the certainty of the fact, maintained that if it was a fact, it should rather be attributed to their indifference to religion itself, to their want of seriousness, earnestness, in the affairs of the soul, and to their insane devotion to the world and its goods.

In his attempt to prove that Catholicity asserts the rights of reason and the dignity of human nature, Hecker seemed to assign to reason and nature more than belongs to them; yet, on the whole, as his general thought was Catholic and his intention right, Brownson was disposed to overlook and excuse some inexactness of expression. Nor did Brownson admit that man, as a fact, always aspires to God, or tends naturally to him even as the author of nature. The intellect and the will since the fall as before it, have the true and the good for their respective objects to which they naturally aspire;

but in point of fact, left to fallen nature, they are developed under the influence of our lower nature, and seek the creature rather than the Creator. He did not deny that our higher nature retains the power or ability to assert and maintain its freedom, and to aspire to God, in the natural order; but only that it actually does so. Hecker directing attention to what nature has the innate power to do, would have his readers to infer that it actually does it, whereas St. Thomas teaches that revelation is practically necessary for the great mass of mankind to enable them even to know the natural law, and St. Augustine that practically they are not naturally able to observe it. There was a confusion of tone and expression, and if not inconsistency, at least an apparent contradiction, which would lead most readers to regard Hecker as maintaining against Calvinists and Jansenists what he denies when reasoning against Rationalists and Transcendentalists, which Brownson thought might have been avoided by the exposition of the weakness as well as the strength of reason, its practical inefficiency as well as its innate ability; but that would have been foreign to the author's purpose, for it would have shown that reason in fact accomplishes very little even in the order of natural truth and virtue, without the aid, direct or indirect, of divine revelation and grace. Practically considered, reason and nature never operate as pure reason and nature. The demands of the intellect, the wants of the heart, the aspirations of the soul, which serious and earnest-minded men, brought up outside of the church, are more or less conscious of, are not those of a soul in a state of pure nature, but of a soul born and bred in Christendom, and are due rather to reminiscenc e

of a lost faith than to the operations of nature. The aspirations of nature cannot rise above nature, and therefore man does not naturally aspire to Catholicity which lies in the supernatural order.

Brownson had as much horror of Calvinism and Jansenism as the Jesuits, or Hecker and Hewit; but he was equally averse to Pelagianism, and never found it necessary to exalt nature and reason at the expense of grace and revelation, or these to the detriment of the former. He believed that nature, though not totally depraved or corrupted, had suffered more by original sin than did Hecker and his companions. He held that man by the Fall lost not only the original justice in which he was constituted, but also the integrity of his nature; that he became captive to Satan, darkened in his understanding, weakened in his will, and disordered in his appetites and passions. He never existed in a state of pure nature; for he was originally created and intended for a supernatural destiny, is never found in a state of pure nature; but always in a state either above it, on the plane of a supernatural destiny, or in a state below it, on the plane, not of a natural beatitude, but of an infra-natural or infernal declivity. He has no natural destiny, and only by regeneration and supernatural aid can he attain to the end for which he was created. On this point he and Hecker were far apart.

On receipt of Hecker's letter, copied above, Brownson added to his article some remarks that seemed to him reasonable and likely to assist Hecker in the accomplishment of the purpose for which he was at Rome. These remarks were honestly and sincerely meant, at the time, however ironical they sound to-day, in the light

of intervening events. "There has been," he wrote, "much said and written of late on the conversion of Americans, and no man amongst us is more devoted to the work of effecting it, or more hopeful of its being effected, than our author. He does all by word and by writing in his power for it, and has quickened the zeal of many to do the same, among whom we may count ourselves. But from the much we say and write in reference to this subject, and the frequency with which we speak of the American mind, the American people, American institutions, and the appeals we make to American patriotism, some Catholics not of American birth, or not having any very lively sympathies with the American character as they see it manifested, are led to suspect us of a design to americanize Catholicity, and of a desire to induce the American people to embrace our religion through appeals to their American prejudices, passions, habits, or patriotism. This suspicion, so far as we are concerned, is wholly unfounded, although we as well as others may have used expressions which would seem at first sight to warrant it. Unhappily this is a country in which no good thing can be proposed, but there stand ready a large number of unemployed individuals to convert it at once into a hobby, to mount it, and to ride it to death. Certainly no such thought or design exists as is suspected, but with unreasoning opposition on the one side, and unreasoning enthusiasm on the other, we cannot say what may come in the end if no pains be taken to guard against extremes, and if there be not on the part of those who are so earnest for the conversion of the country a proper respect for the Prelates whom the Holy Ghost has placed over us, and

full recognition of their authority and obedience to it." Brownson disclaimed for himself and those engaged in the conversion of the country all cause of suspicion in this regard; truly asserting that he had no wish to americanize the Church here; but freely condemning the attempt to introduce into the United States along with Catholicity any foreign doctrines or practices which had been tacked to it in the countries from which our clergy had come. Indeed, any one who is well acquainted with those who are not Catholics, knows that such customs and notions are greater obstacles to their conversion than any Catholic dogma or ordinance, and they judge Catholicity to a great extent from what they find it in those with whom they have come in contact.

Whilst with Hecker hope was constant, ever-living, and active, with Brownson it was rather spasmodic, and kept up only by an effort, for he feared that the licentious and corrupting tendencies in our public and private life were more likely to carry with them a large portion of the Catholic population than this population was to restrain them; that the salt that should save would lose its savour, and he trembled hardly less for the Catholic than for the Aatholic population.

Hecker was far from satisfied with this review of his book, as he showed in his next letter.

ROME, October 24, 1857.

My dear friend:—Your welcome letter and also your notice of "Asp. of Nat." arrived here on the 19th inst. At this moment, having just returned from a pilgrimage to the Tomb of St. Alphonsus, my hands are full of affairs, otherwise I would equal your interesting and affectionate letter in its agreeable length.

The article on "As. Nat." I have read again and again, and surely it is a source of great regret that men who have the same noble, and let me say divine, work at heart, should find so many differences between them. This seems to be the usual accompaniment of all really good undertakings. It is, however, most unfortunate that these were put in print and made public at this juncture. The article will increase the unfounded suspicions of the General here and the Provincial in the U. S. and I fear that the latter will use it with terrible effect against the American Fathers. What you say to exculpate me, however sufficient and true, will not be regarded by minds filled with suspicions. Parts of your letter which touch on these points, I will have translated to counteract this influence if the article be used that way. My trust is in God, who often turns the greatest difficulties into means of success. With God and our B. Lady I can weather any storm.

On becoming acquainted with the state of mind here and the position of things, I found that it would be more prudent to write an article or two for the *Civiltà Cattolica* than to translate the "Mission of America." It was all-important that these matters should be published in the *C. Cat.* and a translation would not find acceptance, indeed it was looked upon as a singular thing that my articles were accepted. There are two, one is translated by one of the editors and will appear in the No. of the 3d Sat. of November, the other the 1st Sat. of December. As soon as I can get a copy of the proof sheets you shall have them. My purpose is to show by different movements in the social, religious, and political world in the U. S. D. Providence has been preparing our

people for conversion to the C. faith. The views of the Asp. of Nat. are motivé in these. There is not a word in these articles that can give the slightest offense to *any one*, or *anywhere*. They are calculated to aid the general cause, my own particular affairs are not hinted at.

In regard to my affairs I cannot tell you how they stand. Every day they involve higher and more general interests. I do not see a step ahead, all I know is that I find myself in the hands of D. Providence *completely*, and am ready to follow its lead in any direction.

Your affairs distress me—every sacrifice I pray particularly for you. Courage, a change for the better is not far distant. God is with us. Thanks for your letter, write soon again.

Ever truly and most sincerely your friend and servant in the service of Jesus and Mary,

I. T. HECKER.

About a month later Hecker wrote :

ROME, November 27, 1857.

My dear friend:—The two articles from the Civil Cat. which I sent a copy of to you two weeks ago, seem to have given complete satisfaction to those who have read them here. They give a clearer insight into the state of things and minds of the Am. people, so I am told, than any thing that has hitherto been published in Italy. Tho regarded as American to the core, no one objects to a word, but the knowing ones say, that if an Italian had written them, he would have been brought up before the Holy Office without delay! I am aware that I have presented the fair side of our country, this was done by design, to attract attention, and interest

the rulers of the Ch. in behalf of our country. The reverse side and in the darkest colors has too long occupied the minds of men this side of the Atlantic. Intentionally therefore I left out obstacles in the way of the conversion of our countrymen, and but slightly hinted at the means to be adopted to accomplish this. Card. Barnabo insists upon my writing more, and this will give me the opportunity to take up the *difficulties*, and to show *how* they are to be managed and overcome. In this connection I will show the origin, nature, and bearing of Mormonism, Spiritualism, &c., which are little understood here, and it will give me also the opportunity of coming closer to the object of my journey to Rome.

My articles were printed before your notice of the Aspirations reached here. We have touched in common several points, and if I am not mistaken, these articles will justify your exculpation of my wishing to present things in a wrong direction, or to make my movement a hobby. You will rejoice in seeing the views which we hold in common brought out here in Rome, passing the Apostolic Censure and meeting with general approbation.

On p. 24 from the word "Diciamo" to the end of that paragraph, the words were not mine, but attached as a note by the Editor to the quotation from the Abp. They were in a different shape, and fearing it might be construed as a covert attack, I changed them, and embodied them in the articles as they now stand. The only reason for them was that they *feared* my meaning might be perverted by the radicals, and for the same reason the note on p. 26 was put. As this motive does

not exist in the U. S., there is no reason for not leaving them out if the articles get in print.

I saw Padre Curci the other day and he told me that they were so crowded with matter that he would not be able to publish my new articles before two or three months. The Cardinal told me that was no consequence, I must write them and have them published then. This will give me plenty of time to prepare them, and if you have any advice or suggestions to make, they will be in time and render me a great service.

Since writing the above I have met several who have read the first article in the Civil. Cat., among others Cardinal Reisach. It seems to have opened the eyes and given its readers to understand the great object for which I came to Rome; excited their sympathy for the cause and for me, and given me a quasi status here in Rome. My coming here will, I trust, prove in the end the work of Divine Providence, it will have served as a means to give a little idea to persons in authority of the American people, and also to engage their interest, and excite their sympathy in their behalf. And tho I do not know the way in which it will be brought about, still my confidence increases that the special end of my journey will also be gained.

Most sincerely and devotedly yours in the service of Jesus and Mary,

I. TH. HECKER.

One of the American Fathers who were waiting the issue of Hecker's visit to Rome was the Reverend Clarence A. Walworth, who wrote Brownson soon after reading the article on Hecker's book.

POUGHKEEPSIE, October 22.

Dear Mr. Brownson:—The immediate motives which concur to bring my pen to paper just now are these. I think I see in the last number of your Review some symptoms of gloom and discouragement, whether proceeding from physical or mental causes, I cannot well judge. On the other hand, you know enough of the present position of myself and my most immediate friends and companions, to have some cause to fear that we may be cast down and discouraged. All times which try men's souls, are times which try men's friendship also, and as I make it both my pride and pleasure to class myself among your friends, this little note cannot be altogether *mal-a-propos*. Please therefore accept it as a sort of return call to that kind of sympathizing visit you made us at Newark, when the sudden news you brought * made us too tongue-tied to give expression to many things which our hearts were tender to feel and to lay up.

So far as concerns our little band, we are as yet afloat on a sea of uncertainty; by no means discouraged however, but full of hopes and confidence in God, who surely is guiding our bark, whither indeed I cannot say. It is probable that a few days will reveal to us some glimpse of the shore before us, and you will be one of the first to hear of our landing.

Our own particular affairs do not by any means engross our thoughts. Brownson and Brownson's Review constitute a familiar and frequent theme of conversation, interest and speculation. As I said at the outset, I

*The news that Hecker had been dismissed from the Congregation.

thought I perceived some signs of despondency in the last number, more even than was fairly couched in words. If so, I am sorry for it. To be sure I have never counted myself among the most sanguine of those who look for the speedy triumph of the good cause in America. But I do look for that triumph, and feel as earnest as ever in the little part I take in the conflict. And permit me to say—there never was a time when I listened more earnestly to hear the sledge-hammer blows of the "Review" or felt more confidence in its power to do execution than in the present crisis of affairs. I have never been much tempted to wish to make you suggestions, either as to choice of topics, or manner of treating them, being always satisfied to hear from you on any subject of common interest, and always liking best those articles which seemed the most characteristic. Go on then, in the name of God, with a light heart, for the sake of many great and holy interests, and also for the sake of many young men who, like myself, have learned much from you already, and rely on you for much in the future. While I rank myself among these in general, I would be glad to have you look upon me also as one bound to you not only by common principles and religious interests, but by the attachment of a warm personal friendship.

In the sacred hearts of Jesus and Mary I remain ever your faithful friend and brother,

C. A. WALWORTH.

Perhaps at another time Brownson might not have expressed himself so little sanguine in his hopes for the future of the Church and country as in his review of Hecker's book; but mental and physical causes com-

bined just then to depress his spirits. When Brownson came to New York and for some months afterwards, his health was fairly good, or at least required no violent remedies. But Hecker was infatuated with a Dr. Watson, who had joined the Catholic communion, and whose peculiar treatment of his patients Hecker maintained was inspired by the Holy Ghost and was to the body what baptism was to the soul. The treatment consisted in bleeding the patient, usually every other day, and administering whisky. The fees, from fifty to a hundred dollars, were required from each in advance. When Watson had collected all he was likely to get, he quietly quit the city. Even McMaster, of the Freeman's Journal, who surely had no blood to spare, was induced by his friend Hecker to place his elongated frame in Watson's hands, as were a number of others, among whom was Brownson. McMaster was ardent in defence of the system; but Brownson's health suffered from it for a while. At the same time he found cause for worry and depression in the Archbishop's attitude towards him and his Review, to which he attributed in great part the falling-off in his subscription list. Hughes, it is true, disclaimed privately to Brownson any intended hostility; but the public could only know what he said and wrote publicly. The pecuniary loss from this cause was, however, more than made up by an unusual number of successful lectures, in the winter of 1857-8, in New York,* Boston,

* The committee conducting the business affairs of the lecture delivered in the Academy of Music, New York, handed to Brownson, after paying the expenses incident thereto, \$1,018.65, the largest sum he had ever received for a single lecture; the attendance was 5,376 persons. And a few days previous, the Reverend Thomas Farrell of St. Joseph's Church wrote:

"Dear Dr. Brownson:—Please accept the enclosed small present which a few of your friends have given me to present to you. They wish you to

Baltimore, Cincinnati, Louisville, Chicago, Cleveland, Zanesville, and other places; which not only brought in a considerable sum of money, but were also the means of gaining many new subscribers to the Review.

Hecker's mission to Rome was so far successful that the American Fathers Walworth, Hewit, Baker, Deshon, and Hecker were released from their vows and honorably discharged from the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, Hecker's dismissal being revoked for that purpose. With the approbation of the Archbishop of New York, they organized the Congregation of Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle, and all but the first-named of the five published a circular dated July 14th, 1858, setting forth their plan and their willingness to receive contributions from those disposed to help them. Walworth's reasons for leaving them are given in a letter to Brownson.

ST. PETER'S CHURCH, TROY, July 6.

Dear Sir:—You may already have heard that I have parted company with my former confrères, but perhaps

regard it as a mark of their esteem and of their appreciation of your labors of love for the Church of God. They hope also that this expression of their esteem and appreciation may cheer you up in the hour of literary toil and in the hour of chivalrous fight for the cause of truth. Please accept it, seeing the spirit with which they offer it, and enroll them among the number of your friends and well-wishers. Allow me also to express to you my own sincere regard and to subscribe myself yours,

“THOS. FARRELL.”

Then follow the names: Rev. H. T. Brady, \$10; Rev. E. Maguire, \$10; Rev. S. Malone, \$10; Rev. J. Boyce, \$10; Rev. W. Quinn, \$10; Rev. D. G. Durning, \$10; Rev. Felix Farrally, \$10; Rev. A. Farrely, L. I., \$5; Rev. J. P. Nobriga, \$5; Rev. P. Egan, \$5; Rev. J. Murphy, \$5; Rev. Thos. McLaughlin, \$5; Rev. Thos. Joice, \$5; Rev. Thos. Farrell, \$25; Rev. A. J. Donnelly, \$25; Rev. J. M. Forbes, \$20; Rev. Dr. Morrogh, \$20; Rev. M. Driscoll, S. J., \$25; Rev. G. McCloskey, \$25; Rev. J. W. Cummings, \$25; Rev. P. McCarthy, \$25; Rev. W. McClellan, \$20; Rev. M. Curran, \$5; Rev. W. Everett, \$5.

you have not heard that I have been installed as Pastor of St. Peter's Church in this city. Not merely (as the Declaration of Independence says) a decent regard for the opinion of mankind, but a particular desire to be well understood by yourself, prompts me to address you a word of explanation. Upon our first conference together after the mission at St. Bridget's, I found to my utter surprise that my companions were (with the exception of F. Baker) in favor of reorganizing without the *vows*. This was a fatal blow to all my hopes and prospects, and destroyed my confidence in the whole thing. It is true that *annual vows* were proposed as a basis of agreement or compromise, and I tried to reconcile myself to it, and thought at one time that I would accept it, for the sake of the missions and of the companions that I loved so much, but I could not so much crush my reason and judgment which revolted at it. According to the Canonists, a "Religio" cannot exist without perpetual vows, and so I found myself called upon to renounce my religious life forever, when I thought it had only been interrupted for a moment. Besides this, motion downwards is a perilous one, especially when it begins with a long leap at the top, and I felt persuaded that the minds which were so willing to abandon the great platform of the Religious life, the perpetual vows, would not easily find a resting-place from innovations.

I need say no more: You can easily supply a host of considerations which go to swell this my main difficulty. And so after much delay and consultation, I felt bound to part company with the rest. We parted, however, I think, on the friendliest terms, and they will be always dear to me, as they have been until now. Al-

though we have parted company, our hearts are still united; and therefore, my dear Doctor, when hereafter in reckoning up your own personal friends, you come to these old companions of mine, consider me for all purposes of personal sympathy and friendship as one of the number still.

I am now in all that worry and bustle which envelops I suppose every new housekeeper, but I shall soon be at rights. When Dr. Brownson comes to Troy, as it may happen often, I trust, let him remember there is a house and a friend waiting for him at St. Peter's.

Your faithful friend and brother,

C. A. WALWORTH.

When George Ripley and Charles A. Dana began the preparation of Appleton's "New American Cyclopædia," in 1857, they applied to Brownson for assistance, and it was agreed that he should contribute the articles treating of metaphysical subjects. When the subject of Atheism was reached in the second volume, Brownson wrote that "speculative Atheism may be briefly defined as the denial of the Supreme Being as first cause, and practical Atheism as the denial of God as the last or final cause; consequently the denial of the moral law, moral obligation or duty; for if there is no end for which—*finis propter quem*—man exists, there is and can be for him no moral law, no duty; and if God is not that end, then he can be under no moral obligation to obey God, or to submit to his will, or his law." The Editors of the Cyclopædia were unwilling or afraid to print this passage without such qualification as deprived it of all force as the expression of the writer's argument. That

the Editors of Greeley's "Tribune" should be unwilling to assert theism in that journal was bad enough; but that they should carry Greeley's spirit into a work of the character claimed for the "Cyclopædia" was to stamp it in Brownson's opinion as an unfit publication for him to contribute to. From Dana nothing could be expected favorable to religion; but Ripley was a different sort of man, and might be counted on to exclude from his work every thing offensive to religion or morality.

As Brownson and other Catholic writers' names were published in the second or third volume, by the Editors as those of contributors, for the apparent purpose of inducing Catholics to buy the "Cyclopædia," he examined the character of the volumes then published, and wrote Ripley his disappointment to find that whilst the Editors professed to be impartial, and to give facts, not judgments, and abstained from opinions and judgments unfavorable to Protestantism, they seized every opportunity of presenting opinions and judgments unfavorable to Catholicity; and had the great saints, fathers, doctors, and philosophers of the Church done by a Unitarian, and the ecclesiastical history articles by a Methodist minister. Ripley's reply was as follows:

Office N. A. C. 346 Broadway,
N. Y., August 5, 1858.

My dear Dr. Brownson:--I beg you to accept my thanks for your frank and kindly note, although I regret that you should take such stringent views of what you deem the short-comings of some of our writers. I had flattered myself that the 3rd volume would prove more satisfactory than either of the others; but it seems the

most earnest efforts and wishes have not in this case proved successful. Perhaps our better way would be to entrust all our articles bearing on the Church only to Catholic authorities, though it seemed to me that if we could find fair-minded and impartial Protestant writers on topics common to both, the effect would be more impressive on minds not accustomed to Catholic ideas. It is exceedingly difficult, as you are aware, to do justice between adverse views and conflicting interests; though I am sure, if you will compare our book with any other English Cyclopædia, you will find it far superior, in that respect, to its predecessors. At all events, you must not anticipate the worthlessness of the whole series because the first three vols. do not reach your standard. Give us fair play, especially as we admit that our organization in the commencement was incomplete, and it takes Cyclopædist like other carnivora, some time to cut their eye teeth.

I hope you will not deem it necessary to deprive us of your invaluable aid in the philosophical department, because we have not yet come up to our mark in that of theology, especially as no writer can be held responsible for the defects of a hundred others, and of all men, you are the least likely to be accused of any connivance with heretical or erroneous statements. But I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you in a few days, if I can get my head above water for a moment, and will only add how truly I am ever yours faithfully,

GEO. RIPLEY.

A little later Brownson and Ripley talked over the whole matter, but it seemed clear that Ripley aimed at

offending nobody and pleasing everybody, which Brownson thought would lead to his pleasing nobody and offending everybody, and that treating theists and atheists, Christians and infidels with equal respect showed indcision, indifferency, want of a clear, distinct and positive religious faith. He declined to contribute to it further; and though he would not say to Catholics, do not buy it, he warned them, if they did buy it, to do so with the understanding that it was a thoroughly un-Catholic work, in which there was, and would be much to offend their religious faith and feelings.

Brownson also wrote an autobiographical volume, "The Convert; or Leaves from my Experience,"—which was published in 1857. It tells the story of his intellectual and religious life, and gives an account of his conversion to the Catholic Church, and so relates his past to his present life as to show that in making the change he had no need to divest himself of his nature or forego the exercise of his reason. It is also an answer to the old objection, based on his many changes, that he was not to be trusted because whatever he might hold to-day, no one could foresee what he would teach to-morrow; for it makes it evident that these changes were but so many stages in his progress to truth, and that it was the error only, and never the truth once seen, that he abandoned. The book, furthermore, gives an account of the various sects, schools, and parties with which at different times he came in contact, together with sketches of their founders and chiefs, and of their influence on his own opinions and relations. The mental and religious experiences which he passed through are faithfully delineated, and fidelity to the idiosyncracies of religious

thought and experience in New England is readily recognized in their analysis by one who had passed through them to the height from which he was able to determine their relative value and importance.

It would be a gross mistake to suppose that the Author of "The Convert" wrote to vindicate himself, or to justify his various aberrations, except in relation to Protestantism, which gives us only false principles, a false starting point, and no guidance but our own feeble understanding, or an illusory illuminism, in studying either the book of nature, or the book of revelation. On Protestant principles, or in view of the position in which Protestantism places one born and bred in its bosom, his course, tortuous as it may have been, is perfectly justifiable. Catholics may censure him, but not Protestants; for only on the supposition of the truth of Catholicity did he do wrong, or fall into any serious error. No doubt, he sinned against common sense, but so sins Protestantism itself. He had as much right to dissent from the sects as Luther had to dissent from the Church, and as good a right to concoct a doctrine, or erect a church for himself, as the Reformers had for themselves.

The attempt of Protestants to disparage the intellectual or moral character of the Author, on the ground that after leaving Presbyterianism and before becoming a Catholic, he embraced various forms of error and was associated with various socialistic, communistic, or other unchristian movements could not serve their purpose; for he himself had said in "The Convert" all that was to be said in his disparagement and all that needed to be said in his vindication, and for his personal character he never had aught to fear. The false assertion of Prot-

estant critics that he came to the Church by an act of intellectual despair and the abnegation of reason was overthrown by the development of the historical and social relations and philosophical considerations which led him to the belief that the Catholic Church alone possesses the prerogative of infallibility and authority. Catholics and Protestants alike profess to believe the word of God; but without an infallible interpreter and guide, divinely appointed and assisted, we can never be sure that any given doctrine is revealed in the word of God. *

CHAPTER VI.

THE JESUITS OF ST. LOUIS.—THE JESUIT PHILOSOPHY.—
CONTEMPORARY FRENCH WRITERS.—CATHOLIC EDUCA-
TION.—THE IRISH UNIVERSITY.

EARLY in 1858, as Brownson was about to start for Cincinnati and other towns where he had been invited to lecture, he received the following invitation:

ST. LOUIS, January 24th, 1858.

Dear Sir:—Having heard that you were on your way to Cincinnati for the purpose of lecturing there, I

*The great difficulty which Protestants feel in regard to infallibility whether of Church or Pope, arises from confounding the office of judge with that of legislator. Neither the Pope nor the Church can propound new dogmas; their infallibility extends only to defining what has been revealed and believed from the beginning; nor do Catholics believe these dogmas because the church says they are true, but because they are the word of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

am authorized by the Catholic Institute to request you to extend your visit to this city for a similar purpose. As our treasury is not over-burthened by money you will oblige me by stating the terms on which you will come here and deliver two lectures. I beg you also to let me know what subjects you deem suitable to lecture upon. If permitted to suggest, I would remark that lectures assailing Protestantism are not those that would be most acceptable to the Catholics of this city, as we found that some of the lectures heretofore given before the Institute were the means of producing intense discord in families hitherto united. . . . Besides it does not improve the morals of our people by telling them that their neighbors of other denominations are very bad Christians. . . . With my best wishes for your temporal and eternal happiness, I remain your obedient servant,

JOSEPH O'NEIL.

It had long been manifest that it was unpalatable to a great number of St. Louis Catholics to be told that their Protestant friends and relatives were not just as much Christians and in the way of salvation as themselves, and Brownson had hoped that his lectures would have the effect of arousing them to a sense of the necessity of the true faith to escape everlasting suffering. He by no means expected such weakness on the part of the Catholic Institute as O'Neil's letter indicated, and indignantly refused the invitation. It was, however, only a few months before matters were smoothed over by the influence of Father Smarius, a sturdy and uncompromising Catholic, who was elected President of the Institute, and very soon afterwards wrote as follows:

St. Louis, University,
ST. LOUIS, Mo., September 24th, 1858.

ORESTES A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

Dear Sir:—I am commissioned as President of the Catholic Institute of St. Louis to request you to favor us with a course of five lectures during the coming season. I hope, dear Doctor, that you will forget the past, and any unpleasant connections which belong to it. The Institute discards the responsibility of any and all these sad memories and begs you to exonerate it from them if you should ever have attached them to its members. Be assured Dear Doctor, that the community of St. Louis and the Institute in particular entertain a very high regard for yourself personally and your immortal writings.

The Institute would wish you (if it suit your convenience) to lecture about the middle of November. If not, name your own time according to your convenience. They tender you the sum of \$300 for the course, and will pay all expenses to and fro, and while among us. We would tender you a more generous compensation were it not that our finances are rather low just now; the fact is, the Institute is making unusual efforts to keep above water; and we doubt not but your presence among us will infuse new courage for prosecution of the work.

Please, Dear Doctor, do come and cheer up with your presence your obedient servant.

C. F. SMARIUS, S. J.

Brownson, in accepting this invitation, wrote that either November or the following January would be

equally convenient to him. To this Father Smarius replied that the beginning of January had been agreed upon as the more suitable time, and tendered the hospitality of the University during his stay in St. Louis.

Brownson accordingly lectured there in January, making his home with the Jesuits, and becoming well acquainted with many of the ablest members of the Missouri province. The impression made on him by these fathers in general was that, whereas the fathers of the Maryland province appeared to be fashioned after the Italian or Acquaviva type, the others took more after the Spanish or Loyola model. Perhaps this might partly be accounted for by the fact that in one there was a large Italian element, and in the other more of the Belgian and Netherland. Hence in these he thought he found more marked individuality and greater force and freedom of thought, as well as more sympathy with his views of Church and State and his opposition to the philosophical teaching in vogue. In Father De Blicck he found almost for the first time, a professor of philosophy who saw clearly that for the last two centuries no philosophy, properly so called, had been taught in colleges or universities, and both agreed that this failure was due to lack of free, independent thinkers. In fact Bishop O'Connor was right when he told Brownson that the philosophy taught in our Catholic Colleges was for the most part some fragments of theology badly proved. Where a priest is one year on the mission, the next, teaching the rudiments of Latin, and then, professor of philosophy, it can hardly be expected of him that he should have thought out for himself a whole system of philosophy. As Father W. H. Hill said to me a few

years after his appointment to teach philosophy: "I don't pretend to be a philosopher; I only try to repeat what I was taught as a student." A little later, however, he took a very different view of his proficiency in philosophy. The mischief is, that men philosophize for the sake of some theory or are weighed down by some authority from which they dare not dissent. Generally, with Catholics, this authority is St. Thomas, who was unquestionably a great philosopher as well as a great theologian. But St. Thomas was not free, certainly not in his *Summa Theologica*, but was oppressed by the authority of the pagan philosophy lately introduced from the East. To interpret St. Thomas is, moreover, like the use of the Bible in Protestant hands. One says he was a Traditionalist, another that he was an out-and-out Rationalist; some find that he was an Inductivist, some a Sensist; this one that he was a Nominalist, that one a Conceptualist, and still another that he was a Realist; and he has been claimed by Ontologists as well as by Psychologists. Philosophical theories are only theories, whether those of Plato and Aristotle, St. Augustine or St. Thomas; they are not truth, but views of truth. The truth is as near and as open to us as to them, and if we fail to attain to it, it is because we fail to make a wise and free use of the means in our reach, because we suffer our intellectual life to be crushed out by the authority of antiquity, or the superincumbent weight of scholastic systems. Of course, due reverence must be paid to authority and tradition, but not a slavish cringing.

Father De Blicck seemed well-fitted to prepare a text-book of Philosophy which should remove the discord

now existing between the real and the known, and he was desirous of doing the work. But before he had finished it, the Superior-General of the order commanded the Jesuits to base their philosophical teaching on Aristotle as interpreted by Fonseca. On receiving this order, De Blicck wrote to Brownson :

BARDSTOWN, April 11th, 1859.

Much esteemed and dear sir:—Although a letter from me can prove but of little interest to you, still having promised you to write, I suppose it is better to do it late than never. You, no doubt, remember that I partly agreed to your request of writing an elementary philosophy. Well, cheered on by your words of encouragement, I had well-nigh finished my plan, which I flattered myself would have met with your approbation, when I received a letter from headquarters proscribing so many propositions to which I firmly cling, that I had to give up all idea of the kind. Bowing with implicit obedience to my superiors, as a religious, I cannot but think, as a man, that Italians, at least, some of them—are far behind in true philosophy. This will easily account for my not having sent to you the outlines of what I intended to write. I have frequently since thought of writing it anyhow, and keeping it in manuscript, relying on time for more favorable circumstances. What would you think of this? I can hardly believe that time and circumstances will not work some change in this regard.

I am much pleased with your article on "The Church and the Revolution." * I rejoice to see M. de Montalembert vindicated, and the *over-pious* Emperor of the

*Conversations of our Club, No. XIV. Works, Vol. XIII. p. 468.

French presented in his true light. Is it not bold in me to say any thing about your own writings? Well, if it be, you will pardon my forwardness. From certain data I think that the end of my rectorship is not far off, and that I shall soon be placed in the Scholasticate, near St. Louis, to teach our younger members.

Dear Doctor, pardon me, but you would confer one of the greatest favors on a sincere and abiding friend of yours by sending me your daguerreotype, or any other type, as you promised me you would when leaving Bardstown.

Please remember me in your good prayers, much esteemed and dear sir.

Yours truly,

J. DE BLIECK, S. J.

Another Jesuit, Father Gresselin, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham, dissatisfied with the text-books in use, expressed in a letter to Brownson dated September 26, 1859, his intention of supplying the want. "Last year," he writes, "I explained the philosophy of F. Fournier; formerly I had followed Rothenflue. Neither of these books, nor any one known to me, is what I want. I had for this year intended to make my boys write what I should say in class, but very soon did I find it too hard for them, and quite impracticable. Therefore, having no book upon which I might fall back, nor any other means to get on profitably, because it is not enough to talk in class, even beautifully, boys must have something to reflect upon, otherwise they are perfectly lost in vagueness, and grasp no precise knowledge, and conse-

quently no knowledge at all; I resolved heroically to write myself a whole course of philosophy."

The great objection to Brownson's philosophy, if his opponents had only understood themselves, was his rejection of extreme views. The charge that he had a tendency to adopt extreme views, has been so frequently made and has become so much of a common-place with his friends as well as his adversaries that it may create some surprise to hear me deny it. He used strong expressions, he wrote with great freedom and boldness, and he made it a point to urge upon his readers the importance of adopting a high-toned Catholicity in doctrine as well as practice; but I apprehend that the reader will search his pages in vain to find evidence of his having adopted on any subject the extreme view. Any man who has diligently read and understood his writings knows very well that the reverse is the truth and that his tendency was to adopt as moderate views as he could with logical consistency. In philosophy, in politics, in theology, in morals, the views he defended were in no instance that I can call to mind the extreme view, and he always proceeded on the principle that if one must err at all, it is better to err on the side of laxity than of rigorism. In philosophy, under the point of view from which he discussed it, the extremes are pure rationalism and pure traditionalism, pure psychologism and pure ontologism; and it is well known that he rejected all these extremes, and started from a primitive synthesis which avoids them. In politics, the extremes are absolutism and individualism; he opposed both and labored to harmonize authority and liberty, the authority of the state and the freedom of the subject. In morals, the extremes.

are the sufficiency of nature and the nothingness of grace, and the sufficiency of grace and the nothingness of nature; he maintained neither, but said with all our theologians, grace supposes nature. In regard to the papacy in face of the secular authority, the extremes are that the Pope has no authority, as say the Four Articles of the Gallicans, and that the state holds from God only through the pope in whom resides the temporal authority in all its plenitude. He maintained neither, and acknowledged that as a Catholic he might owe allegiance to an infidel or heretical government and be bound in conscience to obey it in so far as it commanded him to do nothing repugnant to the laws of God, for grace abrogates no rights held under the law of nature. As to the infallibility of the Pope, the extremes are that all his definitions are reformable, and that in all his acts and decisions he is personally infallible. He adopted neither, and claimed for him infallibility only when defining a question of faith or morals for the whole Church. In the question as to exclusive salvation, he never denied or questioned the qualifications of the dogma suggested by many eminent theologians, but insisted on the necessity of regeneration to put man on the plane of the supernatural.*

* The Editor of the Boston Pilot (*Dr. Brownson's Theology*, June 20, 1874,) falsely represented him as teaching that "whoever is not *actually* a member of the visible body of the Catholic Church cannot belong to the soul of the Church, and therefore cannot be saved." To this Brownson answered: "This is a mistake. I teach and maintain no such thing, as you could hardly fail to perceive if you had done me the honor to read my article through. What I maintain is that one who is not a member of the body of the Church *vel in actu vel in voto* does not belong to the soul of the Church, and therefore cannot be saved, or, in other words, one must, in order to be saved, belong to the Church either actually or in *explicit* desire."

In avoiding extreme views, Brownson not only lost the sympathy and aid of both sides, but was regarded by the world generally as unstable and inconstant. When he opposed one extreme he was supposed to adhere to the opposite, and when the danger threatened from the opposite extreme and he met it, he was regarded as having changed his views. A clear instance of this is afforded by his defence of authority and liberty. When the revolutionary spirit seemed triumphant he defended order, law, and legitimate authority, and was accused of advocating despotism; when absolute government in France had become the idol of Catholic journalism, and he asserted the rights of the Church, and of individuals, he was denounced as a radical. Yet at no period had he failed clearly to assert liberty with authority, and order with freedom.

Brownson met with much more sympathy and appreciation from the French Reviews and writers, always excepting the *Univers*, than at home. The French, as a rule, seize the meaning of what they hear or read, and express their own thoughts, with characteristic clearness and precision, and apparently without any labor or difficulty. They also are willing to concede more freedom to others than is generally permitted by the American Catholic press. Though many of their views were opposed by Brownson in his review of their works, Gratry, Chastel, Maret, Hugonin and other philosophers valued the criticisms and never thought of taking offence at them. Hugonin wrote him that he "would make good use of his counsels and criticisms," and said: "Plus on est porté à se tromper sur le mérite de ses œuvres, plus il est utile qu'on vous en découvre les défauts." And

Maret wrote after the first article on his Dignity of Human Reason * a short letter which is inserted here entire:

Académie de Paris,
Faculté de Théologie.

Instruction Publique,
PARIS, le 8 Octobre, 1857.

Monsieur:—Je saisis avec empressement une excellente occasion qui s'offre à moi pour vous présenter tous mes remerciemens de l'article sur mon livre inséré dans votre savante Revue. Le jugement d'un philosophe tel que vous, Monsieur, était pour moi d'un vif intérêt. J'ai lû votre travail avec le plus grand empressement et, si j'y ai trouvé des appréciations beaucoup trop indulgentes, j'y ai lû aussi des observations qui m'ont fait réfléchir, et j'en tirerai profit pour une seconde édition. Vous annoncez une suite à ce travail que je serai très heureux de voir, et j'ose espérer que ce ne sera pas dans un temps très éloigné.

Les relations qui s'établissent entre nous à l'occasion de ma publication ne feront pas un de ses moindres fruits. Vous remplissez, Monsieur, aux Etats-Unis, une grande et belle mission. Nous vous suivons ici avec le plus grand intérêt. Mais ce n'est pas seulement la cause de l'Eglise que vous pouvez servir dans le nouveau monde; vous pouvez aussi lui être fort utile dans l'ancien, en nous faisant bien comprendre combien l'ordre politique qui règne parmi vous, et qui peut-être est appelé à devenir l'ordre universel, offre de grands avantages à la vérité, et à l'extension d'influence. C'est à ce point de vue que j'ai lû, avec le plus vif intérêt, ce que vous

* See Works, Vol. I. p. 488.

avez écrit dans le temps, sur la mission réservée au peuple Américain. Continuez donc, Monsieur, à répandre des idées justes, à faire la lumière autour de vous; elle rayonnera jusqu'à nous, pour la plus grande gloire de Dieu et de son Eglise.

Veillez agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de tous mes sentimens respectueux, reconnoissans et dévoués,

H. MARET.

PARIS, Rue de Fleurus, No. 37.

Brownson's favorable opinion of Rohrbacher's Church History is evident from several passages in his writings; but the following extract from a letter to the Author gives his judgment of the work very concisely: "Allow me to say that what I especially admire in your work is its genuine papistical tone, and its constant effort to make Catholics understand that Our Lord founded his Church on Peter, and has never admitted the State to Holy Orders. Your vindication of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and refutation of the Four Articles of the Assembly of 1682, are alone a most invaluable service to the Catholic public, although I fear we shall never find any considerable number of statesmen who will not be political Atheists.

"Your philosophy is a little too Cartesian for me, and if I were to fight it, it would be for a contrary reason to that for which you appear to have been opposed. I prefer St. Augustine as a metaphysician to St. Thomas, and I am not satisfied with your excellent Bishop of Mans. I adopt the ontological method, and reject the psychological method. The evidence is in the object, not in the subject; and I use always the principle, What is not is not intelligible."

In 1857 and 1858, the Jesuit Fathers, Daniel Gagarin and others, published at Paris a serial filled with various articles on philosophical, historical, and theological subjects, written with rare ability, and learning, and in March 1859, they converted this into a quarterly review, known as the *Etudes Religieuses*, &c. Brownson was heartily glad of the establishment of a periodical which he regarded as advocating on most questions the side on which he was contending; for he said that, though the Jesuits had never intentionally sacrificed any Catholic doctrine or principle to the exigencies of time and place, they had studied to leave to each age and nation all its laws, institutions, customs, habits, manners, and usages not incompatible with Catholic faith and morals, and had labored to change no more in the private, domestic, or public life of a people than was absolutely required by the Christian law. He earnestly wished a very considerable class of our own Catholic population, if they could avoid abusing it, would cultivate the same spirit of conformity, or of accommodation, which would prevent their coming into collision with the age and the country, more than is necessary for salvation. Visiting the Jesuit College at Fordham, in the summer of 1859, Brownson charged Father O'Reilly, who was in correspondence with the Editors of the *Etudes*, to convey the expression of his views to them and some of the other Fathers. In reply Father Matignon wrote: "Je veux d'abord vous remercier en mon nom, et au nom de tous mes collaborateurs, de la lettre si intéressante et si aimable, où vous me racontez la visite de M. Brownson. J'ai été l'autre jour la lire au P. Chastel qui en est enchanté. Quant au P. Félix, je n'ai pu parvenir

à le rencontrer, et il partait le soir même pour Toulon, où il va prêcher l'Avent. Mais je lui ai fait faire votre commission et j'espère qu'il se conformera à vos désirs.

"Aussitôt qu'aura paru la livraison des *Etudes* qui est actuellement sous presse, nous enverrons à M. Brownson les quatre numéros de l'année, et les volumes qui lui manquent de la précédente série. Nous tenons extrêmement à l'estime si sympathique qu'il veut bien nous témoigner, et nous serons reconnaissants s'il veut bien dire quelques mots des *Etudes* dans son recueil que le P. Daniel a cité dans le Prospectus comme *une des revues les plus recommandables*.

"Vous savez, mon bien cher Père, que nous avons intention de faire davantage, et quelles circonstances* ont mis obstacle au compte-rendu de sa doctrine philosophique. Mais il est d'autres ouvrages de M. Brownson qui ne présenteraient pas les mêmes difficultés.

"Personne n'est plus en mesure que vous de nous fournir de précieux renseignements. Si vous pouvez pendant l'année composer quelque article ou du moins nous en envoyez les matériaux, certainement la chose sera insérée dans les *Etudes*. Le P. Daniel le désire beaucoup, et pense qu'avec un peu de bonne volonté (dont il ne doute pas du reste), cela vous sera possible. Par exemple, si l'ouvrage sur *le pouvoir temporel du Pape* s'imprime, ne serait-il pas à propos de le faire connaître? Permettez donc que nous nous déchargions sur vous d'une partie de la dette de reconnaissance que vous nous avez fait contracter envers l'illustre publiciste. En attendant, veuillez lui faire savoir que l'approbation qu'il

* The orders of higher authority. See Father De Blicek's letter on pages 141:2.

vous a chargé de m'exprimer est un des plus puissants et des plus précieux encouragemens que j'ai reçus. Si l'occasion se présente de me mettre en relations directes avec lui, je le regarderai comme un honneur et une bonne fortune."

O'Reilly said that Brownson's sympathy came to the Fathers at Paris very opportunely, "at a time when Dom Guéranger had taken Father Matignon to task pretty severely, for not demolishing M. de Broglie. I really think Dom Guéranger had been hard enough upon that zealous and amiable young nobleman, in the two volumes which he wrote against his work on the Roman Empire. He stood more in need of generous encouragement than of a second snubbing,—and I was glad that Father Matignon had mixed with a just and temperate censure of some defects, the high praise due to M. de Broglie's brilliant talents. The praise, however, was taken for indirect blame cast on the former criticism; *indeque iræ.*"

At about the same time Father Daniel wrote to Brownson :

PARIS, le 22 Xbre, 1859.

Monsieur:—P. C.—C'est au nom de tous les rédacteurs des *Études de Théologie* que j'ai à vous remercier de la sympathie que vous avez témoignée pour notre petite œuvre à notre cher confrère le P. O'Reilly. Votre suffrage est pour nous le plus précieux encouragement: quand un jeune soldat, dès les premiers coups d'épée, est ainsi salué par un brave vétéran, son ardeur est doublée et il se sent capable de faire des prodiges. En vérité, Monsieur, nous n'avons encore fait que bien peu

de chose pour la sainte cause de l'Eglise, mais puisque vous trouvez que nos travaux répondent aux besoins des âmes, Dieu en soit béni : avec son aide, nous ferons mieux encore par la suite.

Un de nos grands obstacles est dans le mode de périodicité que nous avons adopté, lequel, cependant, réussit parfaitement en Allemagne, en Angleterre, en Amérique, comme votre excellente Revue en est la meilleure preuve. Mais le public français est si léger, si mobile, si difficile à fixer sur des sujets aussi graves que ceux que nous traitons ! Il nous faut bien compter avec lui. Parviendrons-nous à triompher de son inconstance ? Nous l'espérons fermement. Déjà notre recueil commence à conquérir quelque notoriété. Puisque vous avez la bonté de vous y intéresser, soyez persuadé que ce que vous direz en Amérique revenant en France, avec l'autorité de votre nom, ce sera pour nous une grande recommandation auprès de nos compatriotes. Merci donc, Monsieur, de l'utile concours que vous avez bien voulu nous faire espérer, nous l'acceptons de grand cœur et il accroît tous vos droits à notre vive sympathie pour vous et à notre gratitude.

Le P. O'Reilly est chargé de vous remettre la suite de notre publication. Permettez-moi, en l'absence du P. Gagarin, de vous recommander tout particulièrement la *question russe*, que vous trouverez traitée non seulement par lui, mais encore par les PP. Verdière et de Buck, à divers points de vue. De ce côté l'ébranlement se fait et les esprits commencent à se préoccuper vivement. Quelques paroles de vous seraient aussi très à propos pour fixer de plus en plus les esprits sur cette

grande question. Au reste, le P. Gagarin, à son retour, ne manquera pas de vous en écrire.

Il ne me reste, Monsieur, qu'à réclamer pour nos communs travaux l'union de vos bonnes prières; bien entendu vous n'êtes pas oublié ici.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec une profonde considération, votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur en
J. C.

CH. DANIEL, S. J.

The criticisms of our Catholic Colleges and Seminaries, contributed to the Review by Dr. Cummings, Rev. W. J. Barry of Mt. St. Mary's of the West, and Rev. George McCloskey of New York, stirred up very bitter feelings on the part of the Episcopal organs in this country, and were very distasteful to those advocates of Catholic education who only understood by it education by Catholic teachers. That Brownson agreed in the main with these contributors is sufficiently plain since he continued to insert their articles; but that he did not intend to hold himself responsible for everything they said is asserted in his Review when giving this as a reason for appending their initials to their articles. He wrote sufficiently on the subject of education, and in particular of Catholic education; and found fault enough with Catholic education as it existed with us, to make his position clear, and to furnish grounds for censure or approbation according to the prejudices, opinions, or wisdom of his readers. A short account of his teaching on the subject will enable the reader to judge how far he was obnoxious to the hostility declared against him.

In spite of his fondness for tracing the origin of words philologically, Brownson was led by the generally

accepted opinion, to suppose education derived from *educo*, I lead or draw out; whereas a moment's reflection would have made him see that it was from *educo*, I nurture, or rear, which verb is further derived from *edo*, I eat. The Romans invoked the goddesses Educa and Potina to preside over the eating and drinking of their children. Thus *educare* is to feed, to cause growth, to form, to train. When Brownson used education in the sense of training he sometimes distinguished it from instruction, though at other times he included this in the former.

Brownson, when a young man, was associated with the Owens, Fanny Wright, and R. L. Jennings, in getting a system of universal education established throughout the country which should pass over religion in silence, and teach *knowledge*, believing that in this way they would soon be able to convert all our churches into halls of science, and our people generally into "free-inquirers," as they termed infidels like themselves. * For this purpose a secret society was formed, with its members all through the country unsuspected by the public, and unknown to each other, yet all known to a central committee. Brownson was active in the organization of this society which gave an extraordinary impulse to godless education, an impulse growing ever stronger since the organization in 1830. Its aim was the overthrow of Christianity, marriage, and property; its means, compulsory education in schools from which religion was to be excluded under the plea of excluding sectarianism.

* See Brownson's Works Vol. V. pp. 50, 61, and Vol. XIX. pp. 209, 442

The education we are laboring to give American children in our common schools Brownson declared only fitted to make them infidels, libertines, rogues, and sharpers. Catholic children can be brought up to be good citizens only as Catholics, and in schools under the supervision and control of the Church; not in schools that weaken, if not destroy, their faith and render them indifferent to religion. It was, therefore, very unlikely that he should have any undue leaning in favor of the public-school system, and we find him earnestly advocating the education of Catholic children in Catholic schools. He gave great offence by maintaining that the right of parents in the matter of the education of their children is qualified by the rights of the state and the Church in the same matter, and that extreme views on either side were pernicious. The parent, he said, has the right, before the state to choose the school and the religion in which he will have his child educated; but not the right to say he will not have him educated at all. The child does not belong exclusively to the parent, but in part to society and in part to the church. The state has claims on the child, and may require him to be educated, at least to some extent, to provide for that education at the public expense, and to make it compulsory. The state has not the right to train up the child in another religion than the parent's, which is the child's till the child is old enough to choose for itself. Therefore, the state is bound to keep its schools free from sectarianism; and as it has no more right to provide for religious education than for religious worship, whether Catholic or Protestant, under the American Constitution, all that is practicable for us is to insist on the exclusion from the public schools of

everything repugnant to the Catholic conscience. Where good Catholic schools can be found, the parent and the church have the right, and generally the duty, of requiring Catholic children to attend them; for while tolerating the public schools, he could not fully approve them. It was his opinion that the Catholic schools which had come under his observation were inferior to the public schools, and that it was impossible for the bishops and clergy, with the materials and means at their disposal, to place Catholic schools, regarded as secular schools, generally on a level with schools supported by the resources of the state. He considered that the church has made it obligatory to establish schools, as far as we are able, in which our children will not be exposed to the loss of their faith, or the corruption of their morals; but he did not regard as such schools, though called Catholic, those in which the children in study and behavior are not brought up to the common average of the public schools of the country.

In the forty years and more, which have elapsed since these views were published, there has, no doubt, been a great change, and in some parts of the country Catholic schools court comparison with public schools in every respect. They have improved wonderfully, and at the same time the public schools have fallen behind, and in attempting to teach too many things have ceased to teach so much of any thing. But Brownson, as long as he lived, continued to accept cordially the essential principle of the system, that is, the support of public schools for all the children of the land, at the public expense, or by a tax levied equally upon all citizens. He only asked that we might have the portion of the fund

which we contribute, to use in support of schools under our own management, and in which we could teach our religion, and make it the basis of the education given our own children. In January, 1858, Brownson published in his Review an article contributed by Bishop Spalding of Louisville, on common schools, which must be regarded as expressing the views of the American bishops generally, and there is not such essential difference to be detected between those of the Bishop and the Editor, nor does either seem to have considered there was, as was generally charged.

Probably the cry against Brownson in regard to Catholic education, so far as based on any thing he himself wrote, was more owing to the passing criticisms he made of Catholic schools and colleges, than to any doctrine he propounded. Though our colleges and academies fully came up to the ideas of the great majority of parents who sent their children to them, he thought they did not meet our needs, and he could not undertake to defend them as they were then organized and conducted, "Our conventual schools for girls," he said, "are too superficial, run over a great number of studies, but teach nothing thoroughly, unless a few light and showy accomplishments. They seem to forget that girls have intellect. . . There are branches in which I do not expect them to equal men, but there is no reason in the world why the young ladies who graduate from our conventual schools should not, with the modesty, reserve, and the lighter accomplishments, always indispensable, come forth thinking, reasoning beings, and prepared to give to the society into which they enter, a high moral and intellectual tone, at least be able to do something be-

sides *simper*, sing, gossip and dance. . . Our young ladies have not been educated to take an interest in grave intellectual subjects, and in this respect are by no means as well educated as the better class of non-Catholic ladies. The same fault runs through all our Colleges for young men, or I should say, our Colleges for boys. We have none for young men. They may go over ground enough, but they do not quicken the intellect of their pupils,—do not accustom them to think, and to assimilate and make part of themselves what they read or are taught by their professor. I do not believe, as a general thing, our professors and teachers are absolutely afraid of stimulating and cultivating the intellect, or of making their pupils thinking and reasoning men and women.” Yet they “have more or less fear of stimulating thought in their pupils, and in forming them to habits of self-reliance, and free and spontaneous action. They think they must repress as well as encourage, and therefore confine themselves chiefly to loading the memory, without stimulating real intellectual activity.” *

Our colleges, for the most part, combined, or attempted to combine, under the same government and discipline, the grammar-school and the college. The boy leaves college too young and is sent “out in society, weak, ignorant, without any habits of self-reliance, self-government, or self-help, exposed to all its seductions and temptations, so much the more to be dreaded, as they all have for him the charm of novelty, and left wholly unprepared, to battle with the world, the flesh,

* Works, Vol. XI. pp. 421-2.

and the devil, as best he may. The majority, I believe, succumb, as we might expect, in the struggle." *

Speaking of some "Readers" sent him for notice in his Review, and which consisted of about equal parts of Catholic asceticism and bald materialism, he wondered why compilers of school-books could not understand that in our Catholic life grace and nature coalesce, and that the true aim in preparing reading lessons should be to cultivate both on the side where they mutually touch each other and become one in the resulting action. The catechism should be taught, sermons should be listened to, and meditation encouraged, but in their time and place; placing them bodily in our reading lessons, alongside of a mass of natural history, and natural science, pervaded by a material, infidel, or dry utilitarian spirit, is not combining religion and science in education, not even if the teachers are Christian Brothers with their solemn dress and rigid manners. Education should always precede scientific instruction, and no amount of instruction on quadrupeds, birds, fishes, insects, geology, chemistry, mineralogy, can ever supply the lack of education. The old Catholic system of education was the right one, and the attempt of our Catholic schools and colleges to combine special instruction with general education has tended thus far only to render the instruction superficial and the education incomplete, and almost useless. Our primary schools are and must be, to a great extent, simply schools of instruction; but as soon as scholars can begin to read, the work of education may be commenced, and therefore the reading lessons should be selected with a view to education, and not

* Ibid. p. 426.

with a view to instruction, except instruction in reading itself. The aim should be culture, rather than instruction. Instruction is special, and should be given by special masters. We ask the college to send us home our son a man and a Christian, prepared to do a man's and a Christian's work. If the college does this, it does its work, effects its purpose, although it should send him home without having crammed the whole encyclopædia of knowledge down his throat. A man may be able to discourse most learnedly on minerals, on gases, on birds, and bugs, without having had the first rudiments of education properly so called. The greater part of our scientific men, naturalists, mathematicians, &c., are uneducated men, and that is the reason why modern science is placed so generally in opposition to faith. They may have been taught the catechism, but they have never been educated in it; they may have been told that they should be believing and pious, but the great principles of natural reason, intellect and will, which faith and piety presuppose, have never been developed, have never been cultivated, but suffered to lie fallow, or run to waste. After all, successful teaching depends not on the method adopted in books, but on the individual character of the teacher.

Brownson believed that girls, as a rule, should be brought up at home, under the eye and by the care of the mother, when the mother is qualified to superintend the daughter's education in both the more solid and in the ornamental branches. Boarding schools are even at best bad places for girls just budding into womanhood, and the effect of having so many congregated together is not good, and often injurious. The teachers

may be the best and the most vigilant in the world, but they cannot guard against everything improper in word or act. Besides, the very consciousness of being always under surveillance, spied upon, has a tendency to check the openness and frankness of the young girl's character, to render her sly, artful, cunning, deceitful, untruthful; at any rate, to destroy her native ingenuousness and all naturalness of character.

In a country like ours, especial pains should be taken to cultivate the understanding, to give due intellectual culture, to train pupils to think for themselves and have a proper self-reliance. The vicissitudes of life are many and often sudden, when they must think, decide, and act, with small space for deliberation. The boy or girl that has learned one thing well has a key to many other things, besides having acquired a habit that will remain through life, and be always and everywhere of advantage. Pupils are instructed with great pains in their religion, but not always with due perspective. Too much stress is laid on the minutiae. He who is not faithful in little things will prove unfaithful in great things; but our Lord reproved the Pharisees, not because they paid tithes of anise, cummin, and mint, but because, while they were careful to pay them, they passed over justice, judgment, and the love of God, the weightier matters of the law. These ye should have done, and not left the others undone.

This has become, or rather long has been, a great evil. Supposing that religion and morality are separable, our religious teachers have not been particular enough to show their pupils that morals are the practical application of the great truths of the Gospel, and

that justice and strict truthfulness are indispensable to religion. The two remain in the pupil's mind more or less disconnected, and it is not clearly understood that nearly all our duties to God are practically performed as duties to our neighbor.

It is hard for institutions that have no revenues and depend wholly on the patronage of the public for the support of their houses, for the means alike of subsistence and of charity, to escape altogether, in looking after the temporal interests of the community, adopting certain rules which pass uncensured among men of the world, and yet are not exactly the sort to be practised by persons who have renounced the world and devoted themselves to God, and who are placed where their example has great effect for good as for evil.

Entering religion does not entirely overcome one's national habits and idiosyncrasies; and the religious continue to estimate the relative importance of moral duties as the nation does to which they belong either by birth or education. The English and Americans may not be in fact any more truthful or just in their practice than the Italians, the French, or the Irish; but they lay greater emphasis on truthfulness and justice, and profess to regard a transgression of them as relatively a greater sin.

The traditions of these schools are of other countries and a different state of society than ours. In those countries, where the schools have flourished for ages, society itself supplies a very great part of moral education; here it supplies little or none, and the religious must give it or it is not given at all. The moral tone of religious people is lower here than in the old civilized nations of Europe. The moral tone of American society

in general is lower than that of any other Christian people, and it is falling lower and lower every day. This is a fact that religious communities, whose vocation is teaching, have to consider both for themselves and for their pupils.

Reference has been made to articles on the school question by contributors to Brownson's Review, with the main thought of which the Editor concurred. Yet in all these there were expressions of opinion on points of minor importance which would never have been written by him. This must always be so, if the editor is to accept any contributions whatever; and yet he must bear the blame of these as well as of his own. The criticisms of our colleges and seminaries contributed to the Review were written by priests of great intelligence and piety, because they desired improvements in them and must necessarily point out the faults to be eliminated. *

All the objections which Brownson himself made to the course of studies pursued, and the general spirit and character of the education given in all our higher schools and colleges may be summed up in the demand that, in these times of increasing paganism, the education given our youth of either sex should rest on a Christian

* Here is a specimen of letters Brownson received in consequence of such criticisms, one of the shortest.

Dear Sir:—Please find herein, a 3 dollar bill in payment of this years subscription to the Quarterly Review.

I am sorry to state that the reason for which I became a subscriber does not exist any more, for I cannot present it any more to several readers without prejudice to our Catholic school and without wounding too badly their national feelings. Therefore please have my subscription recalled.

Truly yours,

ED. JOOS.

MONROE, the 20th of October 1859.

instead of a pagan basis, and be integrally and thoroughly Catholic; that it should imbue the student with the principles as well as with the doctrines and practices of religion, and prepare him to keep and defend his faith against the false science and miserable sophistry of this shallow but pretentious age. This, he contended, our schools and colleges failed to do; certainly, if they did it, he had never been able to see the proof of it.

Brownson frequently referred to the want of a good Catholic University in the United States, though there seemed no immediate prospect of establishing one. In the meantime he looked upon the Catholic University in Ireland as the best suited for American students.

After reading Newman's *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects*, and the first three numbers of the *Atlantis*, he said, "The Dublin Catholic University we presume, located in Ireland, is intended to be not merely provincial, but national, for the whole British Empire; and as such the Catholics of the British dominions, it seems to us, should be united in its support, and lose no time in securing it ample endowments. It may easily be made the first university in the world. . . . The selection of Dr. Newman to be the Rector of the new Catholic University of Dublin was a wise one, for no man better understood what a university should be, or is better able to secure the practical adoption of his views." * "Till we get a university of our own, we think it would be well for American Catholics, who have the means, to send their sons, after graduating at our colleges, there to attend the university course. In fact

* *Literary Notices*, October 1859, p. 552.

we (i. e. Catholics of the United States,) claim some share in it, for we contributed liberally of our means to establish it, and one of the first provisional professors named by its distinguished Rector was an American; and it is the only Catholic university in the world in which our mother tongue is the language of the houses and of the lectures; we think we might do it a service and benefit ourselves by sending it our sons. We doubt if any university in the world can surpass the present corps of professors, and its rector, Dr. Newman, is a man whose greatness and worth, rich native endowments, profound and varied attainments, will be admired and esteemed the more in proportion as he is known." * This extract, and others similar often found in the Review, indicate that whatever be thought of Newman's theory of devolpment, Brownson recognized the many great qualities which have placed its author in the foremost rank of contemporary English Catholics. He was not, however, aware that Newman had resigned from the rectorship of the University until informed by Mr. Arnold, in a letter received some months later.

Cath. University,

STEPHEN'S GREEN, DUBLIN, 30th December, 1859.

Sir:—I read with great pleasure in the "Tablet" a short time since, a passage extracted from your Review, in which after commenting favorably on the "Atlantis," you proceeded to urge upon your Catholic countrymen the expediency of giving practical support to the Catholic University, by sending their sons to study there. Emboldened by the friendly tenor of your remarks, I vent-

* Ibid. p. 555.

ure, though unknown to you, to address to you these few lines, and to enclose a printed circular which will sufficiently explain itself. I am one of those—and they are many in the three Kingdoms—who have a true admiration for your character and genius, and who would value a few approving words from you immeasurably more than a thousand hollow puffs from persons or parties incompetent to give an opinion worth having.

I thought, when I read what you said in favour of American Catholics' sending their sons to Dublin, that greater practical effect might be given to your words, could it be known that there was at present a house opened in Dublin for the reception of boarders, offering something like a guarantee that their education—taking the word in its widest sense—would be well and prudently cared for.

I therefore determined that I would send my circular to you, and that I would ask you to be so kind as to inform me in what way I could give it the necessary publicity in America, and what practical steps I should take for that purpose.

I am the son of a man whom you certainly know by name, if not by his writings,—Dr. Arnold of Rugby ;—and I am professor of English Literature in our Catholic University here. I cannot say that the institution is making as rapid progress as its friends would desire,—and this for various causes ;—still the Irish bishops are now unanimous in their resolution of supporting it, and if they would only appoint an active sensible man as rector, I am sure that things would soon wear an altered face. It is the *headless* state in which we have been for so long which has wrought us a world of harm. Dr.

Newman, as you are perhaps aware, ceased to reside in Dublin and to take an active part in the administration of the University, for more than a year before he formally resigned.

Trusting that, for the sake of the cause, you will pardon the liberty I have taken, I remain, sir, very faithfully yours,

T. ARNOLD.

Professor BROWNSON, LL. D., &c., &c.

Arnold's letter, taken in connection with what we have already learned, seems to throw light on Newman's relations with the University, and to confirm the opinion long before expressed by Brownson. In May, 1854, Father Murphy, Provincial of the Missouri Jesuits, and well informed concerning Irish affairs, expressed his satisfaction at Brownson's having been invited by Dr. Newman, and at his not having accepted. The motives of his satisfaction he preferred preserving for their first tête-à-tête.* Newman writes in August of the same year, that he is urged *in quarters, to which he cannot but listen*, to request Brownson to give up, at least for the present, his lectures in the University; Brownson replies in September that what he calls the *Irish* party not only would not consent to have him connected with the University, but are not at all pleased *to see an Englishman at its head*.† After struggling for some years Newman felt constrained to retire from the rectorship, and Arnold says, the Irish bishops are *now* unanimous in their resolution of supporting the University.

*Brownson's *Middle Life*, p. 514.

† *Ibid*, pp. 481 and 483.

CHAPTER VII.

POLITICS.—GREAT BRITAIN.—FRANCE.—STATE DESPOTISM AND FREEDOM.—CELTS AND TEUTONS.—THE ROMAN STATES.—DR. FORBES AND ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.—CHURCH DESPOTISM.

THE political triumph of parties in Europe, especially in Great Britain and France, affects and is affected by that of the corresponding party in the United States. A victory of order or of revolutionism, of freedom or of absolutism in those countries is simultaneous or nearly so with a like victory here. It would, therefore, be impossible to discuss thoroughly the political concerns of our own country without paying heed to the movements abroad. Add a special reason why Brownson devoted many pages of his Review to foreign politics, that his Review circulated almost as extensively in Europe as in America.

As a Catholic, and as a patriot, he disliked British preponderance, and regarded the best interests of mankind safer under the supremacy of any other European nation. This was because he was heartily opposed to the British industrial and mercantile system. He had been opposed to that system ever since he had had a thought on the subject, and his opposition became stronger in proportion as he saw more of its workings, especially in his own country. "Wherever the influence of Great Britain is felt," he wrote in 1857,* "the virtue

* Works, Vol. XVI. p. 536.

and simplicity, the peace and happiness of the people depart, and a fierce, bitter, and all-absorbing struggle for the goods of this world alone ensues. English influence has ruined Portugal, has prostrated Spain, embroiled Sardinia, demoralized, to a fearful extent, the greater part of Italy, and weakened France. It corrupts morals, weakens the hold of religion on the heart, and diffuses a degrading heathenism. Her literature, her philosophy, her religion, as well as her industry and commerce, tend to materialize the nations, and to produce the conviction that man lives for this world alone. She is of the earth earthy, and the grand apostle of carnal Judaism."

In his judgment, it was doubtful if we were any more independent of England than we had been in our colonial days. Our mercantile interest depends on hers; our country was governed then as now by men who sacrifice the national dignity and welfare, and the interests of mankind for merchandise. In 1857, the most influential paper in the country, the N.Y. Herald, recommended recruiting the British army in the United States, and proposed that our government, if need were, should assist England in suppressing the Indian mutiny. Brownson was as shocked as any one at the atrocities of the Hindoo mutineers; but he also remembered the various tortures to which the unhappy ryots had been subjected by the East India Company's agents to wring out from them the rupee they did not have; the painful and revolting tortures inflicted on Hindoo women as well as men; the calls for vengeance upon them by the London *Times*; and he pronounced the barbarism of the British in India more atrocious than that of the natives, and to

be judged by a different standard, for Great Britain professed to be a Christian nation. He felt no sympathy with the predominant spirit of England and the United States, based, as it is, on false notions of political economy. All real wealth, he contended, is in land and labor; trade accumulates luxuries, and impoverishes, instead of enriching a country. Land and labor must sustain the luxury and extravagance which are born of trade, and when they are taxed beyond their capacity, the excess of expenditure over income must be met by drafts on the future. By the modern system of trade and commerce we increase the burdens of land and labor, and the actual addition to our productive capital in any one year does not equal the indebtedness we contract during that year; and hence with all our trade and industry we rather grow poorer than richer, and the difficulty of living becomes greater. Accordingly he declared that he "should not grieve immoderately were Great Britain to lose all her foreign possessions, and be confined to her own sea-girt islands, because with her fall must fall, or be greatly modified, that system which now enslaves or cripples all nations, and ruins innumerable souls." *

Napoleon III. succeeded in putting an end to the Crimean war at the proper moment for preventing its advantages from inuring to Great Britain alone; but by her alliance with Austria she rapidly recovered all she had lost, and defeated his eastern policy in which he was backed by Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia. The weakness, vacillation, and indecision shown by the Emperor in his domestic policy surprised those whose opinion of

* Works, Vol. XVI. p. 542.

him had been formed from his *coup d'état* and the first years of his rule. His famous letter to Colonel Edgar Ney, which he had to explain away before the Pope would consent to return to Rome, set forth a policy towards the Holy See which created at the time a distrust of his intentions among Catholics; and Brownson always maintained that he had never abandoned it. Why, he asked, should not the principle, on which he sought to justify the war against Russia, that of protecting the independence of sovereign states, apply to the Pope as well as to the Grand Turk, to the head of the Catholic religion as well as to the chief of Islam?

The Empéror's persecution of Count de Montalembert for what was really no legal offence, outraged the whole higher literature of France, and the public opinion of the civilized world. "The condemnation of Montalembert," said Brownson, "is a condemnation of freedom, a condemnation of thought, and a condemnation of intelligence in France. The Catholic party, led on by Louis Veuillot, are digging their own grave, and preparing for Catholics in France, when the day of reaction comes, a persecution . . . with its chief rage against religion. This Montalembert labored with all his power to put his Catholic friends on guard against. He knew such a despotism as that of the present *régime* could not last and he did all he could to prevent Catholics from allying the cause of religion with it . . . The policy of Louis Napoleon is to give the friends of religion and order no alternative but Despotism or Revolutionism. Are Catholics fools enough to aid him in that policy, and to regard him as the champion of Catholic interests? What will be the condition of the Church in

France when he falls, as fall he will? The *prestige* acquired by the bravery of an army he found disciplined to his hand, in the Crimean war, has been lost . . . He has not been able to achieve a single diplomatic victory, and has been defeated by England and Austria on every point . . . When he falls, when the Socialists with envenomed fury against the Church occupy his vacant throne, the Catholic defenders of despotism will perhaps remember the words of the noblest Catholic statesman and orator of our age. Let them then build monuments with the bones of slaughtered priests and nuns to Louis Veillot and his dupes." * At the same time the Reviewer addressed a letter of sympathy to the illustrious Confessor who was no less the victim of his devotion to the interests of religion than of his devotion to political freedom. The following is the reply :

LA ROCHE EN BRENY, CÔTE D'OR,
February 16th, 1859.

Private.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—I hope I need not tell you that I have been most highly gratified by your affectionate sympathy, with regard to my late trials, as expressed in your interesting letter of December 27th, and in the energetic article contained in the last number of your Review, which *safely* reached me. I felt very anxious to know what your opinion would be, as I was somewhat afraid that your anti-English feelings would have precluded you from perceiving the *whole* extent of the cause. But quite the contrary has taken place, and I think I may say that amongst the many hundred letters I have received on this occasion, few or none have given

* *Review*, January, 1859, p. 142.

me greater satisfaction than yours. I have directed the Brussels editor, December 9, to forward to you the full and authentic account of the *two trials*, which has been published there and which, although wretchedly printed, is well worth your perusal. The splendid orations of Dufaure and Berryer contain an immense deal of information on past and present events, besides their eloquence; but all this is quite unknown to France, as the publication of the debates before the Courts of Law, in all political cases, is strictly prohibited and severely punished. So that except the happy few who were present, not a soul in France is allowed to know what the *first* lawyers and orators of the country have said on so vital a question! This is what Catholic prelates and writers have dared to call *the restoration of Christian Society—in the world*.

However the result of the whole matter has been one of undivided gratification to myself, whose person and whose writings have gained thereby a degree of notoriety and even of popularity throughout Europe, for which I shall ever stand indebted to his Imperial Majesty. Not only in England, but in Russia and in Hungary, I have met with the liveliest sympathy. Besides which the prosecution has produced a decided triumph for the cause of truth, honor, and freedom, even in France, and at least amongst that limited class which has kept true to their opinions in the past and to their hopes for the future. Although every sort of resistance to the Imperial will is looked upon by the blind and fanatical *masses* as an aristocratical protest against impersonated democracy, it is never useless to show how far it is possible for men of honor and spirit to stand their ground,

even under such a régime as this—and a day may come when the memory of this last struggle may prove dear and useful to regenerated France.

But, my dear and venerated friend, this is small comfort for Catholics, like you and me, who see the glorious cause of their Church and faith so miserably compromised by the unnatural and dishonorable alliance which has been contracted between the clergy and modern Cæsarism. You are quite right to be much more indignant against Louis Veillot than against Louis Napoleon—*celui-ci fait son métier*—but the other one has basely betrayed, *out of sheer demagogical jealousy*, the trust reposed on him, and pandered, as you so justly say, to the worst and lowest inclination of the day. Unfortunately he has met with great encouragement at Rome, where, for the sake of some relatively insignificant victories on liturgical and canonical questions, they have ignored the danger and the shame which their authorized organ has brought down upon the Catholic cause, a *danger* ten times greater than those which the worst gallicanism has ever engendered, and a *shame* which ought to call a blush on every Catholic's cheek who does not pretend to forget what forward and exaggerated opinions on the liberal and republican side were maintained in 1848 by the *very same men* who now insult and deny their former creed and all those who have remained true to forsaken freedom and honor.

How much I wish that your most eloquent description of the state to which the influence of the *Univers* has reduced the Catholic mind and Catholic interest in America, could be published and given to the world—for alas! it is but too true a picture of what is taking

place throughout the whole Catholic community, in Belgium as in Holland, in England as in France, intelligence and independence are looked upon as guilty and dangerous tendencies. The *manhood* of Catholics is to be eviscerated and immolated in every department of public and private life. As the Bishop of La Rochelle, Mgr. Landriot (a most distinguished prelate whose *Mandemens* deserve all your interest), writes to me this very morning: "il y a une guerre ouverte contre *l'ordre naturel*, dans les lettres, dans les sciences, dans la philosophie, et . . . c'est le contrepied de St. Thomas qui dit: 'Dicendum quod gratia est perfectio naturæ: inde nihil quod ad gratiam attinet, naturam interimit.'"

I trust that *Brownson's Review*, which has the privilege of being published in a land of liberty will come to the rescue, and pursuing its glorious career, will more and more *say the truth*, and unveil the base and miserable foundations of the present alliance between Cæsarism and Veillotism. No lesson can be more striking than the present appearance of war, a war to be undertaken *against Rome* by the man whom the French Bishops have called a *second St. Louis*, and which is till now only prevented by the resistance of Protestant and parliamentary England.

I have read with pleasure a very good article on your Review in the *Ami de la Religion* of the 14th, and hoping soon to hear from you (always direct to Paris), I remain your obliged and faithful friend,

CH. DE MONTALEMBERT.

Most of the Catholic papers in the United States, looking upon Veillot as their leader, and unable to respect authority save as embodied in some man whom for

a time they implicitly obey and reverence, denounced Brownson as a friend of liberalism or republicanism because he warred against absolutism. To these he replied in the April number of his Review * and explained very clearly the ground of his objection to Veuillot. Between the extremes of red-republicanism and Cæsarism was a party opposed to both forms of despotism, which sought to restrict power within just limits, to restrain without abolishing government, and to secure to the nation in some form a preponderating voice in the management of public affairs. To this party, when it was popular, Louis Veuillot had been attached; but when the Emperor of the French attempted to break down and utterly annihilate this party, so as to leave the friends of order and religion no alternative between supporting Cæsarism and joining the ranks of red-republicanism, Veuillot went over to what seemed to be the winning side, carrying with him a portion of the French Episcopacy and a large part of the rural clergy of France, and combining the highest-toned Catholic doctrines and practices with unceasing opposition to civil freedom, gave a false direction to the public thought of the Catholics who confided in his guidance, both in Europe and in America, and did more injury to the cause of religion than the vilest Voltarian journalist in France. No one in this country could blame him for giving loyal support to the government then in power in his country; but he was to be blamed for endeavoring to enlist Catholicity on the side of Cæsarism, and doing all in his power to place the Church in a false position before the world; for laboring constantly and with all

* *Conversations of our Club, Works, Vol. XII. p. 482.*

his might, as Editor of the first Catholic journal in Europe, to prevent the establishment of any check on power, and to leave the friends of order and religion no alternative between Cæsarism and red-republicanism. Brownson had always maintained that the Popes had asserted and used their high prerogatives only in defence of the laws, of popular and national rights, against the invasion and usurpations of Cæsar, never in his support; and now all the benefit the Church was deriving from this teaching in America was set at naught by Veuillot's endeavoring to use the sound papal doctrine he asserted with even unnecessary ostentation against the Gallicanism of the old French court, to protect the political Cæsarism he seemed determined to fasten on all Catholic states. The evil was far more serious than our narrow-minded and short-sighted editors suspected. As far as the bishops and clergy of a single nation can, those of France confirmed the standing charge of the enemies of the Church that her existence in a state is incompatible with its political and civil liberty, and that her real sympathies are with Cæsarism.

The pretence that Cæsarism was necessary to put down socialism was unfounded. The Republic itself had defeated the socialists, and broken their power, as early as June, 1848; and the Revolution had known how to set bounds to itself. It was the French Republic that put down the Roman triumvirate, and restored the Holy Father to his temporal throne. In fact, throughout Europe the victory for order had been fought and won under Republican or Liberal auspices; and it was not till the cause of order had been everywhere successfully vindicated, that Cæsarism durst leave its hiding-place, and

not till the friends of freedom had proved their ability to put down anarchy and protect society and religion, did Louis Napoleon attempt his *coup d'état*, or the movement to reëstablish Cæsarism, under pretence of sustaining order and religion, fairly commence. To surrender religion and society to Cæsar is really to abandon both, and unless men have become slaves in their souls, is to sow the seeds of a new and fiercer revolution against them. We see in France to-day the justness of Brownson's arguments and predictions, and if the Church there has lost the freedom it enjoyed half-a-century ago, let her thank Louis Veuillot and his clerical followers.

Most of all Brownson was concerned with the result of Veuillotism in this country. The Catholic press of the United States, with very few exceptions, were infected with it, and this just at the moment when it was most prejudicial to their interests: *The Freeman's Journal*, and the *Louisville Guardian* were among the most earnest opposers of the education of Catholic children in the public schools. McMaster was the most persistent follower of Veuillot, except in American affairs, in which he relied at that time on Douglas or Walker. The *Guardian*, however, Bishop Spalding's organ, led the attack on Brownson for his opposition to Veuillot, combined with his unfavorable opinion of the likelihood of the Bishop's plan of a division of the school fund being accepted. No stronger argument against the acceptance of that plan could have been offered than the hostility of the two journals to the cause of freedom in France; for the American people will never consent to appropriate a portion of the school fund to the propagation of Cæsarism in Catholic schools. The persistent warfare carried

on by our Catholic and Irish papers against fixed American ideas, often for the sole reason that they were American, was deplored by Brownson as sure to draw down on the Church the continual prejudice of the ruling minds in the country.

As if to make the prejudice of the American people still more difficult to overcome, some authors and editors, who were, or fancied they were, of Celtic descent, put forward at this time a theory that Catholicity is adapted to the Celtic race and Protestantism to the Teutonic, which for the Protestant was to the glory of the Germanic, and for the Catholic to the glory of the Celtic race. This theory assumes as its basis what it erroneously takes to be a fact, to-wit: that the Catholic nations are Celtic and the Protestant Germanic; and looks upon the struggle of the Popes and the Emperors as the key to modern history, at the same time woefully mistaking the nature of that struggle.

In the first place, Brownson denies the assumed fact that Catholicity is restricted in the main to the so-called Celtic nations, even counting the Latin nations as Celtic, which they are not to any such extent as pretended. In the next place, he calls attention to Catholicity as essentially the contradictory of heathenism or gentilism, and of no race or nation. Thirdly, as neither Catholicity nor Protestantism is a matter of race, so Cæsarism and free government are neither Celtic nor German. It is admitted that the Celtic emigration from the old homestead in Asia was at an earlier stage of Japetic civilization than the German, and though subsequent to the Iberian, yet prior to the development of the family, or of the sept or clan, into the nation, and before the full

divergence between the Japetic and Semitic dialects; to all which the German emigration was subsequent. To this may be attributed the Celtic regard for authority only as represented in a chief, or a leader, and the failure of the Celts in all ages to found a nation. But a careful examination of historical facts proves that, whether the Latin nations were Celtic, or Iberian, they were completely romanized before the German conquest and had been for four hundred years under Roman possession and despotic rule. To their long subjection to Roman rule, and not to any tendency of the Celtic or Latin races, Brownson attributed the prevalence in the so-called Latin nations of that order of civilization which makes the state or society absolute, and hardly retains, in the political order, a vestige of real individual liberty. That huge system of centralized despotism found in imperial Rome, both before and after Constantine, he traced from its beginning in Assyria with the children of Ham, to its expulsion from Europe by the Germanic system. It survived in Constantinople till the fall of the Eastern empire in 1453, and came very near recovering its power under the German Cæsars of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and finally succeeded in nearly all modern Europe. The great struggle of the middle ages of the popes and emperors was between German freedom, of which the popes were the champions, and the Cæsarism which the emperors sought to introduce, but never could have succeeded in restoring had it not been strengthened by the Protestant revolt. The Protestant princes of Germany, and the Celtic Tudors and Stuarts in England were equally despotic, and it was against the

Catholic theologians of Southern Europe that James I advocated the divine and unlimited power of Kings.

For these reasons Brownson treated the two orders of civilization, the Romanic or despotic, and the free or Germanic, under the political point of view, without any reference to the Teutonic origin of the one or the reputed Celtic character of the other, and as not at all a question of race. His Irish friends of the Press in spite of this, unhesitatingly accused him of making war on the Celtic in favor of the Anglo-Saxon civilization, and cried out against his excessive Anglo-Saxonism. * Other Irish friends, on the other hand, who took an unbiased view of the matter, agreed with him. One of these a professor of History in the Cincinnati Seminary, whose duties obliged him to devote some attention to ethnography, wrote: "I earnestly assure you that, for my own part, I think no greater service could be rendered the Church in this country, the home of all nationalities, than by severing her cause from that of any nation or race, by showing that she is what her divine Founder meant her to be, Catholic. The sooner our people get rid of their absurd notions that to be a Catholic a man must be an Irishman, Frenchman, or Italian, the better for their own souls and the souls of their thoroughly American neighbors.

"Yet, speaking of civilization by races, could you not have brought out more prominently the fact that England is to-day the only representative of the Teutonic order? When the Saxon Low Germans conquered the Island they almost exterminated the Celts, and thoroughly Saxonized England. Their coöperators, the

* See *Romanic and Germanic orders*, Works, Vol. XII. p. 238.

Angles, were also Teutons, but of the warlike High German stock. The Normans came in the end of the XIth Century, but they too were of the great Teutonic family, with their Scandinavian fierceness somewhat mollified by their residence among the more polished Franks. The civilization of England, with Saxon and Norman, is thoroughly German. In other European countries the Teutonic element has more or less suffered from the influence of Græco-Latin, Celtic, or Iberian elements."

No one could be more Irish in his feelings than the Jesuit Father, Michael Corbett, though like many Irishmen, he always viewed matters with good sense and judgment. Corbett wrote to Brownson from Chicago, January 5th, 1860: "I am also anxious to write at this particular time, for you may have felt some solicitude as to the impression the last number may have left. There should reasonably be no injury done by it. There were, perhaps, two or three words expressed in a general manner which could be the occasion of offence; but if the entire article were read with a close attention, with the views and motives of the writer kept in mind, these could be overlooked. My feelings and manners are as Celtic as any other of the race, and it cost me nothing to read the whole with interest and advantage. Your last number is most interesting and valuable, and I am glad you have criticised so well and justly the author of *Mary Lee*,* for the truth is, books of that character are

* "*Mary Lee, or the Yankee in Ireland*," by Rev. John Boyce, author of "*Shandy McGuire*," and "*The Spæwife*," was published in the *Metropolitan Magazine*, and then in book form. The first publication differed very greatly from the second, and was intended to ridicule Brownson, who easily recognized under the name of "Dr. Horstman," was one of the main characters of the story. Brownson took a good-natured view of the intended satire. His article on the book is in his *Works*, Vol. XX, p. 83.

enough to make our poor people nothing short of ridiculous."

Of Brownson's German readers who expressed their opinion on the same articles in their letters to him it is sufficient to give an extract from one distinguished and representative priest of that nationality, the Reverend Lucas Wimmer, who wrote from Butler, Pa., October 6th, 1859: "I think it good and just to pay you the due tribute of my applause, since I think that I comply thereby with a duty in which every one of your German readers would subscribe his name if he were here present with me. I have observed, Doctor, that even the few good ones here in this country, who ought as one man to stand on your side, have been decimated by your righteousness and love of truth. Those friends of yours, whom I mean to allude to, must be exceedingly touchy, because you have indeed treated the respective subjects with so much precaution and tenderness, that nobody can see how this could have been done better. I can only look upon persons of the kind as idiots and blind nativists, who can in their wrong situation not bring it upon themselves, that any man can see right, or have the right point of view, if he comes out with anything contrary to their prejudices in regard to national preference, &c. Sometimes one must laugh, but some other times one cannot laugh, at the sight of serious consequences. You have been undoubtedly standing upright while seeing things so as some others do not see them. The reason, now, why these are so badly satisfied with your respective views, cannot be another one than this: that they do not stand upright, like you, but so as if one holds his head through his own two legs in

order to look at the world; no wonder with them, if they say those things to stand below which you see to be above. Isn't it so, Doctor, in this world as it always has been before? I take the freedom to remind you of the truth that by doing a very good thing for God and man, one finds not only the bad but also many good ones to stand up against himself. For your firmness, with which you have hereunto abided by the straight way of truth, I admire and esteem you more than for all the rest of your remarkably great qualities. I have been always delighted by seeing you constantly stand on the highest platform which man can occupy, to make a good review over the confused things of the world. I mean that sublime and safe platform, upon which the divine wisdom from on high and the natural light of history from below, are always well minded at the same time by an active genius when exerted in reviewing the present things of the world. Is it not true, Doctor, that only those who have a correct or right stand as scientific speculators who hold their head towards heaven, after the wisdom of (the supernatural) Revelation, and besides that, look down on the world, to see under that higher light the present time below him in the past, in order to draw conclusions for the future? You, by and for having always kept that high stand, have been admirably preserved from getting light-headed on such a high place, and have preserved yourself sober under the two directive lights or points of view. Now I am glad to see you triumphing over error in your stand between your two friends, Wisdom and History; and the time will come in which your triumph will also be over those who shall have defended error against you. Your situation in the

world is now similar to that of the Prophets and their Master, in their times; since you have declared open war against error you have got the world against you (*Quemnam prophetarum non persecuti sunt?*): you happen to speak of many things, as the Prophets did, of which *virī loquentes perversa propter vanam gloriam et panem suum* do not want you to speak, nor do the other perverted ones wish to hear you. But you have your daily bread from God, and with regard to the opposition, you have the consolation that God will hear you when you complain of it with the Prophet in your prayer: *Cum loquebar illis impugnabant me gratis.*"

What Brownson most of all objected to in absolute government was the enslavement of the Church, in which was included the denial of all true individual freedom. He did not believe that such governments tyrannized over their subjects more oppressively than do democracies. Yet in these days grown men are unwilling to be treated as nurselings; they would sometimes be trusted to themselves, and be permitted to act spontaneously, from and for themselves, and to express in their own way their opinions and wishes.

After the peace of Villafranca, the world's attention was directed to the Italian question, and Brownson like many others, hoped for a satisfactory solution of it, in the belief that the Austrian and French Emperors intended the resuscitation of Italy, so essential to the proper working of the European political system. Not Italians only, but all European statesmen saw very well that Italy, in order to be elevated to her proper rank and influence, must be reorganized as a state or union of states on liberal principles of government, and that

this was impossible without a liberal constitution of the Papal states. The difficulties in the way were by no means insurmountable. After proving that the rights of the sovereign of the Roman States, though originating in the fact of his being Pope, do not derive from his spiritual sovereignty, and are precisely what they would be were he not chief of the spiritual society, and that the rights of the Roman people are precisely what they would be, neither more nor less, in case their sovereign held no spiritual jurisdiction; Brownson could see no reason, if desirable and practicable, why the Pope should not concede his temporal subjects a constitution and govern them, not as an absolute, but as a constitutional monarch. "Of course," he said, "such government cannot be extorted from him by force, for that would be sacrilege, and to be legal it must be a concession made, as the papal documents say, *Motu proprio*," *

If he were free to treat the question solely from the political point of view, the union of all Italy under a federal or a consolidated government, monarchical or republican, was desirable; but so long as the south and the north remained separated by the pontifical government, impracticable, unless either by all Italy coming under the supreme temporal authority of the Holy Father, or else by dispossessing him and establishing a laical government for the whole peninsula. The union of all Italy as a federal state under the effective presidency of the Pope, or its union as a monarchy with the Pope for sovereign, would be the best for Italy and for Europe. This was, however, clearly impossible; and therefore Brownson said that, as a mere statesman,

* *The Roman Question.* Works, Vol. XVIII. p. 418.

governed by political reasons alone, he should not hesitate to adopt Cavour's policy of the annexation of the whole of Italy to Piedmont, could it be done without violation of vested rights. The Sardinian government certainly had no right to annex the Papal states, or any portion of them, without the Pope's consent, and to use violence would in such case be sacrilegious. Many Catholics thought that the interests of religion would be promoted by the Pope's ceasing to be a temporal sovereign, and the experience of the last forty years seems to confirm this opinion; but the Pope, Brownson had ever maintained, is the divinely appointed judge in the case, and his judgment in all spiritual matters,—and this he shows to be a spiritual matter,—must be ours. The Sardinian government, moreover, by its acts in the States of the Church, struck a blow at all government, and therefore at society itself, for society is impossible without government. "The cause of the Pope is the cause of all sovereigns, of all legitimate government, whether monarchical or republican, of society, of the human race . . . We place ourselves on the side of the Pope." *

It was easy enough to defend the Pope's right to his states as against Sardinia, or any other foreign power; but in relation to his own subjects, the case presented greater difficulty. In maintaining the Church's supremacy in spirituals and also in temporals in relation to spirituals, Brownson held that the Church defines by divine right what things are spiritual and what things are temporal, thus defining her own rights and powers and those of secular society. Within what she defines to be temporals,

* *The Papal Power*, Works, Vol. XII. p. 351.

all concede the independence of the secular order. In these, spiritual persons, as such, have no authority, and can take no part in them by virtue of their spirituality. He never held that the special sacredness and privilege of the Pope as temporal sovereign proceeded from the original and inherent rights of the Holy See; but that as temporal sovereign he stood on the same footing with all legitimate temporal sovereigns. He therefore maintained that the Roman people, though they might have no rights in face of the Pope as representative of the spiritual order, yet had the same rights as any other people in face of their temporal sovereign; among which rights is that of renouncing his allegiance and choosing another liege lord, in case of mal-government.

Brownson felt that as a Catholic publicist he must be greatly embarrassed in defending the Church against the charge of hostility to free institutions and free government, were he obliged to defend absolutism at Rome, as he would be if obliged to defend the Pope's temporal government as essential to the Pontiff's freedom and independence. He had heretofore sufficiently vindicated the rights of the spiritual; he now attempted the vindication of the rights of laymen and of lay society, for he wished not to have it suspected that he forgot the rights of the temporal in asserting those of the spiritual; and he believed that the interests of the spiritual itself required that there should be a full and unreserved recognition and assertion of the rights the Church leaves to laymen and to lay society.*

The essence of despotism is that it is a government of mere will. God himself, in the government of the

* See *Rights of the Temporal*, Works, Vol. XII. p. 376.

universe, never acts as will alone, or power alone ; but the three divine persons concur in all acts *ad extra*, and power and will are joined with intelligence. Man, as a rational creature, has the right to be governed rationally, that is to say, by law ; and whatever the wisdom, justice, and paternal kindness of the Roman government, the people will not be contented so long as they are debarred from taking their part in the events of their age. Brownson was far from believing that the change would bring them the blessings they sought ; but as they had set their hearts on having a career, political life and activity, to live and develop themselves as a nation with a central life of their own, he would not believe that "the law of God, or the interests of religion were opposed to the resurrection and autonomy of Italy, or doomed the temporal subjects of the Pope to hopeless slavery or perpetual nonage."

Carrying on a war on the one hand against absolutism, and on the other against license, asserting the just prerogatives of power while recognizing and vindicating the rights of the people, he could hardly fail, on the one side or the other, to offend mere one-sided men. Some took what he said in defence of the Pope's temporal principality as a denial of the just rights and true interests of the Italian people, Others took what he said in sympathy with that noble and much-abused people as an attack on the Pope's temporal sovereignty. All his articles on the subject should have been taken together, and what in one seemed to go too far on one side interpreted by what in another might seem to some to go too far on the other side. One article presupposes the other, unless the contrary is expressly stated. In a periodical

like his, where the greater part is written by one author, it does not do to take any one article as complete in itself, or to read what follows without taking it in connection with what had preceded on the same subject. The several articles, on any given subject, naturally complete and explain one another. It must be so, or else the writer must repeat in the subsequent article what he said in the preceding, which would be a great inconvenience. The *Review* was a continuous work, and never completed on any one subject as long as that subject was before the public for discussion; and to understand properly what he wrote one day on any one point, the reader should take it in connection with what he had previously said, as what he had previously said should be taken in connection with what he now says. Thus, those who thought in his essays on the supremacy of the spiritual he denied the rights of the temporal, might find in his article on that subject the qualifications always given in his mind to the statements some regarded as too sweeping, and even expressed, though not developed at the time. What he now wrote on the rights of the temporal should be taken in connection with, and as defined by, what he had heretofore said in favor of the spiritual. For it should be borne in mind that when circumstances made it proper to treat a subject under a different aspect from what he had previously treated it, he changed simply his point of view, not his doctrine. This point is important, because its not having been regarded was the occasion of many false accusations against him, and of making him the subject of much undeserved reproach, when there would have been no room for complaint, had readers been fair and candid.

From opposition to despotism in the state, it was an easy step to opposition to despotism in the Church. Brownson's most intimate friends among the New York clergy were mostly priests who had felt, like himself, the consequences of the Archbishop's arbitrary ways, and his sympathies were naturally with them on this account, besides the bond created by their common zeal for extending the faith among the real American people and their similarity of opinion as to the best method of accomplishing this end. The defection of the Reverend Doctor John Murray Forbes, who returned to the Episcopalian ministry was a severe shock to him. With kindly sympathy for the Archbishop, who could not but feel the sad occurrence most keenly, Brownson wrote to express his condolence, and at the same time, with his usual humility, regretted having failed to make that prelate's task as light as he might have done. In answer to that letter, the Archbishop wrote:

NEW YORK, November 2d, 1859.

Dear Sir:—I have just received your letter of the 31st ult. I think it does very great credit to your faith and your feelings.

You are not mistaken in supposing that the fall of Dr. Forbes is the heaviest blow that was ever inflicted on my heart. I am aware that the Catholic Church is not unaccustomed to such individual caducity—otherwise the world would not be as it is. This general reflection mitigates to some extent the sufferings of my mind in this regard. And again, after a calm review of all my intercourse with him, my conscience bears me testimony that I never said and never did, in his regard, a word or an

action for which I can reprove myself, or of which he can rightly complain.*

When I read his melancholy and public apostasy, I was, as you can easily imagine, confounded in my own thoughts. Reflecting before God, I thought it better to be silent than to speak or write. And since then I have had no occasion to alter or modify my determination.

There is another portion of your letter in which you speak of yourself in language more than sufficiently reparatory for any thing you may at any time have said against me or to my disadvantage. I have never judged you so severely as you have judged yourself in your very kind and, as I call it, very honorable letter. What did not occur to you in writing it, has occurred to me in its perusal, viz: That persons who have embraced the Catholic faith in mature life, or have been admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism in infancy, should never imagine themselves as anything more or less than Catho-

* A short time before this, Erastus Brooks, of the *New York Express*, in speaking of Hughes's hopes of a red hat, charged him with sending his ablest priests to Rome to solicit his nomination as Cardinal. In his published reply to Brooks, Hughes, in denial of the charge, declared that only two of his priests were in Rome, and if they never returned to the diocese, he should not regret it. These two were Drs. Cummings and Forbes. Forbes left New York as Pastor of St. Ann's Church, and on his return Mr. Preston, his former assistant, refused to acknowledge him as pastor, and it was some time, and after much trouble, that Forbes got the Archbishop to restore him. I was generally present at the conversations between Forbes and Brownson, from his return till his apostasy, and much of his talk was of the manner in which he was treated by his bishop. Forbes was a man of fine and imposing appearance and manners, with a high sense of honor and manliness. When speaking of what he was subjected to, he would get up and walk up and down the room in much excitement. Just before he left the Church,—I think it was the last sermon he preached at St. Ann's,—his text was 1 Cor. IX. 27, and he begged the people in the most earnest and pathetic language to offer their prayers for him; for they could not know the temptations which beset a priest's faith.

lics, and should leave behind them the idea that they are converts. I can easily imagine that Dr. Forbes, having been one of the most conspicuous of those who, at that period, or before or after, renounced the heresy of Protestantism, his fall should afflict all those who had passed through a kindred ordeal in their own minds. At the same time, since his fall, no distinction has sprung up in mine, between those who are baptised in infancy, and those who in mature life were led by the Grace of God to embrace the Holy faith. The transition in the latter case was a deliberate act. Men might preserve the *date* of its occurrence, but since then, we are all Catholics of one and the same family. Neither is there any security that some who have been born of Catholic parents, and baptised into the Communion of the Church, even raised to the dignity of the Priesthood, may not do as Dr. Forbes has done. And if they do not, let it be understood that their protection is the protection of Divine Grace.

I had allowed myself three or four days to hear and speak of Dr. Forbes, after having read his melancholy publication. But as in my life I never uttered, even while he was an officiating priest, an unkind or harsh word of him, so I have made a covenant with my lips, that after Thursday of last week, they should never communicate in the hearing of any human being expressions unworthy of that charity which ought to abide in the heart of every Christian, but more especially of one who is invested with the dignity and responsibility that have been imposed upon me, contrary to my own will and desire.

I may have been hasty in admitting him to the priesthood—I may have been too kind in allowing him to have his own way in almost everything since that date—but he was an exceptional Priest, and I have not been deceived or disappointed in anything except in the last page of his sacerdotal history. It furnishes a lesson to us all, which is found in the language of the Inspired Apostle, "Let him who thinks he stands, beware lest he fall."

I remain very faithfully your servant in Xt.

† JOHN ABP. OF N. YORK.

O. A. BROWNSON, ESQ., LL. D.

Dr. Forbes's brief letter, assigning his reasons for renouncing his obedience to the Catholic Church, would have been a hard one for the Bishop to reply to, at least if he meant to meet it fairly and without evasion or subterfuge; for it struck the key-note of the Protestant mind, and assigned the real objections of intelligent Protestants to the Catholic communion. Doctrinal questions have been sufficiently disposed of; but the mass of Protestants who really think, adhere to their Protestantism because they have under it a certain freedom of thought and action, in their opinion the natural right of every man, which they cannot enjoy in the bosom of the Catholic Church. They believe the church is, if not theoretically, at least in practice, hostile not simply to license, but to reasonable liberty itself, as Forbes maintained. "There were, perhaps," said Brownson, "many good reasons for not replying personally to Dr. Forbes, but there can be none for not meeting and refuting his objections; for, if the truth must be told, they operate not only in keeping those outside from coming into the Church, but in pre-

venting a large class brought up in her communion from practically adhering to it. Look over this city, and you will find that almost all the sons of Catholic parents, who have received a liberal education, even in Catholic colleges, and have become distinguished for their intelligence, ability, and success in law, medicine, or politics, are little more than nominal Catholics, are practically nearly as much in schism as Dr. Forbes, and substantially for the same reasons. They believe, or feel, or imagine that the Church is in her practical administration a spiritual despotism, and that a man cannot be practically a Catholic without surrendering his manhood, and denying his natural sense of right and wrong. There is no use in declaiming against them, denouncing them, or assuring them that they are in the broad road to destruction. There is the fact, and that fact we must meet and explain before we can, in the ordinary course of things, either keep our own, or gather in those who are avowedly without. We may dwell till doomsday on the fatal consequences of private judgment, and the necessity of submission to authority, without in the least diminishing the evil or advancing the cause of the Church. We have sufficiently done the work of vindicating authority, of guarding Catholics against the false notions of liberty so rife throughout the civilized world a few years ago, and warning them against the dangers and errors of Protestantism; the work now especially obligatory on us in this country is, to turn our attention, and to direct our chief efforts, to the conversion of non-Catholics, and those Catholics who are *in* without being *of* the Church. This work, which has been most fearfully neglected, can be effectually done only by meeting and

disposing of the objection we have indicated. We must meet it, not by denouncing those who bring it; not by opposing all liberty as license, and all progress insisted on by the modern world as diabolical; but by showing both dogmatically and historically that it is founded in error, that the church theoretically and practically leaves to her members their manhood, and all reasonable freedom of thought and action, all that reason itself leaves them, and is in no sense despotic. We must recognize and state the facts which have led to the contrary conclusion, that the Church is a spiritual despotism, keeps the souls and bodies of her children in bandages and swathing clothes, and permits no free thought, free speech, or free action. Such facts there are, for it is only in the misconception and misinterpretation, or misapplication of real facts the false notion could have originated.

“We must show that these facts do not warrant the conclusion drawn from them, or at most they warrant conclusions unfavorable only to those churchmen, who forget that they are not to ‘lord it over God’s heritage’, and now and then govern those committed to their care as despots, perhaps as capricious tyrants; never any conclusions unfavorable to the Church herself, who condemns the conduct of these churchmen, and does what is possible to correct it. . . . This, in our age and country, we regard as possible only by showing that the Church is neither despotic nor leagued with despots; that neither her principles nor her interests oppose true liberalism, individual or social, and that in her teaching, faith and reason are reconcilable, and authority and private judgment, when rightly understood, are harmon-

ized, and when they are not so, the fault is that of Catholics, not of Catholicity."

Brownson foresaw that in attempting this work, he was likely to be denounced by those who claimed to be the especial organs of Catholic thought in this country, as un-Catholic, or as retaining some portion of the old Protestant leaven; and that his words, being thus denounced by Catholics, would want weight with A Catholics and nominal Catholics, who would say, as had been said, that he was merely defending an ideal Catholicity, a Catholicity of his own, not the Catholicity of history: for when he spoke so as to present and commend Catholic truth to those who were ignorant of it or alienated from it, he lost the confidence of a large body of his fellow-Catholics who did not and could not at once see the chain of connection between what he said and what they had received as Catholic tradition. As no one else was willing to assume this task, he undertook it two years later, as will be told hereafter.

CHAPTER VIII.

RESIDENCE IN NEW JERSEY.—TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.—CRITICISMS BY MONTALEMBERT, DUMONT, McMULLEN, LUERS, AND ELDER.

BROWNSON only resided in New York for two or three years, after which he moved to Elizabeth, in New Jersey, a place of easy access to his office of publication,

and but for the malaria and mosquitoes, a pleasant residence, where he felt less confined than in New York, and where he could have a garden and enjoy the fresh air of the country, as he had all his life been accustomed. His time too was less broken into by visitors, many of whom, coming from various parts of the Union, interrupted his work, in a manner that was very annoying, by visits the only motive of which was often idle curiosity. The failure of his New York and London publishers also rendered it important for him to reduce his household expenses, and it cost much less to live in Elizabeth than in New York. Another reason for leaving New York was the desire to be in another diocese. Brownson had not expected, when he moved to New York, to find in the Archbishop another Fitzpatrick ; but he had a high esteem for Hughes as a man, and revered him as one of our most eminent prelates ; their relations had been friendly and there was reason to believe they might continue on the same footing. But when it became evident that however they might agree in private, the public utterances of the Prelate were directed on several occasions to discredit him with Catholics, and it was impossible to foretell what might be his future action, it seemed advisable to live in another diocese.

The three articles on the temporal principality of the Holy Father, to which reference was made in the foregoing chapter, were received by the Catholic public in the manner which Brownson foresaw, in spite of the qualifications and explanations which he introduced in order to prevent as far as possible any misconstruction of his position. In fact, his position on the papal government, as he understood it himself, was such as to excite

opposition, without any misinterpretation. The Bishops, by affixing their names to the declaration that the temporal power was necessary, had committed themselves to the other side. Of late years, however, some of our most esteemed prelates have expressed opinions more opposed to that declaration than anything the Reviewer ever wrote.

What made the matter worse in the eyes of the advocates of the temporal power was the insertion in the July number of the Review for 1860, of the Reverend W. J. Barry's article on Dr. Arnold and Catholic Education, and in the October number, of the Reverend Dr. Cummings's article on Vocations to the Priesthood. Writing to one of his sons, October 18th, 1860, in reference to these, he said: "My October number has kicked up a bobbery, and made the Archbishop, they say, perfectly frantic. My article on the Rights of the Temporal, and Dr. Cummings's on Vocations to the Priesthood have done the work. The greatest wrath seems to be manifested to the Dr. A trial has been threatened, and lawyers consulted and retained; but I think it will blow over. The number is one of the best I have ever sent out. You will see that I by no means abandon any of my former positions on the Papal Power, and by no means endorse the conduct of the Emperor, or Count Cavour, but have merely attempted to place the temporal principality of the Pope on its true basis, and to say a word or two in apology for the Italian people. I do not believe the temporal principality of the Pope necessary to the exercise of his spiritual sovereignty, and I do believe the political and even religious interests of Europe require the Union of Italy and her elevation

to the rank of a great power, either as a Federal State or as a Unitarian Monarchical State. This is the sum of my heresy, but I recognize no one's right against his consent.

"I am afraid some of my friends in France are implicated in movements not friendly to the Imperial government. You know my politics. I am no friend of the Emperor or of the Imperial régime; but I am opposed to all attempts at a new revolution in France. As I am opposed to any dynastic change, I go for the Napoleonic dynasty, and seek only such changes as may be obtained without detriment to the dynasty, or the position or power of the present Emperor as chief of the state. I wish for France neither a Republic nor the Bourbons. In Italy you know my views. I wish matters there permanently settled. I do not share the general distrust of the Italian people. I have no fears on the score of religion should the Pope even lose his temporal principality. I have rejoiced in the pastorals of the bishops, for they prove their attachment to the papacy, but they contain many things as to the temporal principality of the Pope I do not think warranted either by history or theology."

The gentlest criticism of those not wholly agreeing with Brownson was the following from Montalembert:

LA ROCHE EN BRENY, CÔTE D'OR,
16th October, 1860.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—Illness, business, and the superabundant pressure of all sorts of duties and studies have, as usual, thrown me out of order with regard to correspondence and many other things. But I have just been reading all together the three last numbers of

your New Series, from April to October, and I hasten to tell you how *delighted* I am with most of what I have read, and more particularly so, with the two articles on *Catholic Education and Dr. Arnold*, and on the *Rights of the Temporal*. With regard to the first, I, who have been for nearly thirty years (since my trial in the House of Peers for opening a free school September 1831), the champion of Catholic education against the State Monopoly, can only say that I completely agree with the author in all he says on the lamentable inferiority of the Catholic *Continental* system, and as to the superiority of the English system already pointed out in my *Avenir politique de l'Angleterre*. With regard to the second article I also heartily concur in all you say, *except* on the Italian question. Here I apprehend you to be mistaken, and to have been victoriously refuted by your own self in the splendid pages on P. Ventura's Christian politics, as well as of that on the Papal Power: in both you most triumphantly demonstrate the *guilt* of the revolutionary theory which substitutes the divine right of insurrection *with or without* reason, to the divine right of monarchical absolutism—and you particularly insist, p. 299, that no man has the moral *right to seek even a good end by immoral means*. Now that is just what the Italians are doing. Their *end* may be good, as the end of the first French revolutionists in 1789 was most undoubtedly good, but they cared not about the means they employed to reach that end, and God has therefore not blessed their *efforts*, nor indeed those of their successors: and I do not suppose he will do more for the Italians, for in power of treachery, if not of cruelty, they have outdone the French.

I am sorry to see you have done so much honor to Father Ventura; he really deserves *none*. He is what we call a *miserable*, a man of some science and some talent, but without honor or character. He basely betrayed Pius IX at Rome in 1849, and still more basely adulated the French Emperor, by insulting in his presence the old French Kings in their own royal chapel, and daring to compare the resurrection of the Empire to the resurrection of our Saviour.

Forgive me, my dear Mr. Brownson, these strictures on your most excellent Review. I hope you will only see therein the renewed proof of my constant sympathy with you and my general approval of all you write.

The French clergy are rather *déconcerté* of him whom they have so pitifully cried up as a second St. Louis, and as the restorator of order and authority throughout the world, But they are far, *very far*, from being cured of the odious *cæsarism* which Veuillot and his crew have instilled into their hearts. They still dream of an orthodox Cæsar, who will kindly undertake *to do their work*, or at least to keep down and gag their adversaries, so as to deliver them from all troubles or struggles here below. The Bishop of Orleans is a glorious exception to this universal disposition, but he is only an exception, as you may see by the vile language of the Episcopal courtiers to the Emperor during his last progress in the South of France.

I was very sorry to miss your son when he went through Paris last winter; but he was off before I could lay hold of him. The same bad luck befell Mr. Cochin, who is with me here, and with whom I often talk of you.

I hope you got my *Moines d'Occident*, which I sent you two months ago through Bossange: as you will see, I have undertaken an immense work which I shall certainly never achieve, but of which I think even the first *assises* may be useful to some, as our poor Catholics are sadly ignorant of real history. My book has been most unmercifully denounced by the irreligious press, and most *perfidiously* attacked by the *Monde*, the *Croisè*, and the ultra-montane exagérés, who twit me with being a *rationaliste* and a *nationaliste*, because I believe in honor and in freedom as well as in revealed religion. I trust your Review will not spare me any reasonable and conscientious *criticism, s'il y a lieu*.

Ever yours affectionately,

CH. DE MONTALEMBERT.

Since writing the enclosed I have received your Review for *October*, which I most gratefully thank you for. But I have not received the number for April, and to make my collection complete I am in want of nos. 22 and 24 of the New Series, April and October 1852. If it was in your power to send me those two *livraisons* by any friend of yours coming over to France you would deeply oblige me, as I most highly prize the whole collection of your Review, and intend it to occupy a prominent place in my modest library.

Father Smarius thought the "Rights of the Temporal" inconsistent with Brownson's doctrine of the supremacy of the Spiritual order, and in a friendly spirit inquires.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, November 5th, 1860.

DR. O. A. BROWNSON.

Dear Sir:—I avail myself of the privilege which you gave me at your last visit among us, of interrupting your more serious and important pursuits, by troubling you to read over a hasty scrawl from the pen of one of your greatest admirers and warmest friends. I need not tell you that my spirit is often with you although absent in the body. I converse with you every leisure hour which I can snatch from official labor. Your *Review* is always a welcome visitor, and your conversation held through its pages, a charming guest.

Your last elicited peculiar interest. Its very headings were magical in their effect. Of course, I dare not venture the opinion of a critic. You would chide me, as my age deserves, for my daring rashness. But you will, I hope, excuse me for excepting to your article on "The Rights of the Temporal." It seems to me that you forgot your former articles on the same or nearly the same subject, in which you seemed to me, if anything, an ultramontane in everything. However, I suppose you had your reasons for writing as you did, in *direct* opposition, to the principles laid down in the *Civiltà*, and, as I always understood them, to your own views of former years. How harsh to Catholic ears such an expression as the following found on page 480, "We do not believe the law of God, or the interests of religion are opposed to the resurrection and autonomy of Italy, or doom the temporal subjects of the Pope to *hopeless slavery* or *perpetual nonage*." The Pope, therefore, holds his subjects in temporal slavery and his government keeps them in

perpetual nonage. Truly this is not a very filial expression of the government of one whom you as well as all other Catholics love to call "Father." My object is not to find fault, but, as an admirer and defender of yours, to know; how must I defend sentiments like these against the host of fault-finders and critics, who are not slow to come with a grin on their lips and point to such and similar paragraphs, and to ask with an air of much self-importance: What do you think of that, eh? Would you be so kind as to relieve me and other friends of yours in this city, by pointing out in your next *Review*, in what consists the slavery and the nonage of the temporal government of the Popes, and how they could be done away with by Italian autonomy carried on by either the Sardinian or Mazzinian reformers of Italy? An explanation of this sort would throw much light on the present obscure passages of your article, and might prove of great advantage to the present government of Rome and Italy itself. Do not imagine that the above is written in a critical or censorious spirit, but merely to set myself and my friends right on a question which I and they have hitherto viewed quite differently from what we are now called upon to do.

Yours very affectionately,

C. F. SMARIUS, S. J.

Father Gresselin, also a Jesuit, who had just been transferred from Fordham to Boston College, wrote December 30th, 1860: "In this house all sympathize deeply with you, and the deeper in proportion as you are treated with less charity and justice. In spite of the few words you have written or admitted in your last *Review*,

and which, between us, are objectionable, you remain in this country most unquestionably the brilliant and efficacious champion and promoter of Catholicity. So far nothing, in the least degree, is sufficient or calculated to make any just mind forget what you have done for the sake of J. C. It would be a great consolation for us all here to receive some information about your own dispositions, if you are not discouraged, if you turn all this clamorous contradiction to the good of your soul, if you put them, as an humble and earnest follower of J. C., at the foot of his cross. Perhaps in your next issue a little note, such a note as you can shape so well, would do much to bate down all this irritation; perhaps it is better simply to leave all care about self to the hands of The One who sees the inmost of your heart, the purity of your motives, and your zeal for his glory. Nothing, you know full well, is perfect here below; let us forbear a little more easily what we cannot set right. In fact, when you complain of something, there is something to be complained of; and this I own openly; but the inconvenience is you strike too hard. Your aim is to quicken people into life; but at times you quicken them into fever. But, I repeat, these excesses, if so they are to be termed, are naught when compared with the substantial and unequalled merit of your *Review*; and you may be sure many, great many of your readers make that discerning and keep quite cool. For meeting some words which ill please them, they are not blinded to the excellent quality of the rest.

“I had previously an intention to write again to you, but this morning I was again determined by F. Duverney who prompted me to do so quickly, and even suggested

all I have said. F. Bapst also, our Rector, took always your side energetically, and maintained there was no cause for such an outcry against you. F. Ardia was deeply concerned for fear lest you might be disheartened by this kind of persecution. Such are our feelings in this house; and I desire that, by bringing them to your knowledge, you may derive some comfort from thence."

Very few of those who were opposed to Brownson's articles on the Roman question were as gentle in their remonstrances as the Jesuits. The Reverend Edward Dumont, afterwards Bishop of Mechlin, wrote from Detroit, October 18th, 1860: "A l'avenir je vous prie de ne plus me compter parmi vos abonnés. Je regrette de devoir vous dire que les opinions que vous émettez dans votre article sur les droits du S. Père m'ont profondément blessé comme prêtre catholique; j'ose espérer, monsieur, que vous reviendrez sur les opinions que vous avez émises dans ce malencontreux article que bien des hommes de talent et de profonde science se feront, je pense, un devoir de combattre pour le bien de la religion et de la vérité. Si vos opinions se changent sous ce rapport et que vous retractez cet article je vous prierai de m'ouvrir un nouvel abonnement, dont je vous enverrai le montant."

The Reverend Doctor McMullen, who was also raised to the episcopate some time after, wrote:

Epis. Residence, CHICAGO, October 11th, 1860.

Doctor:—I have just received the last number of your Review and am anxious to let you know what I think of it.

I dislike it very much and it is the only number that I have not read with pleasure and perhaps with profit.

Your change is undoubtedly for the worse. You have altered your position to carry yourself on the wrong side. The great trouble is in this country and in this age that too much is claimed for the Natural order. Natural rights are unduly extended and are no longer the faculty of acting according to reason but are as unbounded as individual Caprice. Nature is exalted to embrace or exclude the Supernatural. Why then appear as the champion of natural rights at present and put your patrons on their guard against the encroachments of the supernatural, at present more prudential: or how it can be accepted as an apology for want of *Catholic Spirit* and sound theology. I do think your explanation does no more than show a good intention, concerning which there is no question, for certainly if I thought your intentions were as faulty as your late productions I would be praying for you in place of writing to you.

I would write publicly against your late articles but I prefer to unite with those who attack the common enemy, rather than wrangle in the camp with those who may deserve correction. If you think the expression of my views severe remember you may meet them yet under a more *formidable* aspect, and if you do they certainly shall be triumphant. If apology be required the only one I give is the sincerity of one who wishes you every good and who has received much pleasure and instruction from your writings.

J. McMULLEN, dd.

O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

P. S.—I expect no answer. J. M.

Brownsong, however, answered:

ELIZABETH, N. J., October 20, 1860.

REV. DR. JOHN McMULLEN,

Dear Sir:—I have this moment received a letter dated "Episcopal Residence, Chicago, October 11, 1860," and signed by your name, but of so singular a character that I am unwilling to believe that you are actually the writer. Some mutual enemy must have written me in your name. You are a Christian and a priest, a scholar and a gentleman, and I am sure, if you had found anything wrong in my Review, you would have calmly and courteously pointed out the wrong, stated distinctly wherein I have erred, and given me the opportunity to correct my error, and to atone for my offence. The letter does no such thing, and deals in severe, but vague censure and threats.

The writer accuses me of lacking the Catholic spirit, of being unorthodox in my argument, and unsound in my theology, but specifies no particulars. He says I am on the wrong side, but I am on the side I have always been on since I became a Catholic, and he cites no proof to the contrary. He complains that I defend "the rights of the temporal" in face of my repeated declarations that the temporal has no rights against the spiritual, and that it has only the rights defined by the spiritual. Have I claimed any right for it beyond the definition of the supreme Catholic authority? If so, the writer should in charity, if not in justice, have told me what right, yet he does not do so.

I am accused of claiming too much for the publicist, and of claiming the right to discuss and to decide questions reserved for the clergy, and not within the province of the laity. What questions? Have I gone beyond the

temporality? If so, in what particulars? I have disavowed all intention of doing so, and can have done so only through ignorance. Why, then, could not the writer have enlightened my ignorance? I am, I trust, not above learning, nor incapable of learning.

The writer tells me I give too much to the natural order. If so, can he not tell me wherein? I certainly mean to do no such thing. He intimates that I either raise the natural to the supernatural, or bring the supernatural down to the natural, and says some good things about the danger of doing it, as if I could be less sensible of that danger than he is, or as if my Review had not said far stronger things of the same sort than he says, or perhaps, can say. It would have been more to the purpose to show me wherein I raise the natural to the supernatural or bring down the supernatural, for he cannot suppose that I would do either knowingly.

You know, sir, as a reader of my Review, that I have labored long and hard to vindicate and illustrate the theological maxim: *Gratia supponit naturam*, and to draw accurately the line of demarcation between the natural and the supernatural. If in my effort to do this I have fallen into error, which is possible, you, I think, were you to write me on the point, would specify the instances and respects in which I have erred. The writer does no such thing.

The writer declaims against the article in my last number signed J. H. and says it is a disgrace to any respectable publication. The note I appended shows him that I by no means approved of the article throughout. I did not think very highly of the article, nor do I agree in the judgment of the Letter-writer. I inserted

it because it was written by an Irishman on Ireland, from a visit to which he had recently returned, partly because I honestly believed it would be acceptable to my Irish readers, and partly to avoid the charge of anti-Irish prejudice, which was sure to be raised if I rejected it.

The writer likes the article signed J. W. C. and says it is the only redeeming feature of the number. I am glad of this, for the article was written at my solicitation. My own article on the rights of the temporal he condemns without benefit of clergy. Yet the views of that article have a clerical origin, and the article itself was submitted, before being sent to the printer, to the examination, revision, and approbation of an eminent theologian, a Doctor of Divinity, and a Propagandist, like yourself. He told me that it was the best article I had ever written for my Review, and he commended especially its truly Catholic spirit and tone. This much I know, that while writing it I sought light and guidance from above, and offered my communions to be preserved from all error.

Now if you were the writer, I should ask you, my dear Doctor, what a poor devil of a layman like me is to do? You are a priest, a Roman doctor, and if you are the writer, you denounce me rudely, in terms of unmeasured severity for an article which was suggested, revised, and approved before publication by another priest, another Roman doctor, your senior in years, your superior in reputation, your equal at least in position, in attainments, and perhaps in natural talent, and a Propagandist as well as you, and really one of the first divines and ablest men in the country. What in this case am I to think? I have submitted my article to the examination

of the highest theological authority within my reach, an authority designated to me by my former Bishop and director ; I have done my best by prayer and study to enlighten my own mind, and yet I am denounced as wanting in the Catholic spirit ! What more could I do ?

The fact is, my dear Doctor, you doctors on matters not of positive dogma, differ widely among yourselves, and it is impossible to agree with one of you without disagreeing with another. You know the old saw, "When doctors differ, disciples are free." I know no right you have to insist that I shall agree with you that your brother Propagandist has not to insist that I shall agree with him. You and he are alike doctors, but neither of you has any right to command me except in the name of the Church. If I depart from her teaching or her law, either of you has the right to censure me ; if I do not do so neither of you has the right to pronounce me uncatholic. In matters of opinion, you will permit to say, I have the same right to hold and express my opinions that you have to hold and express yours, or he his. You are both teachers, which I am not, but you are teachers of doctrine given you, not of your own concoction, but outside of that doctrine you have no more right to teach than I have.

The writer reminds me that there are those whom the Holy Ghost has appointed to rule the Church of God. This is kind in him, but I am not aware of having forgotten it. I know that I am bound to obey them in all things spiritual, but I do not suppose I am bound ordinarily to ask my parochus or my bishop whom I may employ as my hatter, my tailor, my butcher, or my green-grocer. In things which the Church recognizes as

temporal, and in their simple temporal relations, I suppose I am free to follow my own judgment, providing I do my best to form an enlightened and just judgment. Now, if I find a bishop or any one else claiming by virtue of his spiritual commission the right to command me in such matters, I shall tell him, very respectfully, that I do not hold myself bound to obey him. He then commands me only in his own name, and not by virtue of his office or commission. This distinction is very obvious and valid, and if you expect us Americans, who are in the habit of making it every day in the case of our civil rulers, to disregard it in respect to our spiritual rulers, you will find yourself very much mistaken as to our character. We obey the law, not the man, and we will obey the priest only so far as in obeying him we are obeying God. We worship God, not men.

It is precisely here where the difficulty between us and men born or formed abroad begins. We obey the law for the sake of the authority that enjoins it, not for the sake of him who administers it. With us, the clergyman, whatever his rank, is the minister of the law, which he and we are alike bound to obey, not the chieftain of the clan as well as the priest of the parish. We respect him for his office, not the office for his sake. We do not recognize the priest, the bishop, or even the pope, as the living law, but only as the living minister of the law, for we do not accept despotism in the church any more than in the state.

This, sir, is a trait of American character Europeans do not fully understand, and which they seldom treat with respect. I have endeavored to bring out this trait in the American character, and to impress it on the clergy

trained and formed abroad that it is only by recognizing and respecting it that they can deal successfully with Americans, that is, Americans of the old stock, who have the real American national character. This is a prominent trait in myself, and hence the writer's censures affect me less seriously than he probably supposed they would. Man to man, I hold myself his equal, whoever he may be. He must show me that the law of which he is the minister censures me; the fact that he as a man, though occupying the highest station, censures me, can in no wise affect me.

Am I bound to believe that all bishops and priests are infallible in matters of prudence? Am I bound even on ultramontane ground to believe that the pope himself in such matters is infallible? Do you maintain that even in the administration of spiritual matters he cannot blunder? I believe what he defines, I obey his commands, in every thing in which he himself defines that he, as Vicar of Christ, has authority to command me. Does Catholic law require me to go farther? You certainly do not pretend that our church requires me to stultify myself, and maintain that all the public acts of popes recorded in history were wise and just, dictated by unerring wisdom and heroic sanctity. I believe the pope the supreme judge in all cases of conscience and I believe him infallible, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, in deciding questions of faith and morals, and I recognize in him full authority under God to feed, govern, and rule the church, not as supreme lord or dominator, but as supreme pastor. So much I have always maintained in regard to the papal authority, and I am not conscious

that I have ever maintained or uttered an opinion to the contrary.

The pope's right to his temporal principality I believe to be valid, even against the people of his states; but I believe it a temporal, not a spiritual right, and that it rests on the same basis as the right of any other legitimate sovereign. I deny the right of Louis Napoleon, Garibaldi, Victor Emmanuel, or anybody else, to invade his territories, or to wrest or to attempt to wrest his principality from him. Yet I own that I should like to see Italy recovering her autonomy and united in a single state, unitarian or federal, if it could be done with the pope's consent; and I think if it could so be done, religious interests as well as political and social interests would be promoted thereby. Consequently I cannot utterly condemn the Italian people for wishing it, and trying to effect it, though I of course condemn the means they take to bring it about. Now, I may be wrong in all this, but tell me, if I am uncatholic in it, or hold any opinion that I am not free as a good Catholic to hold?

I have labored hard to draw accurately the line between the natural and the supernatural, and to guard against Pelagianism on the one hand and Jansenism on the other, and as good theologians as yourself have assured me that I have done it successfully. I have said nothing on this point in my last Review that I had not said perhaps fifty times before. You should remember I am not a boy just learning my A. B. C. and that it is possible that I have devoted as many years as you have months to the study of this question, the vital question between the rationalist and the Catholic. A young man, even if a Doctor of Divinity, should point out to

me my specific error, if I have fallen into any, and not even in a private letter deal in vague censure, as though I was ignorant of the importance of the question.

You think, if you are the writer, the danger is just now in giving too much to nature and extending natural rights too far, for that is the error of the age. All error, as all exaggeration, is at all times and in all places dangerous. But perhaps the writer has not reflected that one extreme begets another, or paid attention to the fact that the standing objection to the Church in the minds of non-Catholics is that she denies the natural or absorbs it in the supernatural. A few years ago, out of nine bishops and archbishops at Milwaukee, there was only one who did not accuse me, in my vindication of the spiritual, of falling into this very fault, and I had to defend myself against no less a person than Bishop O'Connor. I did not admit the justice of the charge, but I was satisfied that I had not placed in a sufficiently prominent light the rights of the temporal. The rights of authority had not been then, at least of the pope, asserted in this country with sufficient boldness and energy. But it will never do to dwell for ever on one aspect of a question, and I believed, when I wrote the last number, the time was come to bring up the other aspect of the case, and answer the objection of non-Catholics, and to answer it so that they could understand my answer.

I believe the fault of Catholics here and in Europe is that they leave natural rights to be asserted by their enemies, instead of taking their assertion into our hands. We are looked upon by those outside as leagued with despotism and devoted to the defence of despotism.

The writer would forbid me to set them right, and have me continue asserting authority, cramming it down the throats of our opponents against the stomach of their sense. I believe it my duty, without lowering the claims of authority, to bring up in harmony with them the rights of liberty.

The writer objects to my note as unsatisfactory, * and no wonder; for he took it as an apology, and failed to recognize its meaning. The note was added to remind just such readers as the writer of the letter, that in order to do me justice, they must take what I say of the rights of the temporal with what I had previously said in vindication of the rights of the spiritual, and not take it by itself alone. I am sure, if you had been the writer, unless you had written hastily and without taking time for reflection, you would have interpreted the latter article by the earlier, as well as the earlier by the later. You would not have supposed me such a blockhead as to contradict in October what I had published in April and in July, and at the same time to pretend I had done no such thing. I trust I have too much sense and too much honesty for that, and it would have been perhaps more modest and even more reasonable for the writer to have supposed that he had missed my meaning than to have supposed I could change sides without knowing it, or knowing it, could deny it.

* Appended to the Review for October was a note warning the reader that the article on the rights of the temporal, to be rightly understood, must be interpreted in connection with, and qualified by his articles on the Roman Question and on the Papal Power in the numbers for April and July of the same year, as well as those six and seven years before on the supremacy of the spiritual order.

The writer thinks I have done very wrong in warning the people against the supernatural. Had I done so, I should have deserved severer censure than I find in the letter. I have done no such thing. The most that I can be pretended to have done is to warn them against the encroachment of spiritual persons. I have denied the right of spiritual persons to govern us in all things. Will you say they have the right to do so? I see, or think I see, rising up here in this country, not generally, but in some localities, a spiritual despotism, or rather a tendency, not on the part of the bishops or clergy, but on the part of laymen who claim to speak for them, to defend what in practice would render us the slaves of a spiritual despotism. "The bishop wishes you to vote for so and so." "The person who does that is a priest, a monk, or a nun, and nothing must be said." Look, however, at the claims put forth by the Archbishop of New York, in his newspaper articles. If those claims are to be conceded, the temporal order has and can have no autonomy. The bishop or the priest is dragged in everywhere, and if the tendency is not resisted, we shall find ourselves slaves in our very souls, and a practical denial be given to all that Catholics have said of the compatibility of Catholicity and liberty. These are matters which concern the laity, and in regard to which honest intelligent laymen can form opinions which even the clergy need not treat with contempt.

The writer winds up his letter with a threat which I do not understand. Is my Review to be denounced at Rome? Let it be denounced. I shall not be found defending anything in it Rome shall declare to be an error in faith or morals. I am a Catholic; a Catholic I

am determined to live and die. Err I may; a heretic I will not be, as a *formal* heretic I never was. It will cost me nothing to retract any error authority may point out in any of my writings. I only ask that the error be specified so that I may know what I am called upon to retract, and to avoid. They little know me who think I love my own opinions better than truth. If I miss the truth, I at least know whose words are true and authoritative.

The writer said he expected no answer. I have seen proper to give an answer, and a long though hasty one. I have some reason to complain of unfair treatment. No doubt, some look upon me as a turbulent innovator. Many declaim or exclaim against me. No man reasons against me, or does more than get off a philippic against me. No man grapples with my argument. I am treated as a boy, a child, an ignoramus. What is the reason Catholics in our country cannot be candid and just to one from whom they differ? Why is it they must always misrepresent and vituperate? In my case this has been the rule, with scarcely an exception. But enough. I remember with lively gratitude the pleasant evenings I spent at the Bishop's, and believe me with profound respect, yours truly,

O. A. BROWNSON.

J. McMULLEN, D. D.

The excellent and lamented Bishop of Fort Wayne and the Bishop of Natchez, now the venerated Archbishop of Cincinnati, expressed their disapprobation in a tone suited to the episcopal character, and more adapted to produce the effect wished for than a harsher and more

bitter one would have been. Bishop Luers wrote as follows:

FORT WAYNE, November 29, 1860.

Dear Sir:—I have taken your Review ever since its first appearance, and read it not only with great pleasure and delight, but also with no little advantage to myself, and hope to do so for the time to come.

I think, however, that it might do still more good if, at times you were not so unnecessarily severe, more guarded in your expressions, and intent not only upon *what* you say, but also the *manner* in which you express it. The age is blind, weak, and full of self-love; it can neither bear the rod, nor digest strong food. Hence in making it perceive and appreciate the truth, we must make use of as mild and gentle means as possible. Light is indispensable, but when the eyes are weak, to expose them to the sun, will only inflame them more and close them up entirely. Too strong a dose of the best of medicines will only prove injurious, and food, although necessary for the body, must, when the constitution is not strong and robust, be prepared with the greatest care; otherwise it will become pernicious and indigestible. So it is with all other things. Hence in advancing a question we must not only ask: Is it *true*? but also, is it *expedient*? Are those to whom it is addressed in a proper condition to receive and appreciate it, will it be of beneficial results?

Sometimes also you seem to me to carry even delicate questions to their *extreme logical consequences* without paying attention to their *practical bearings or results*. When these run counter to long-established

and inveterate habits, views, and prejudices, their untimely or incautious agitation is apt to do more harm than good. Many things are in themselves really beautiful and true, but by reason of our imperfect and fallen state here below, they can never be realized nor carried out in practice. How few powers, governments, and even individuals have, for instance, kept within the strict bounds and limits of the *Rights of the Temporal*.

For the last six months and more, I have spoken with several bishops, priests, and others, *your real friends and well-wishers*, and they all desire and are extremely anxious to see you drop, for the present, all those irritating questions which have been the source of so much calumny and personal abuse against you; the more so, since, just now, the land is cursed with a set of unscrupulous and mercenary demagogues who wish to render themselves popular, and to thrive and make money by distorting and vilifying your Review. If I were in your place, I would not give them the malicious satisfaction nor grant them such a chance; but take up such questions v. g. of Theology, Philosophy, Geology, Literature, History, Politics, &c., &c., as would not involve nationalities, or any other exciting question,—nevertheless prove useful and instructive to all, v. g. the intrinsic necessity for the Sacrifice of the Mass? Hell? Purgatory? &c. Or on Geology, or treat of such historical subjects as the Inquisition, St. Bartholomew's night, or Huss, &c.—the Catholic view of Slavery, &c., &c. Believe me, I have written this from a good and pure motive, with a sincere desire of seeing you and your

labors prosper, and your esteemed and to me valuable Review having as large a circulation as possible.

Your very devoted friend,

J. H. LUERS,
Bishop of Ft. Wayne.

O. A. BROWNSON, ESQ.

Bishop Elder's letter was as follows :

NATCHEZ, MISS., December 18th, 1860.

O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

Dear Sir:—I am not enough practised in such matters to know whether usage required of me to send you directly a copy of the enclosed.—I intended, however, doing so,—but by a most rare promptitude of our sluggish mails it reached N. Orleans in time to be published a week earlier than I thought possible; and at the same time my own travelling was delayed, and I missed getting the copies I had asked for, until very recently.

Although you have probably seen it, yet I have thought well to enclose a copy, and take the opportunity of writing you a word in private.

I remember that, some years ago, when we had you for a few pleasant days at the Mountain* you were *great* on "Discrimination," and I am sure you have enough of that rare virtue to discriminate between a carper who feels happy in finding a fault to bark at, and a friend who desires to see a valuable work as free as possible from blemishes. My desire is to be among the latter. It was partly for that reason and partly as an act of justice to my own most meritorious clergy, that I published the letter.

* Mt. St. Mary's, near Emmittsburgh, Md.

There are other points on which I feel an inclination to write to you, but I do not know whether you would choose to accept advice unasked for. I know it is one of those things which it is—not better—but easier, to give than to receive.

But I presume you advocate "the right of petition." And you will not be offended if I petition you, in the name of those interests to which you have generously sacrificed your abilities—to consider carefully and conscientiously and to study profoundly some of those more important points which have been found fault with. *Etiam ab hoste fas est doceri*, and even in the angry declamations against you, you will find sometimes a valuable truth. Remember your own great principle, that men never uphold an error for the sake of the error, but for the sake of a truth which is bound up with it, or which they think is bound up with it. They do not discriminate between the two—sometimes because they do not know how, sometimes because they will not take the trouble. But you do know how,—and you have all your life been taking trouble to do things well.

And as it may be with some of your most unfriendly critics, so it is with some of the things which you criticise. Even routine is not absolutely bad. There are good routines as well as bad ones. For a man to say his morning prayers, it is not necessary to go over again every day all the reasons for this duty, nor to discuss in his own mind every day why the Blessed Virgin is called the Mother of God. He has been taught to say them—he has adopted that good practice—he has satisfied himself already that it is right,—and so he continues.

For our tenure of Church Property—if you look over the history of the difficulties that grow out of the old Trustee System, you will see that it was not from clerical jealousy nor ambition, that it was put aside ; but that the most essential interests of religion and the spiritual rights and wants of the faithful, made it necessary to abolish it. Whether the present method is the best or not is hard to say. If you will study out some other, which will be free from the inconveniences of the present, and safe from the radical dangers of the old one, and present it in a pleasant tone, I do not think you will find angry complaints—nor resistance to “the rights of the temporal.” I am sure that some will be thankful to you. But it ought to be offered not as from an opponent complaining of injustice, but as from a friend helping us to solve a difficult problem.

And so it is for other points which I will not detain you to go over. You can seize them and penetrate and analyze the good and the bad in them, without my helping you.

But there is one matter in which I must enter not a petition but a protest. In regard to your expression that the Italian Patriot “feels his wrath burn against the sovereign” (the Pope). Aside from all the other questions in that connection, this expression is wanting in that respect which a great Catholic publicist owes to the Head of the Church, and such a head as Pius IX. Whatever be the sentiments of men about the papal government, no one, so far as I have heard, charges the present Pontiff with any crime which could make “the wrath burn” in any reasonable man. You not only use the

other man from justifying them, or Sardinia. I wrote to have an influence on those who imagine that the unity and independence of Italy cannot be effected without making war on the Papacy. I wished to show that it necessarily involved no war on any but the temporal rights of the Holy See,—rights which cannot indeed be wrested from her without crime, but which she, if she judges proper, may surrender without surrendering any spiritual right, which I presume you will not dispute.

My purpose in the article was not to set the temporal up against the spiritual, for I claimed for the spiritual the right to define her own powers and those of the temporal; but to maintain that not every right of a spiritual person is a spiritual right. There were strong reasons for maintaining this, reasons which, could you know the real state of things in the Diocese of New York, you would not treat as trivial. The real question is: Can I as a good Catholic and as a Doctor of Canon Law maintain this thesis?

I have, with your permission, in no instance talked like Philip the Fair. In administration I believe the Church is to be obeyed; I believe her generally right; but I have never supposed that I was required to believe her infallible save in matters of faith, morals, and dogmatic facts. I believe the Pope is the divinely appointed judge in cases of dispute between temporal sovereigns, and temporal sovereigns and their subjects; but I have never believed his judgment based merely on human testimony could be infallible. I am not aware that in deciding such cases either he or even a General Council has the promise of the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost. I do not say that in deciding the question

between him and his own subjects that I should suspect him of abusing his spiritual power to support his temporal. I am all along giving the reasoning and feelings of the Italian patriots, not my own ; for it is in their persons I reason. But you will get a fuller view of the writer's intention from the article, Separation of Church and State, in the number for January.

You make an injurious application of my own principle against me. I shall not say the application is unjust; but I will say that the clamor against me is founded in misapprehension, although very likely the reason why I am misapprehended is in some measure my fault.

I am discussing questions from a point of view and with ulterior purposes not generally considered by my Catholic friends. My own conviction is that the ordinary method of presenting and defending Catholic truth, does not really present that truth to the non-Catholic mind, and the chief cause of the misapprehension of my meaning by Catholics is in the fact that I adopt an unusual method, and use language which, while it conveys a Catholic sense to non-Catholic minds, has a non-Catholic sense to the ordinary Catholic mind. I can easily write so that Catholics will not misapprehend me, but then I should only so write as to give a false impression to the minds of non-Catholics. Here is my difficulty. I know no way of avoiding it, if I am to do any good by writing.

Let me say, I do not complain that Catholics oppose me. I complain that I am unfairly opposed, on some collateral point, or for some accidental reason, never on the real issue, or on the merits of the question itself.

Your official organs do not reason with me, or against me. They denounce me, or combat me by opposing to me popular opinion, or popular prejudice, sometimes false philosophy, false theology, and false history. Yet I do not find the bishops rebuking them, or interfering in my defence when I am manifestly in the right. They seem to lay everything on my shoulders, not only my own faults, but the faults and scandals of the Catholic press. They may lie about me, distort my meaning as much as they please; but it is all my fault; for as Archbishop Hughes tells me I am responsible not only for my own meaning, but for the meaning others without warrant deduce from my language. I think I have a right to complain of gross injustice on the part of the Catholic press and on the part of a considerable number of Catholic bishops. You all know that I take not and will not take any newspaper article as the voice of authority. I recognize authority only when it speaks to me in its own name. Yet no bishop condescends to write me to tell me wherein he thinks I am wrong, or to inform me of his wishes, or to offer me his advice. You and the Bishop of Fort Wayne are the only two who have done it since I have been a Catholic Editor. The first communication I have is, Stop my Review. Now I do not think this is fair. I commenced my Review as a Catholic Review at the request of the bishops. I have wished to conduct it in a manner acceptable to them, and have always held myself amenable to their censures and open to their advice. I am no heretic, I am no schismatic, but an obedient son of the Church, and no word from any bishop addressed in his own name to me but will receive from me due respect. All I say is, you

may kill my Review, but you cannot manage me through newspapers. I love my religion and wish to serve it not in my own way, but in the way the bishops point out. I wish to act in subordination to them, and under their advice. I am all docility, if they will only themselves speak to me, and tell me their wishes.

Even you yourself seem to misapprehend me, and write as if I was one of the most proud and touchy men in the world. I know not whence this impression with regard to me has got abroad. I do not regard myself as perfect; I have not a very remarkably high opinion of myself, and I seldom do any thing that satisfies myself. But one thing I can say is, that I am not a proud man, at least, I have no pride of opinion, and can when shown a reason for so doing, abandon without the slightest internal struggle any opinion I hold.

I have been, ever since I became a Catholic, in the habit of submitting my articles to theological revision before they are printed, and to the best theological revision within my reach. The article on the Rights of the Temporal was inspired, to some extent dictated, and revised and approved by a dignitary of the Church. Numerous alterations were made at his suggestion. Moreover I presented the main points in confession to my confessor, a Jesuit, a professor of theology, and one of the ablest theologians I ever met. I made the subject a matter of prayer, and offered up my communion four times while writing it, for light and guidance. I say not this to excuse the article, but to show you that I am not unwilling to receive instruction.

If the prelates of the Church would deign to communicate to me from time to time their objections, or

make such suggestions as occur to them, they would find the Review would in its humble way respond to their wishes. The main difficulty lies in the fact that they seem to rely on the weekly press to set me right; but for that press I have in general no respect, for its conductors are men who understand little of the wants of the age and speak only to a narrow circle, while my Review speaks to the whole Catholic world. They cannot be my guides and instructors. I cannot take my cue from them.

But let a bishop or priest speak to me privately, and he will find me ready to listen and to correct any errors he convicts me of and to pursue the course he convinces me is the one the Church requires.

I have been threatened with being denounced to the Congregation of the Index. Perhaps I have been. If the Holy See finds aught in what I have written to mark with a note of censure, or that she requires me to retract, I do not think it will cost me a moment's struggle to obey her, and to accept her decision *ex animo*.

I have written to you as to an old friend, and have shown you my heart. I will only say that while in Boston, I followed the direction of the Bishop of Boston. I cannot accept the Archbishop of New York as my consultor. His advice I cannot respect, and I am not under his jurisdiction. But for him there would have been but little of the difficulty that has occurred, and it is his conduct and the state of things in his diocese that create the grief and dissatisfaction I feel. Forgive me if I have said any thing wrong, and pardon me for inflicting on

you so long a letter, and believe me affectionately and reverently your obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

RT. REV. WILLIAM ELDER, D. D.

Bishop Natchez.

Another letter from Elder some months later is also inserted.

NATCHEZ, July 26th, 1861.

O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

My dear Friend:—You received so kindly the letter which I wrote you last December, that I feel constrained in my concern for yourself and for religion to write again.

I did write to you afterwards making an inquiry about proper books to study Philosophy from—for young ladies—I never received an answer. *

By a happy accident, notwithstanding the interruption of the mails, I have got an opportunity to read your July number. The article on Gioberti I have not had leisure yet to study. It is the article on Polemics which arrested my attention. Let me first remark in answer to a part of your letter of December 29th, that you cannot fairly expect Bishops to be writing to you, nor to publish over their names their sentiments concerning your articles. I find even with my little administration of less than twenty Priests, my time is pretty closely occupied with the interests of religion in the Diocese. Again, although your Review is very conspicuous, and it has rendered great service, and you have been laboring very hard for many years in the cause of religion—

* That letter was received; but if answered the relations between the North and South may have prevented its transmittal.

yet it is a public periodical—and therefore is properly dealt with through the public press. If a Bishop has time to write about it,—you can hardly complain that he rather writes for a public paper, than addresses a letter to you privately. And it is not often that the matter is such as to require that he publish over his signature. He must discriminate, and not expose his signature needlessly.

Nor do I understand by what principle you have resolved not to pay any attention to articles in the Newspapers. Many of them no doubt are unworthy of attention, because they contain no argument, but bad denunciation, or superficial fault-finding. But those which do contain argument deserve to be considered by you, and profited by. They are not *authority*. You know well it is the spirit of the Church not to exercise *authority* on all occasions; but to leave as much as possible to reason.

I thought that you understood that our Catholic papers are not “official organs” according to the ordinary political dictionary. A Bishop uses the paper as an organ only for the official promulgation of the laws and directions which he publishes. As to the sentiments of the paper—while perhaps a Bishop may exercise a certain supervision to guard against manifest error or great imprudence, yet no Bishop, so far as I know, requires the Editor to reflect the Bishop's own views on free questions.

Now for your article on Catholic Polemics, I do not know what partial experience you may have had, but for the general spirit of our country, you certainly do “*state the case too strongly*” in the account you give on pages

358, 359, &c. That there are individuals who have such a spirit and that sometimes they are noisy enough to make themselves conspicuous, may be very true. But that the Body of the Clergy, the Bishops and the most revered among the Clergy have such a spirit, I must say is an assertion which if I were a man of the world, I should hardly have patience to discuss with you quietly. I should be apt to resent it as a gratuitous indignity to myself and to the body with which I am identified. But I am writing not for my own sake but for yours, and I must simply inform you that you are mistaken totally with regard to our spirit. Indeed if you reflect dispassionately, you will see that you virtually retract it, when you explain on page 358 what "we do not, of course, mean to say" and what "we do mean." But unfortunately the explanation is given in four or five lines of a subjunctive sentence—while the charge, which is withdrawn by the explanation, is spread over several pages, and repeated in still more incorrect and odious words on page 360. A great portion of the censure which has been put on you has been owing to your not expressing your meaning until after the censure has been given. It may be a want of science in your critics which causes them to misunderstand you; but to criticise from *want* of science is a very different thing from censuring you *because* you avail yourself of science; the former is a misfortune, culpable or innocent, which the critic himself would be glad to remedy; the second is a perverse spirit of narrow-mindedness and pride. It is this second which you charge with prevailing even with the sanction of the higher clergy. I remember hearing you once maintain against a good Priest that children who die

without baptism are condemned to hell. I think you maintained it to be *of faith*. Some who listened were shocked,*—and some were annoyed at your persistence; until you explained that by *hell* you meant all place of exclusion from the beatific vision.† Now you may call it a want of science, or a want of reflection that they did not at once divine in what sense you used the word,—but you can surely discriminate enough to see that their displeasure towards you did not arise from their hatred of science, nor from their aversion to the use of new expressions. And as you so often remind us that we must take men *as they are*; it was wise and charitable in you to give the explanation. And sometimes your use of words is not rigorously correct. The great outcry

* It would seem that Elder had never read the decree of the Holy Œcumenical Council of Florence in Eugenius IV's Bull "Lætentur cœli." *Illorum vero animas, qui in actuali mortali peccato vel solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, pœnis tamen disparibus puniendas.* If he had, how could he doubt that unbaptized infants go to hell? As St. Augustine says, "Qui non in regno, procul dubio in igne æterno.... quando confiteris parvulum [non baptizatum] non futurum in regno, fatearis futurum in igne æterno." Sermo 294, c. 3, in fine. St. Thomas says, indeed, that the fire must not be taken literally; but does not hint that they are not literally in hell. As to what hell is, we are certainly very ignorant; but we know that it will include all who die in mortal or original sin; that is, all who attain not to the destiny for which they were created.

† But, as the Fourth Lateran Council defined Cap 11, De fide Catholica, all excluded from glory with Christ receive "cum diabolo pœnam perpetuam." These words are found immediately preceding another definition which to many who believe in the future beatitude of unbaptized infants is something of a stumbling-block: "Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur." Pius VI, in condemning the errors of the Synod of Pistoia, no. 26, says: "Doctrina quæ velut fabulam Pelagianam explodit locum illum inferorum (quem limbi puerorum nomine fideles passim designant), in quo animæ decedentium cum sola originali culpa pœna damni citra pœnam ignis puniantur; perinde ac si hoc ipso, quod, qui pœnam ignis removeat, inducerent locum illum et statum medium expertem culpæ et pœnæ inter regnum Dei et damnationem æternam, qualem *fabulabantur* Pelagiani, falsa, temeraria, in scholas catholicas injuriosa."

against your articles on the Temporal Power of the Pope, some years ago, arose in great measure from your not explaining in the beginning what you did explain at last after prejudices had been pretty solidly formed—and your explanation showed that the power was not *temporal*, but *spiritual*, affecting indeed temporal things, but only in their spiritual relations.*

Again if persons blame you for discussing questions inopportunately, it does not follow that they object to all questions on disagreeable subjects, nor on new matters. They may see especial harm in that one in particular. You may think they are wrong—that the little disturbance it will cause is overbalanced by the good that will result. Then reply by giving your reasons for judging the discussion to be opportune. Do not imitate those whom you justly complain of, by denouncing instead of reasoning. Do not abuse them as *oscurantisti*, because their opinion differs from yours.

The various topics which you propose, page 371 and seqq. † would justify separate and lengthy remarks. I must say in general, that they seem to be suggested partly by your partiality for “a synthetic method” which

* If Brownson did not explain at first that he claimed for the Pope no direct temporal power in the several nations and tribes of the world, it was because he thought he was writing for readers not absolutely void of intelligence. His thesis was that the temporal order is subordinate to the spiritual by its very nature, somewhat as the body with its lusts is subordinate to reason. There was no attempt to confound the two orders, to deny the power of the temporal authority in its own order. He could not have dreamt that many bishops and other clergymen would show so little understanding as to infer from the assertion that the temporal is subordinate to the spiritual, that he denied the temporal altogether, and when they charged him with rejecting all civil allegiance to temporal governments, he showed this was by no means his meaning or the consequence of his doctrine. This Elder calls an explanation.

† Concerning the condition of the reprobate.

will show the harmony of all truth. I admire very much a beautiful and solidly built theory, and I know it is of incalculable benefit in teaching science. But remember you objected to Dr. Newman's Theory of Developments "that it was a theory," * and whether the objection be solid or not, certainly Science and Common Sense require us to build on facts—and not to stretch facts on the Procrustean bed of our theories. There are different ways of ascertaining facts, varying according to the nature of the evidence. In Chemistry by material analysis,—in Natural Philosophy by observation—in Astronomy, chiefly by measurement of angles—in History by examination of evidence. Now in theology the *facts* are historical—the question of *fact* is "what has been revealed from the beginning and taught by the Church"—and a synthetic method which contradicts any least one of these facts is no more entitled to respect than the learned essays which explained the phenomenon of the fish's not increasing the weight of the water. A very plausible synthesis may lead us to *examine* more rigorously our facts, and *correct* some inaccuracies in our apprehension of them, but it cannot be a sufficient ground for denying a fact. If a modern thinker objects that eternal punishment is opposed to the goodness of God, the common sense way is not to offer at once to explain away eternal punishment so as to agree with his synthesis of God Creator, but to examine the evidence as to *what is the fact* of God's revelation on the subject. Perhaps you will say this is just what you wish to do, that Catholic public opinion should permit you to do it—and sustain you—provided you attempt it *in a proper*

* It is plain that the Bishop confounds theory and method.

spirit, and "without lesion to Catholic faith." But there is where you fail. You do it in a spirit of grumbling, of general censure of the most odious kind on the Catholic clergy—of holding us all up as wilfully guilty of the obnoxious charge made against us by the most bigoted Protestants. Moreover you prejudge the case. Your language leaves the impression that if examination should result in establishing that eternal punishment is a fact and revealed, it will be contradictory to the love and mercy of God—even to the goodness of "the worst man that ever lived"—It is true you only *ask* questions. But you are not so inexperienced in Rhetoric and Human Nature as not to know that interrogations convey statements as clearly as direct assertions,—and even often have more power of carrying the assent of the reader. And in this case whatever may have been your intention—such is certainly the impression your words will naturally convey to the popular mind. If you find it necessary to suit your language to the comprehension of non-Catholic readers you ought to be not less tender of the understanding and the salvation of Catholics—nor less careful to avoid scandalizing them.

In my judgment whatever be your motive—you have not been discreet in throwing out that question—and some of the others—in *so crude a form*. It would have been vastly better to have *made* the examination which you propose—or else to have said *nothing* about it. If you had presented the Authorities or Evidence—from which we learn the *fact* of God's revelation and the Church's teaching on the subject—and shown that this evidence left or seemed to leave the question open—your conclusions could be either assented to or refuted.

But now you convey the vague impression that what is commonly believed to be an Article of Faith is contradictory to sound reason. Surely you forget what you have often beautifully written on the paramount value of one human soul or you would not so easily "scandalise one of these little ones"—when you could have done as much and more for science, by another course.

The questions you propose on Sacred Scripture do their mischief too—in an opposite way. They convey an impression that Theologians in this country at least have the most narrow and untenable notions on the subject of *Inspiration*--the *Vulgate*--Interpretation &c. and Progress of Biblical Science. Again it is only by interrogations—but still such is the impression conveyed to both Catholics and Protestants. There was no occasion to put any of these questions. Perrone's Theology--to say nothing of others—in common use in this country would show you in a moment that we are free on most of these questions. Archbishop Kenrick's translation—and his brief remarks show that freedom to be acknowledged, and the exercise of it encouraged as far as the limit of *faith*--that is, as far as it does not contradict ascertained facts—"provided it be attempted in a proper spirit, with loyal intentions, and without lesion to Catholic faith."

With regard to all the questions that follow, I have never heard of any one in authority blaming you for discussing them nor others like them, nor for using all the aids of modern science. Cardinal Wiseman has given too conspicuous an example, and his works are too much known and respected in this country, for Catholics of

any attainments to avow so narrow a spirit, or to cherish it intentionally.

Certainly it is desirable that all our Catholic Clergy should acquire as much science as possible, and use it in behalf of religion. We have to regret that many circumstances hinder us from getting all that is desirable. Perhaps we are too slow and indolent about remedying the defect—a good stimulus may be of great service to us. But remember your own great maxim, “We must take men as they are.” A rebuke, to produce good effect, must be administered “in a proper spirit, with loyal intentions.” Grumbling and abuse are not apt to do good to others, any more than to yourself. If there is *not sufficient zeal for science*, tell us so respectfully, earnestly, warmly, if you please, but don’t charge us with *fearing* science and *shunning* argument. If you see something in the spirit of the age which does not strike our attention, point it out to us plainly,—but do not first write an article in strange terms for the people to misunderstand, and then accuse us of wilfully ignoring the spirit of the age.

Reading this over, I fear that though I have desired to be kind, yet in the weakness of human nature, feeling may have betrayed me into saying some things too sharply. It would be impossible for me to write it over. I must throw myself on your charity, and beg you to exercise your usual power of analysis (not less than your admirable synthesis), and eliminate what may be disagreeable in my manner, and incorrect in my apprehension; and I believe you will find some solid truth worthy of your consideration, and furnishing also some points for conscientious examination of your writings, and their

effects on souls. You know it is not enough to have good intentions, nor to utter what *ought* to do good; we must see whether in practice our utterances do produce good or evil. A good Catholic proposition may sometimes convey an heretical impression in the circumstances in which it is uttered. A public writer is *bound in conscience* to observe whether it is so in his case, and if wilfully or by negligence he conveys an evil sense, he is not excused before God nor man because his words are rigorously correct.

As in your letter of December you speak of your Confessor's approbation, it is no impertinence in me to express my persuasion that if your Confessor read and approved this article on Polemics, he is not a safe man for you to intrust your conscience to. He may be a profound theologian, and an acute reasoner, but he is not a *discreet practical* guide for one in your position.

I have said nothing about your article on "The Great Rebellion." I only mention it now, lest my silence might appear to be an acquiescence in its sentiments and language. I believe I know your standpoint, from which you view the country. I do not care to discuss politics, when there are interests at stake of immensely greater value. I believe that if you could take a more kindly view of the spirit of Catholics, point out in a friendly way their short-comings, and suggest encouragingly and hopefully your own views about improvement, disregard declamatory abuse by ambitious penny-writers,—but consider and profit by serious strictures, even when you think them unwarrantably harsh, extracting the truth for your present profit, and offering up the bitterness for your future reward—you will do still more

service to God's glory than you have done already. I have more than once admired your patience and your humility. But remember our pride is never utterly killed so long as we live; we must gain new victories, cut off new heads continually; and if we give up the contest, we shall be devoured—and what will our victories avail us?

Forgive me this enormously long Epistle. I could not make it shorter, if I had time. May God preserve you, my dear friend, and bless you in all your studies, preserve you from all error in truth, natural and supernatural, and fill your heart with His holy love for Him and for men, and bring you safe to see Himself, and in Him the great harmony of all truth and beauty. Please to remember me in your prayers.

Yours very sincerely in Christ,

† WILLIAM HENRY ELDER,

Bp. Natchez.

CHAPTER IX.

AN ARTICLE ON IRELAND.—THE ATTEMPT TO GET PROPAGANDA TO CONDEMN THE REVIEW.—CUMMINGS, HUGHES, AND BARNABO,—TENDENCY TO LIBERALISM.—HECKER'S DEMOCRACY.—SPECULATIONS ON HELL.

AN ARTICLE in Brownson's Review for October, 1860, on Ireland, was inserted by the Editor with some reluctance, and only for the reasons set forth in his

answer to McMullen, as given in the last chapter. In inserting the article, the Editor remarked: "There are some few remarks in this article from a respectable source, the justness of which we will not vouch for, and one or two digs at England which are not precisely to our taste, but there is so much in it that is judicious, and on a general subject rarely treated in our pages, and the view it gives of Ireland is so hopeful, that we are sure our readers will thank us for laying the whole article before them precisely as it came to our hands." The writer of the article was a young mechanic, about 25 years of age, and an Irishman by birth. His name was James C. Hogan, or Charles J. Hogan; for he signed it both ways when writing to the Editor, to whom he was an entire stranger. Among those who objected to this article was the Reverend P. J. Nolan, who sent a reply with his letter.

DONNYBROOK, December 7, 1860.

Private.

Sir:—I beg leave to hand you a notice on an article in the last number of your *Review* received here about the middle of November. I had intended to have sent this notice to you printed, or at least more carefully written out, but my duties so pressed on me that I could not; the printers, however, of New York, are not inferior to those at home who have often accurately printed from even more hurried manuscripts of mine. The article, on which I have written the notice, has been unanimously voted most offensive and most ignorant. I trust that you will pardon me, but I distinguish between you and your contributor J. H. I have for many years most

highly respected you and your *Review*, and if I now desire to appear in the pages of the *Review*, it is on account of this respect, to correct errors into which you have been led, and to rebuke impertinence for which you and the *Review* would, though undeservedly, suffer. I think that in the first paragraph of the notice I have proved my claim for the insertion of the notice. If you get it inserted, could I, however, trouble you, as I cannot correct the proof, to have it done for me? The M. S. is not indeed what I would wish, but, as I before stated, I could not rewrite it and I had not time even to get it printed.

With great esteem and respect, believe me, dear Dr. Brownson, yours most sincerely,

P. J. NOLAN.

TO DR. BROWNSON.

Whether Mr. Nolan's reply to J. H. would have been inserted or not, if it had been received before the next number was printed, it became unnecessary after that. For at the end of his January number, 1861, the Editor announced that he had adopted a new rule, and thereafter, in order to maintain unity of doctrine and purpose, he would publish only such articles as met his approbation and for which he was willing to be held responsible.

This notice satisfied Mr. Nolan, for on its receipt he wrote:

DONNYBROOK, February 12, 1861.

Sir:—I wrote to you in the beginning of last December, including a reply, hurriedly written, but well considered, to a most impertinent article in the October

number of your *Review*. I have now just received the January number, and I see that the notice to my reply is given, indirectly indeed, but, as I must say, in a most satisfactory manner; the article on which I had so severely to comment, was by a contributor and was not fully approved of; for the future you shall not insert any article of which you do not fully approve, for which you shall not be prepared to hold yourself responsible. Would that it were always so; but better late than never; the journal shall, I feel, "by the new mode of conducting" be amazingly improved, flippant nonsense shall never again sully its pages. The bold yet respectful tone of an honest well-informed Catholic journalist who knows how to appreciate his position—as noble as could be—shall ring out clearly and wake echoes as yet unthought of.

As a matter of course, you need not now any further notice the production I forwarded to you; if I wrote hastily it was not in offence, but in vindication of what is dear to me as life. I would not, in the least degree, injure or annoy you, but I could not, without protest, see in your journal, which I so highly prize, censure gross, reckless, and unfounded, on what I have grown up so fondly and justly to esteem; for the censure in your journal could never be the censure of a nameless contributor, it should be Brownson's, and Brownson's censure is weighty; I would not have it fall foully or in vain—wherefore I wrote warmly in my cause, kindly towards you, and truly throughout.

Apologizing for my long intrusion on your valuable time, I have the honor to be yours faithfully,

P. J. NOLAN,

Donnybrook, Co. Dublin, Ireland.

Brownson wrote in answer :

ELIZABETH, N. J., March 3, 1861.

Rev. and dear sir:—Your communication was not received till after my January number was all in type. In regard to the article by J. H. I think you attach quite too much importance to it, and you and others of your countrymen certainly understand it in a sense in which I do not, and find in it what I never found there. To me your reply seems more objectionable and far more unfavorable to Ireland than what he said. For that reason, I had concluded not to publish it. You may be assured that if I had understood J. H. as you do, his reflections would never have been admitted into my *Review*.

The principal statement of his that you deny and the one that seems to have given the most offence, that the old peasant-priest took the first kiss of the bride, I thought nothing of, for I had been for nearly twenty years in the habit of doing that same thing myself as a Protestant minister, and I see no great harm in it now, where custom sanctions it. You are rather too severe on me in relation to my having heretofore admitted articles which I did not fully approve. Had I not done so, I should have had to write the whole *Review* myself, besides refusing to several very worthy and excellent men, as likely to be right as I am, all opportunity of

expressing through my pages their honest thoughts. I wished to encourage those men to write, and to create, as far as in my power, a Catholic literary class in my country. I accordingly adopted the French system of conducting a Review instead of the English. But I found our English-speaking Catholics too intolerant to allow me to continue it. I therefore return to the rule of excluding every article that I cannot endorse. I regret the first article excluded under this rule was your own. I can, however, assure you that never knowingly shall I admit into my pages anything reasonably offensive to your countrymen, whether at home or abroad. I am anti-Irish neither in my feelings nor in my convictions. I aim to be Catholic, and to allow myself to be controlled by no national partialities or national prejudices. I try to treat every man according to his own intrinsic merit, to deal frankly, justly, and liberally with all men, of all nations.

Excuse me, Rev. Sir, for the liberty I take, and believe me, with profound respect, your most obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON,

Ed. B. Q. Review, New York.

Rev. P. J. NOWLAN,

Donnybrook, Ireland.

At the close of the same January number, the Reviewer notified to his readers that it concluded what he had to say specially on the rights of the temporal in relation to the Italian and Roman questions, till new and unforeseen events should reopen them. In this number, in spite of the adverse criticisms of clergymen and

editors, he continued to express his views as to the policy that seemed to him proper to pursue, in the interest of religion, in the first place, and secondarily of political and social well-being. These criticisms proved that there was, between Brownson and his opponents a difference not merely of policy, but of principle. In his view, the church, or the spiritual order, represented in the world the immutable element which continues unalterable through all the changes of politics and society, and which they ought to conform to: whereas the others seemed to look upon that which is mutable and ever imperfect as the necessary and unyielding standard which must be conserved at all hazards, and to which religion in the providence of God would adapt itself. The tendency of the clergy is to introduce into civil society the fixedness and unalterability of the Church; and the tendency of radicals to copy in the Church the mobility and changeableness of all things human, and to reduce the Church to simple civil society. Against both extremes Brownson argues in this number,* and shows that as there is no human means of restoring and preserving the pope's temporal principality, it is the part of wisdom, and in the interest of religion as well as of social order, to accept the political unity and independence of Italy united under the liberal constitutional monarchy of the House of Savoy, supposing it accepted by the Holy Father, with just indemnification. The question lay in the temporal order, in which compromises are allowable, and even necessary, when demanded by the good of religion and society, to which all temporal rights, whether

* *Separation of Church and State*, Works, Vol. XII. p. 406.

held by secular or spiritual persons or bodies, are subordinate, and may be surrendered or redeemed, though not taken away by violence, unless in case of abuse, which in the present question could not be pretended. "We assert the principle," he writes. "It is not for us to apply it. All we wish to establish here is, that though mixed up with the practical administration of ecclesiastical affairs, the pope's temporal government, in its origin and character, is neither a spiritual nor a *quasi*-spiritual government, and therefore with the consent of the pope may be suppressed. . . . All we say is, that we hold him free to consent to a total severing of all *political* bonds between Church and State, and we see no other way, with the tendencies of the modern world such as they evidently are, of arriving at a passable solution of the terrible problems pressing every day more and more for solution."

The Jesuit Father Gresselin, whom Brownson calls "a highly revered friend, and really one of the ablest and most learned theologians in our country, whose disapprobation cannot be otherwise than extremely painful,"* on reading the article just referred to, wrote to the author:

BOSTON, January 3d. 1861

Doctor:—There is so great a rush to read your last number that I hardly could get at it, and during the few hours I had hold of it *eight* scholastics knocked at my door, claiming the privilege to have the book after me. Here we are fifty readers of your Review and receive only two copies. I sent you Monday last Pape

* Works, Vol. XX. p. 130.

et Empereur. I hope you will take your gallantest style, your hardest whip to lash all the individuals who have concocted that miserable rhapsody; if at all they are worth mentioning. The lashing must go to the bones.

I read with good care your article on Separation of Church and State. I deem it one of the best papers that ever issued from your pen. The *Status quaestionis* is put forth so clearly that no mistake is possible. The reasoning is so closely and strongly chained that no link could be broken, and the tone is grave and majestic. The opinion yet can be differed from, but not a word in it can give offence. Our poor mind is so constructed that not unfrequently words prove more offensive than the very opinion clothed with them, but this time such is not the case, in the least degree. Now for my part, viewing and weighing all the *data* of the problem, all the elements of the question, I admit fully your solution. I have found not a jot exceptionable: and I have admired the stream of that manly thought, the power of that eloquence, and the depth of a statesman in it. I wish to see what reception you will meet with from the *so-called* Catholic press.

F. Bapst has been delighted with the remembrance of the hospitality you shared with him. He forbids you, most positively, when you come to Boston, to take any other lodgings than our house. He is now buried in his annual retreat, but he told me before not to forget this strict order of his. He extends the same to your new collaborator, Mr. Henry, whom I love as ever, and whom I should be particularly pleased to see, that I might chat with him about our French affairs. Excuse

the carelessness of this letter—I am worried completely with the business of letter writing at this time.

Do not imagine that I send you French compliments, I have dropped long ago that practice, if I had it at all formerly. This letter is as sincere as the two which ran before.

C. GRESSELIN.

The whole series of Brownson's articles in reference to the temporal principality were denounced to the Propaganda at Rome, but there is, as their author was aware, a much better chance for justice at the hands of the Roman congregations than at those of the lay and clerical organs of the Church here. Cardinal Barnabò, the Prefect of Propaganda, was not to be hurried into action by a mere accusation, even from an Archbishop, but wanted more information. For this he applied to Cummings, whose learning and judgment he held in high esteem. Cummings was the theologian mentioned by Brownson in his answer to McMullen as having approved of the article on the rights of the temporal, and was ready to defend it without fear. On the first of January he had sent Brownson an order for twenty-five copies of the *Review* for 1861 for new subscribers; and on the 15th he wrote to the Reverend Joseph M. Finotti; "As to that melancholy article in the 'Record,' it was the production of Archbishop Hughes in person. Of this you may be certain. Brownson's *Review* is doing well in spite of many efforts made to stop the bread and butter of its Editor. Many of the old fogies have given up taking it, and many underhanded efforts were made to break it down, but he began the new year with more subscribers than he had in 1860 on January 1st. Me

they cannot hurt, and when it is time to speak they shall find that I am not to be dragooned into silence. I hate despotism and brutality whether it be practised in the name of the civil power or of the Church, by Austrian soldiers or American churchmen. I mean to fight it—prudently and prayerfully—but to fight it until I see it die or I die myself. Some of the magnates here have tried to get the Propaganda to denounce Brownson, but Roman wisdom is not as easy to entrap as they think.

“My crime is not that I am an enemy to the Irish—they know that I am not—but that I have dared to publish the Decrees of Trent, and the letters of Pope Benedict giving fits to the bishops! I have done this and I live? It is the first instance, since Episcopal despotism was inaugurated here. They have done all they could to crush me, but I am as good a Catholic and as jolly a fellow as ever.”

A few days later he wrote to Brownson:

NEW YORK, January 25th, 1861.

Dear Doctor:—I send you a letter from our friend O’Leary * which was not meant for your eye. The extraordinary proceedings he describes will grieve you somewhat, no doubt. It does not to my mind prove that you or your friends should cease telling the truth, or that they should tell it even with bated breath; but rather that God is with you and them, since their opponents are going demented.

* Dr. O’Leary was a lay professor in the Cincinnati Seminary, and also a professor of Chemistry and Toxicology in the Ohio Medical College. Brownson had been informed, from other sources, of the personal calumnies against him circulated by Archbishop Purcell and his brother Edward; but he cared nothing for them in proportion to the attacks on him in the *Catholic Telegraph*, of which Edward was editor.

You have no doubt read the eight columns of abuse in the "Metropolitan Record." Poor Barry is the scape-goat for this number, and is catching it from all quarters.* Dr. Manahan, † I find, tells one set of people that I am going to New Orleans, and lectures to another on the articles in the Review. He is to hold forth next Sunday at the Cooper Institute. It is said that he will get permission to have his lecture published in the churches. If this is the case, I will publish his lecture and recommend it to my parishioners, and at the same time couple the announcement with a warm eulogy of "Brownson's Review" on the principle of *audi alteram partem*, and I shall appoint a person to receive subscriptions for it in the Vestry . . . I hope you will keep up your courage. Were the Review to suffer no persecution you could scarcely hope any good to be done by it. Personally you are less likely to suffer from opposition than flattery. Were those who oppose you to caress you it would be for no good end.

I am, Dear Doctor, faithfully yours,

J. W. CUMMINGS.

The charges against Brownson were notified to Cummings by Cardinal Barnabò and at once made

*No doubt Barry and Cummings himself might have said all they said in Brownson's Review, without censure, had they said it elsewhere. Had their articles been published in one of the present Catholic Reviews or Magazines, they might have provoked discussion, but not abuse.

† Dr. Manahan was incumbent of St. Stephen's Church while Cummings and Forbes were in Rome; but on returning Cummings took possession without listening to any objections from any quarter. Manahan, who was always uncertain in his friendships and animosities, turned upon Brownson as well as upon Cummings. Until then, he had been an almost daily visitor at Brownson's house; for he was preparing his great work on "The Triumph of the Church," hardly a page of which was written without Brownson's assistance.

known to the accused, who immediately wrote to Cummings.

Rev. and dear Doctor:—I am much obliged to you for sending me the observations of his Eminence the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda on the no. of my Review for last October. As I do not know what particular assertions of mine touching the temporal dominion of the Supreme Pontiff his Eminence refers to, I am unable to explain or retract them. I can only say that I have never knowingly made any assertion “deeply offensive to the sincere Catholic heart,” or “in open opposition to the sentiment of the Episcopate, or the vows of Catholics throughout the whole world.” No bishop of this country, with a single exception, has complained to me of any thing I said in that number of my *Review* of the temporal dominion of the Holy Father, and he only complained of single phrases as irreverent. I hold the right of the Holy Father to his temporal dominion to be sacred and inviolable, and as such I have always defended it in my *Review*. I have never knowingly justified any invasion of that right in any sense, or from any quarter. What I said in my *Review* for October on the subject was said in reference to what seemed to me likely in a near future to be *un fait accompli*, and suggesting what in my judgment would be the best manner of dealing with it, as will be evident from the article on Separation of Church and State in the subsequent number for January 1861.

Unwilling to continue a discussion which I found unacceptable to many, I gave notice in my *Review* for January, p. 136, that it would not be continued. I submitted both articles before publication to the best the-

ological revision, and did my best to be correct. If I have erred, I deeply regret it, and am ready to make any explanation, modification, or retraction required by the Holy See.

If my *Review* "has gone astray," I am anxious that it should at the earliest moment return to the true path, and I can assure his eminence that I have no pride of opinion to gratify, and that the Holy See will always find in me a docile and obedient subject.

Very truly your obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D.

Editor Brownson's Quarterly Review.

ELIZABETH, N. J., January 11, 1861.

REV. J. W. CUMMINGS, DD.

A copy of this letter, in Italian, was sent to the Prefect of the Propaganda, and it was supposed that the affair was at an end, till Brownson received another notice of complaint about an article in his *Review* for July, 1861, criticising Cayla's pamphlet, *Pape et Empereur*, supposed to have been inspired by Napoleon III. The article was severe enough on the imperial policy, but contained nothing that any defender of the papal dominion could object to, and hardly mentioned the matter at all. * The letter from Cummings was this:

NEW YORK, July 19th, 1861.

Dear Doctor:—There are parties at work to injure you with the authorities at Rome, the complaint being now against your reopening of the Papal question in your last no. but one. I wish you would come to see me this week and I will tell you some particulars. I

* See *Pope and Emperor*. Works, Vol. XII. p. 439.

know that the authorities of the Propaganda are favorably disposed towards your person. They are somewhat puzzled as to your position in the Review on this question of the Temporal Power. I may add that in seeking an interview with you I do so with their knowledge and consent. I am sure that I need not add that it is also my earnest desire to serve you and the Review.

I am, Dear Doctor, very truly yours,

J. W. CUMMINGS.

The result of the conference with Cummings was that Brownson wrote to the Cardinal Prefect, a full abstract of all his propositions relative to the question of the Roman government, the qualifications he had expressly made to them, and his motives in discussing the subject. The result was made known to him in this letter from Cummings:

NEW YORK, October 9th, 1861.

Dear Doctor:—Your letter of explanations, dated August 12th, was received and read with pleasure at the Propaganda. Had it been received sooner the Cardinal Prefect would not have forwarded the subsequent document dated August 31st, which they now desire to be considered *non avenu*. Rome is satisfied with your explanations and with your disposition to submit all you write to the judgment of the Church. By the mail of August (September?) 12th, the Propaganda wrote to the Archbishop of New York to inform him of Mr. Brownson's *éclaircissements* and to tranquillize his mind in reference to that writer's "disposition." They have been especially pleased that the first notice they had of inaccuracy (*errore cadutogli dalla penna*) touching the eter-

nity of the punishment of the lost came from yourself, with a promise of early correction.* They notice the closing expression of your letter, "There is no salvation at least for me, outside of the Catholic Church," and do not suppose that you believe that there is salvation under the circumstances indicated for anybody else.† I am, in fine, exhorted to comfort the Reviewer especially under the various afflictions which God has permitted to befall him at the present time.

I think you take a little unfair advantage of Gioberti when you blame him for saying that sin has its dialectic side. He says it, I think, only of original sin, which was actual sin in Adam and Eve alone, He does not say it of actual sin from which alone your *reductio ad absurdum* seems to me to flow.

The article on *Slavery and the War*, in the main, you know I do not accept; its side hits are deserved and will do good. Besides, I believe you are honest in what you say. I was surprised to read the postscript to that article; I thought you could hardly mean it—that you knew better. The response to it has been a brutal kick which your friends here say you partly deserved. Take it as a penance, my dear Doctor, and learn to live and labor without sympathy. Care for the approval which your conscience will bestow upon you at the feet of the Crucifix—and labor to say what you have learned from your study of the Doctors of the Church to be the truth as received by the Church, and not to say what will please even great Bishops and great ones of the earth of whatever order.

* See Brownson's Works, Vol. XX. p. 195.

† Cf. Works, Vol. XX. p. 394.

I would like to have a line from you. With respects to Fathers Bapst and McElroy, I am very truly your friend,

J. W. CUMMINGS.

Upon receiving the letter of Cardinal Barnabò, referred to by Cummings, the Archbishop of New York wrote the following letter, almost every sentence of which is contradictory of what we have seen to be the facts:

NEW YORK, October 3rd, 1861.

Dear Sir:—I have received a letter from the Sacred Congregation in Rome, expressing great dissatisfaction, and even uneasiness, in regard to yourself, founded upon your July number of the Review. Who has presented the statement to the Sacred Congregation I do not know. But they write to me to inquire whether it is true, and, if it should be true, urging me to put the faithful of my Diocese on their guard against your writings. The objections are that you oppose, and profess to refute, certain opinions that are sacred in the Catholic Church,—that you calumniated the Church by maintaining, either directly or indirectly, that she crushes intellect down to the level of the belief of simple Catholics;—that your disquisition on Hell is unsound in itself and dangerous to your readers.

I have replied that as to your personal orthodoxy as a Catholic I have not the slightest doubt—that I think it very inexpedient either for the Sacred Congregation or myself to write anything on this subject. This is the substance of their letter to me, and my answer.

I write this for your own personal inspection. I wish it to be considered as private, and to remain very respectfully your obedient servant,

† JOHN, Abp. of New York.

O. A. BROWNSON, Esq., LL. D.

The present Bishop of Louisville was at this time Rector of the American College at Rome, and the July number of the *Review*, containing the article which the Archbishop thought contrary to the Catholic teaching concerning the punishment of the reprobate and some other matters, was sent to him to be laid before Propaganda.* Dr. McCloskey sent it to Father Cardella, the Jesuit, for examination, and he returned it, saying he found nothing in it that could be objected to, and expressing the highest admiration for the writer. Indeed, one of the students at the American College, seeing Cardella reading the article, remarked that he had a slight acquaintance with the Reviewer; whereupon Cardella exclaimed: "A slight acquaintance! I should be glad to cross the Atlantic and come straight back for a slight acquaintance with this writer."

Bishop McCloskey's recollection of the details is not distinct now. When the first attempt was made to have Brownson censured at Rome, he wrote a letter to his brother, the Reverend George McCloskey, in which he says: "As regards Brownson, I do not think his articles (October number) were prudent. I thought he was not in humor when he wrote them; but I defended him and told the Cardinal [Barnabô] that he was a good man and an able one, but not likely to surrender when

* See *Catholic Polemics*, Works, Vol. XX. pp. 123 *et seq.*

his foes were battering at the door. I think there was a strong effort made to condemn him, and but for the Cardinal's good sense and sympathy with such an old hero as Brownson, I believe the object of the others, whatever it was, would have been effected. He asked me to write to B. and advise him in a friendly way, but not being very well acquainted with the old gentleman, and as the next number would have been published before he would get my letter, I did not write. What a pity people can't bear without anger the views of an old man who happens to think differently from themselves!!"

The following letter from the Bishop shows what impression the matter has left on his memory:

LOUISVILLE, 12 January, 1900.

H. F. BROWNSON, ESQ.

Dear Sir:—Of your Father's writings "having been complained of to the Roman authorities" during my residence at Rome, I have absolutely no recollection. It was my custom when I had business with Cardinal Barnabò, at that time Prefect of the Propaganda, to call on him in the evening, knowing that he rarely went out after supper, and that he was more at leisure in the evening than during the busy hours of the day. During one of these visits,—perhaps in '63,—his Eminence alluded incidentally to rude criticisms that had been levelled at certain principles broached by your Father, presumably in his *Review*. What precisely the subject was to which the Cardinal referred, I have not now, well nigh forty years afterwards, any very clear and definite recollection; especially as it was rather of the *rough*

manner in which these critics had dealt with what they regarded as Dr. Brownson's short-comings, than of the *merits of the case* itself that His Eminence spoke ; but, unless my memory plays me false, it was in some way linked with the matter of eternal punishment. But be that as it may, I do distinctly remember how strongly the straightforward Cardinal deprecated the fierceness of the attack which had been made on a man whose lofty spirit and fearless character was not unlike his own. Plainly it annoyed him. What serves to fix the visit in my memory, was the dramatic manner in which His Eminence showed how an old Dreadnaught like Dr. Brownson would act, if threatened with the fire of a whole fleet of popular pamphleteers. But that Cardinal Barnabò was a very small man, and your Father a man of Daniel Webster's build, but taller by some inches, I could have fancied the Doctor stood before me. Rising from his chair and dropping his scarlet biretum on the floor, His Eminence put himself in an attitude of defence, as if to say : Come one ; come all ! intimating, for that I remember well, that if his critics had dealt gently with him, and pointed out his error, if error there was, no man was more ready humbly to acknowledge it, than that great champion of the faith, who for us was what Newman was for England. Each in his day put Catholicity fifty years ahead in their respective countries ; and it is now, when people see there are none to take the places of those two intellectual giants, that they are beginning to appreciate both the one and the other.

I remain yours faithfully,

W. G. McCLOSKEY.

Father Gresselin, who, in the month of January, had written that he had not found "a jot exceptionable" in Brownson's solution of the Roman question by proposing the cession of the papal states to united Italy; six months afterwards writes him: "I said again, at the time, that an honest man can entertain all these notions. But since then, I have taken a wholly different view of the case Now your Review is no more the same as before. I do not know why, I cannot account for the change. But change there is, and a striking one. Assuredly you have still admirable passages. But you have taken the habit of mixing up with them passages of quite a different nature, which grate terribly on the ears of your friends." * This remark was just, though the Jesuit was late in detecting it; and from 1860 to the end of 1864, the change in the tone and temper of the Review grew more and more evident. Even though the Reviewer seemed at the time to be unconscious of the full extent of that change, he admitted it, in some measure, when he attributed it to the necessity of defending the rights of the temporal more explicitly than he had formerly asserted them; because the tendency now was to belittle them where it had been unduly to magnify them. He was opposed, as all along he had been, to either extreme; but as the danger appeared to him to be in the exaggeration of the rights and prerogatives of power, he now set out to combat civil and political, and even spiritual despotism. At the same time, he altered his plan of attacking error in matters of religion, and of defending Catholic truth. Twenty years previously, when preach-

* The whole of the Jesuit Father's letter, and Brownson's reply to it, may be read in Brownson's Works, Vol. XX. p. 130, *et seq.*

ing in the Masonic Temple in Boston, and attempting to bring infidels to a belief in God and Christianity, he had been accused of being himself an infidel, and of trying to convert Christianity to infidelity, although he believed far more of Christian truth than he thought necessary to insist on in his sermons. Before he became a Catholic he was convinced that the opposite course was the honester and better policy, and while he remained in Boston he ever asserted the highest-toned Catholicity. After his removal to New York, some of his clerical friends there, with the Reverend Isaac Hecker at their head, urged that the best way to make converts in this country was to present only so much of Catholic doctrine to those not Catholics as was absolutely necessary for them to accept in order to enter the Church; and that they would be repelled rather than attracted by doctrines and practices too much opposed to their habits of belief and of conduct. Brownson eventually gave in to this policy, and not only tried to sever the Church in this country from the national abuses and excrescences which a foreign-born or foreign-bred clergy brought with it from Europe, but also disparaged many works of supererogation practised by Catholics in all times and in all countries. To separate from the Church, in the minds of the American people, such foreign notions and habits as had no root in her faith or discipline, was wise and praiseworthy, and only objectionable because at that time, and perhaps even yet, impracticable, and sure to be opposed by the mass of the clergy and laity. But in making light of asceticism, of the vows of religion; in attempting to adapt the Church to the age; in assuming a more liberal tone towards Protestants, and towards

Catholics whose theories he had denounced as uncatholic; he showed that he was suffering himself to be borne in the direction of what some pretend to denominate "Americanism," and some call "Heckerism," and which is really but a form of "Liberalism," closely allied to "Developmentism." It is worthy of remark that, at this time, Brownson expresses a more favorable opinion of Newman's Essay on Developments, endeavoring to give it a Catholic interpretation, and though still holding that, what Newman wrote was inadmissible, suggesting that what he really meant was only a subjective development; for liberalism and developmentism are closely akin.

There was, nevertheless, an irreconcilable discrepancy between Hecker's principles of social and theological science and those which Brownson had seen fit to adopt. Even before either became a Catholic, and whilst both supported Mr. Calhoun, they took opposite views of that statesman's doctrine, and of the real nature of the government of this country, Hecker holding to the sovereignty of the people and a pure democracy, and Brownson advocating the theory of a constitutional republic. Calhoun had said to Brownson that it was an unfortunate mistake for their party to have abandoned the name of republican for that of democratic, and Calhoun himself continued to speak of it as the republican party long after the rest of them called themselves democrats. There is much in a name, and from calling themselves democrats, they came to embrace democratic notions. The federal constitution was avowedly formed in 1787 with a view to checking the tendency to democracy which had begun to manifest itself in several of the states, and it was not till Jackson's administration

that the doctrine came into vogue that the sovereignty, after the formation of the constitution, persists in the people outside of the political organism, and that their will, expressed in any way, through or not through the organism, is supreme and to be regarded as the sovereign will. Democracy, in Brownson's understanding, is the absolutism of the people; republicanism, a government limited and subjected to a constitutional organism. Republicanism is freedom, democracy is incompatible with freedom. The American institutions are not democratic, though the American people are becoming democrats, and giving their institutions a democratic interpretation, or altering them in a democratic sense. Hecker, when writing at Rome his articles to prove that our institutions are favorable to the growth of Catholicity, was too democratic in his personal convictions and tendencies to perceive this grave political danger or to regard it as so threatening as it really was; yet he did well to dwell on the fact that in this country there was much real freedom, and full legal freedom for the Church, which was undoubtedly favorable to the growth of Catholicity amongst us. Our institutions are favorable to the church, according to their original intent; but they should not be presented as favorable to the church in the sense it has now become the fashion to interpret them,—a fashion which makes them just what the dominant sentiment of the country for the time chooses. The danger the Catholics run here is the taking of that sentiment as the constitution, and following it out in our political action, instead of resisting it, and doing all in our power to bring the practical interpretation of our institutions back to their original republican meaning. Restore in practice

the republican theory of our institutions, and then the Catholic can heartily accept them, and praise and defend them with all the patriotism and loyalty congenial to his heart. In fact, Brownson, saw little in the American character, as developed under the democratic theory, to encourage his hopes as a Catholic. He rather believed the tendency of the American people, with individual exceptions, to be away from, than towards the church. That he did not despair, was because he relied on God, who will not withhold his grace, and because he trusted that the Catholic population, as it gradually increased in weight and influence in the country, would introduce new and stronger elements to neutralize those alluded to.

The divergence of Hecker and Brownson's views of the relations of the natural and the supernatural has been pointed out in a former chapter; and this, with their different doctrines concerning original sin and other fundamental truths of revelation, prevented their ever cordially agreeing in opinion, though acting in concert and with equal zeal for the conversion of unbelievers and heretics. It is noteworthy that in condemning Elliot's Life of Hecker, and Archbishop Ireland's Introduction to it, the Holy Father Leo XIII, aware of the close connection of Liberalism, Heckerism, and Developmentism, applies to the first two the Vatican decision against the third.

It was in the belief that many of the most serious objections urged by thinking men against the church would be removed by a theological explanation of the Catholic doctrine of hell greatly modifying the popular opinion, that Brownson threw out doubts as to the nature and duration of the punishment of the wicked.

True, he only asked questions as to what Catholic faith requires us to believe; but questions may be asked in such manner as to suggest and enforce their answers; and there is no doubt but what he meant to maintain that we are not obliged to believe that the hearts of the reprobate are gnawed by a literal worm that never dies, or their bodies subjected to literal fire that is never quenched. The Church has never so defined. In the case of those who die in original sin only, no one takes the worm or fire in a literal sense. We need not therefore do so in the case of those who die in actual sin. Moreover, the punishment of the reprobate, said he, is vindictive or expiative. To say it is vindictive he thought incompatible with God's attributes, if expiative, it must terminate, unless they continue forever adding to their sins, which last would be to deny the final triumph of Christ over sin and the devil and his works. But, may not punishment be vindictive, and neither vindictive nor expiative? Daniel Webster used to say that he wished to "vindicate the majesty of the law" when scolding his wife for not playing as he thought the rules of whist demanded, and she excused herself by pleading that she had thereby gained another trick. Vindictive in this sense is neither vindictive nor expiative, and it would seem that the punishment of the reprobate was rather vindictive of the law that has been violated, and the necessary effect of God's justice. Although the loss of heaven, the deprivation of the beatific vision is undoubtedly everlasting, Brownson said he knew nothing in the definitions of the Church opposed to the opinion that "all men may attain to as great a degree of good as is foreshadowed in the state of pure nature." This last expression was

not precisely what the author meant, and in fact, was qualified in his mind by the sentence immediately preceding: "May we not hope that the sins of this life may in some sense be expiated, and that the reprobate, though they can never receive any part or lot in the palingenesia may yet find their sufferings gradually diminishing, and themselves attaining to that sort of imperfect good which is called natural beatitude?" What he really meant was, that he should like to concede, if he could do so compatibly with Catholic faith, that the punishment of the damned is not everlasting because they are everlastingly sinning, that is, committing new sin; and that it is expiatory, and not, at least in the popular sense of the word, vindictive. It was not his intention to maintain that the expiation would ultimately end, and the reprobate be finally in possession of natural beatitude in the sense in which theologians understand the term natural beatitude. He knew perfectly well that, as a Catholic, he was bound to maintain that the reprobate descend to hell, and that hell is everlasting; that all the reprobate go *in ignem aeternum*, and that the punishment of those who are guilty of actual sin, is termed *gehennae perpetuae cruciatus*, and he never thought of calling this in question, or of asking if he might lawfully concede any thing incompatible with it. There was no intention of intimating that the expiation could ever be completed, or that the natural beatitude could ever be perfectly realized. Consequently, there was nothing in his meaning to militate against the everlasting punishment of the wicked, or in favor of the notion of their ultimate redemption from hell, or even complete attainment to natural beatitude.

In using the term, natural beatitude, Brownson did not imply that there is a natural destiny for man to which he supposed the reprobate might ultimately attain or be attaining, for he did not admit that man had or could have any natural destiny at all. His only destiny is supernatural. He used the term as the synonyme of good, some degree of which must always be supposed for man, if we suppose his existence at all as the creature of God. The complete severance of the creature, either from his first cause or his last cause, is not, he said, his complete misery, but his total annihilation, since to the existence of any creature the final cause and the first cause are alike essential. Man by his creation participates of good in the first or cosmic cycle, and hence he is said to be physically good; but, as he could not exist without a final cause, he must have an initial or inchoate good in the second cycle, and therefore is not and cannot be totally depraved. It is not, therefore, necessary to believe in the case even of actual sinners, that the damned are absolutely severed from all good, that is, from every degree of good; but simply to believe that they are for ever reprobated from heaven, and therefore, as the fulfilment or completion of man's destiny is heaven, for ever remain initial or inchoate existences, for ever below their destiny, deprived of all means and of all hopes of ever attaining to beatitude, or the end of their existence. He did not assert that they would attain, or ask if we might not hope they would ultimately attain to natural beatitude, or a natural destiny; but simply if we might not hope that they would ultimately attain to that degree of imperfect good called by theologians natural beatitude. The term was ill-chosen, because he

did not believe in natural beatitude at all; for beatitude is in fulfilling our destiny, which is in the palingenesia or supernatural order alone. But it was not beatitude in any order, but simply an imperfect degree of natural good that he really spoke of. Respectable theological writers have advanced the opinion that the punishment of the damned is expiatory; and if so, all that he concluded with regard to the gradual diminution of their sufferings must be conceded.

“Still the doom of the reprobate, since it includes the loss of heaven, the loss of God, the supreme good, the loss of glorification and all the joys of the kingdom, and since it includes, in the case of all who die in actual sin, the internal torture of feeling that the loss has been voluntarily and maliciously incurred, and in the case of all, the necessity of remaining for ever mere initial or inchoate existences, for ever below their proper destiny, without any hope or possibility of ever being able to attain to it, seems to us sufficiently deplorable, sufficiently wretched, sufficiently miserable to satisfy even those who luxuriate with the greatest fondness on the tortures of the damned . . . At least, we could wish no greater suffering to our most bitter enemy, and we can conceive it possible for the damned to suffer no greater misery, unless we suppose that God by a continuous miracle sustains them in existence for the sole purpose of enabling them to bear a punishment above their nature. Our view of the case supposes as much misery for the damned as they are naturally capable of enduring, and hence, as we cannot conceive them to be supernaturalized, that is, raised above their nature, we hesitate to

believe that the Church teaches and requires us to believe that they will suffer any greater misery." *

The sum of what Brownson insisted on maintaining in regard to hell is, first, that the punishment is not God's positive infliction, but the necessary consequence of the state in which the sinner dies, and vindictive only in the sense that it vindicates the wisdom and goodness of the Creator ; and secondly, that the *pœna sensus*, in his judgment the pain of internal rather than external sense, is not punishment by material fire, as ordinarily understood, in a literal pool of literal fire and brimstone.

CHAPTER X.

THE CHURCH NOT A DESPOTISM.—BISHOP WOOD'S INTER-DICT.—LIBERAL CATHOLICISM.

HAD the speculations about the punishment of the damned been put forth at any other time, it is not likely that Archbishop Hughes and others who found fault, would have been any more uneasy about them than were Father Cardella, Father Ballerini, and Cardinal Barnabò, who saw nothing reprehensible in what was said ; but the feeling that Brownson had assumed a more independent tone in his Review, led his more cautious readers to interpret what he wrote in the worst sense it would bear. So it was with other articles. In October, 1861, Brownson published an essay on "Reading and

* Works, Vol. XX. p. 196.

Study of the Scriptures," * most orthodox in all respects, and just such as he might have written after reading Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical on the same subject; but containing one passage which the Archbishop disliked, and which set him against the whole essay. The passage was harmless and true enough and apposite to the subject. It was, however, tortured into a belittling of the scholastics and modern theologians. After explaining why Catholics had been prevented from insisting with due emphasis on the great advantage to be derived from the daily reading and study of the written word of God, he says the result has been the substitution of a whole host of devotional and ascetic works, many of which are of doubtful merit and of doubtful utility. "If faith has not suffered," he said. "piety at least has suffered therefrom, and we attribute no little of the weak and watery character of modern piety to the comparative neglect of the study of the Scriptures, and to the multiplication of works of sentimental piety

"The fathers studied and expounded the Scriptures, and they were strong men, the great men, the heroes of their times; the great medieval doctors studied, systematized, and epitomized the fathers, and, though still great, fell below those who were formed by the study of the Scriptures themselves; the theologians followed, gave compendiums of the doctors, and fell still lower; modern professors content themselves with giving compendiums of the compendiums given by the theologians, and have fallen as low as possible without falling into nothing and disappearing in the inane. In devotional

* Works, Vol. XX. p. 171.

and ascetic literature there has been the same process, the same downward tendency."

Brownson was wrongly accused of contemning the Scholastics generally. For some of them, St. Anselm, St. Bonaventure, and St. Thomas of Aquino, in particular, he had the highest reverence; but he did not think them equal to the great fathers. They grasped the truth indeed clearly, but in detail and piecemeal; whereas the great fathers seemed to seize it in its dialectic unity as a whole, and in the true relation of the parts to each other. To read the fathers seems like beholding the country with the naked eye, all the varied scenery of the landscape harmonized in blended beauty; whilst perusing the scholastics is like examining each separate part in turn through a field glass, which lends distinctness to so much as comes within its focus, but unrelated with the rest. Hence the student of scholastic and modern theology is taught accurately, and, if he remembers what he is taught, can speak correctly concerning any given proposition; but if asked why it is true or otherwise, he will hardly look for the reason in the nature of things, in the great principles which rule all thought, all reality, and explain all things in relation to the dialectic harmony which pervades all creation and all revelation, all nature and all that is above nature.

Nor was he deficient in respect for the great theologians who came after the scholastics, as is evident from his frequent references to Suarez and Bellarmine, Bossuet and Fénelon, to whom he gave credit for having done for their age what their great predecessors had done for previous ages.

That Brownson strongly condemned the sentimentalism of modern piety and devotion is not to be denied. To persons born and bred in a community where superstition has encroached on religion, and is regarded as the harmless and exuberant foliage of a believing soul, practices and observances that to others seem to smother devotion, may really appear to have no tendency to obscure faith, and to put external acts of devotion in the place that should be given to interior virtue. A priest in Ohio, himself Irish, at least by descent, wrote to Brownson that the men working on the railroad near him had refused to eat their dinner because it had been cooked by a woman who had not been "Churched." Instances might be multiplied all going to show that even among our Catholic population there are many who "pay tithes of anise, cummin, and mint, and pass over justice, and judgment, and the weightier matters of the law." "To suppose," he said, "that the simple wearing of the scapular of our Lady, even if one should die with it on, is of itself a sure guaranty against eternal punishment, is mere superstition, and not a harmless superstition either. The scapular is not a charm, and the benefits promised to the wearer are secured only by his faith and piety, his earnest devotion, or his observing certain prescribed conditions, and he who observes those conditions will be saved. without wearing it." Yet Brownson wore a scapular himself, wrote ever with a statue of the Blessed Virgin beside the crucifix, on his table, and recited his rosary daily, and usually about the hour of dusk; not because he supposed these things to have any virtue in themselves, but because they are fitted to remind us of the mystery of the Incarnation and render

our faith in it more lively and strengthen our charity towards God and our neighbor. In spite of his reluctance to make parade of it, Brownson was really and deeply devout. His constant meditation on the Trinity and the Incarnation not only enlightened his mind and guided his pen, but also excited in his heart such gratitude and love as had power to restrain him when tempted as strongly as man could be to rebel against ecclesiastical authority, like so many distinguished Catholics of his own time, or ever yielding in any degree to the desire of popularity. In contemplating God's love for men, he did not attribute the Incarnation of the Son to an excess of love beyond that of the Father and the Holy Ghost, but to the fact that the Son is the medium of the divine activity. God's love for us is infinite, and not greater in one of the Persons of the blessed Trinity than in another. Cardinal Manning, one of the greatest advocates of devotion to the Holy Ghost, recognized in Brownson's writings a like devotion, as he shows in a letter of the 6th of February, 1873, in which he says: "You see as I see, and your discernment confirms mine. You have so long and so powerfully maintained the authority of the Holy See in the midst of indifference, liberalism, and half-truths that we all owe you a debt of gratitude; and the Church in America will bear the marks of your testimony to the highest conviction of Catholic Truth. We have had one point in common. You, I believe, have always had a special devotion to the Holy Ghost. It was this that brought me out of darkness into light. And it is this that has made the prerogatives of the Vicar of Christ the first axioms of my faith."

In meditating on God's love for man, and in speaking of it, Brownson did not think of it as a love for the human race in general, like that of philanthropists who, he said, love mankind in general, and hate every one in particular unless he is a scoundrel, or has a black skin; but, in the words of St. Paul, considered that "he loved *me*, and delivered himself up for *me*," and with St. John Chrysostom held that if one, and one only, of Adam's posterity had sinned, the Son of God would have died for the redemption of that single soul.

The importance Brownson attached to constant prayer and meditation, and also his familiarity with those pious exercises will be made apparent by one or two extracts from what he wrote:

"Speculation, discussion, reasoning, are all good in their way and in their place, but not by them do we acquire truth. They serve to remove obstacles, to break down barriers, to strip off envelopes, and place our intellectual acquisitions in their logical order, but we acquire a knowledge of truth itself only by standing face to face with it, and by calmly contemplating it, that is, by elevating the heart to it, and meditating on it. The mental act is intuitive, not discursive; for discursion requires truth for the basis of its operations, and cannot begin till the truth is apprehended. Hence it is that prayer and meditation are necessary conditions not simply of spiritual growth, but also of the acquisition of the highest order of intellectual greatness. This is true, even confining ourselves to prayer and meditation as a subjective exercise, without taking into view the objective graces that the exercise obtains from God. The mind is naturally fitted for truth, for truth in the intelli-

gible order, but if it turns away from it, or will not look towards it, and consider it, it will not find it, but will remain in ignorance. The light shines and illumines all around us, but what avails it, if we shut our eyes, or refuse to open them to it? . . . Prayer or meditation removes the obstructions to grace, and places the soul in the proper attitude to receive it and to act,—to act with a clear mind and a firm will. So the advantages of meditation are twofold, objective and subjective,—in the grace received, and the state of the mind and affections produced, . . . The grace received is a stream from that fountain of grace which is in the Word made flesh, and which is always near the soul, ready to flow in the instant the soul opens the valves of her heart, or permits it to flow in and circulate through her veins. The grace exists always in all its plenitude, and near the soul of every one. Meditation simply opens the heart, and permits it to flow in, and the soul to appropriate or assimilate it. The grace is supernatural, but no special miracle is wrought on occasion of the prayer or meditation. The miracle is the one grand crowning miracle, the Incarnation, the very apex of the creative act of God. The grace already exists, is a living fountain open in the sacred side and heart of Jesus, and its flowing into the soul on occasion of meditation which tends to remove the obstructions the soul herself places in its way, is the effect not of a special or isolated act of God, but of the one continuous act by which he became incarnate, and offers himself a perpetual sacrifice for us." *

"The supreme God of the pagans was inaccessible to all emotions of pity or compassion. No prayers,

* Works, Vol. XIV pp. 581-585.

intercessions, sacrifices, or expiations of gods or men could bend him, or obtain any mercy or redress for outraged and suffering humanity. Hence he is never with them an object of worship, and his service finds no place in their ritual. But the God of the Christian is not a blind, inexorable, and unbending fate: he is good, loving, full of tenderness and compassion, who hears any of his children when they cry unto him, and is more ready to answer than any one is to ask. He is, what this age denies, infinitely free, and his providence extends over all the creatures he has made, not by fixed, invariable, and inflexible laws, but by the free and unconstrained exercise of his own will. I shall never forget the singular emotion, I may say rapture, I felt one day, while wandering in the mazes of error, when suddenly burst upon my mind, for the first time, this great truth that God is free, and that what most needs asserting of all liberties is the liberty of God. It struck me as a flash of light in the midst of my darkness, opened to me a new world, and changed almost instantaneously not only the tone and temper of my mind, but the direction of my whole order of thought. Though years elapsed before I found myself knocking at the door of the Church for admission, my conversion began from that moment. I had seized the principle which authorizes faith in the supernatural. God is free, I said, then I can love him, trust him, hope in him, and commune with him, and he can hear me, love me and raise me to communion with himself." *

Placed in direct contact with arbitrary authority which denounced him without wishing to comprehend

* Works, Vol. VIII p. 262.

him or condescending to argue fairly with him, and urged on the other side by his liberalizing friends to make common cause with them, Brownson determined to act with them so far as he could consistently with his principles; but not to go all lengths with them. For he was rather driven off by excess of authority, than attracted by schemes of ecclesiastical reform. Even if he had unwittingly fallen into some errors of doctrine, which was by no means true, the proper course, and that which has been pursued by the church except in a few countries, and which is in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, would have been to point out the errors, and to reason with him without passion or vituperation.

Not only the complaints to Propaganda, but also the criticisms by bishops and priests of his writings, whether addressed to him personally or published in "Episcopal Organs," were enough to exhaust the Reviewer's patience. When he first became a Catholic, his reverence for the clergy and bishops was almost unbounded; but sixteen or eighteen years' more intimate acquaintance with our ecclesiastical rulers forced him to make the necessary distinction between the person and office, which he had always made in the case of civil office-holders. Controversies in which even bishops falsified his doctrine to impugn it more successfully in the eyes of the public; underhand attempts by some—especially the Archbishops of New York and Cincinnati—to injure his Review and him, while professing friendship; narrow-minded views in treating the great questions of the time in reference solely to the interests of a nationality, disregardful of great principles universally applicable; and other similar anomalies proved at last to Brownson's

mind that the grace of Holy Orders does not destroy nature.

While his main purpose in his theological and philosophical essays was to show the harmony between Catholic dogma and modern civilization, especially between it and that advanced type of civilization which he contended that the American people had it in charge to develop and realize in their national, domestic, and individual life, he was thwarted in that purpose by the almost unanimous denunciation of that civilization by churchmen; by the declaration on the part of those whom he resisted as *oscurantisti* against modern society, and by the effort to force upon us as Catholic tradition all the traditions of Irish, French, German, Italian, and even Baltimore Catholics. Brownson did not believe it necessary to transfer to the United States usages which had grown up in countries less free and educated, and which had outlived their time and their reason, and whatever temporary benefit they might have in regard to those migrating hither from countries where that state of things had obtained, could here be only an impediment to conversions and tend to confirm the prejudices against the Church already well-nigh invincible in the minds of Americans. With these feelings and views Brownson announced in his Review for January, 1862, that he should thereafter write according to his own honest convictions and publish his articles just as he wrote them, simply holding himself responsible after publication to the proper authorities for any abuse he might make of the freedom of the press guaranteed him by the constitution and laws of the country. He would send each number, as it appeared, to Rome, and make such corrections as the

Holy See might require or suggest ; objections from all other quarters would be accorded the respect and weight they might, in his judgment, possess, and be acknowledged accordingly. This announcement being interpreted by many as a proclamation of defiance of episcopal authority, the Reviewer took occasion in his next number * to define the rights of a lay editor and the power of the ordinary of the diocese. He maintains the right of a layman and a secular to write and publish what he pleases without asking any one's permission, though at his peril if he offend against faith or morals ; and any canon to the contrary, if such there be, is without force in the United States ; and moreover could not affect Brownson's case, since he wrote at the request of the bishops in general and of Hughes in particular. On the other hand, he shows that the power of the Church authorities is not arbitrary. "The bishop does not make the law ; he is appointed to administer in his diocese the law of God already known and promulgated. If either the pope or the bishop assumes arbitrary power, or to be, as Cæsar claims to be, the living law, he assumes to be what he is not, and usurps a power to which he has no right, and offends against the very law he is divinely appointed to administer. The pope is a pastor, not a dominator ; the bishops are pastors, not dominators ; the servants, not the lords of God's people . . . † The Church defines, but does not make the faith . . . The pope is infallible speaking *ex cathedra*, but the pope *loquens ex cathedra* is the pope with his auditory, and his

* *The Church not a Despotism.* Works, Vol. XX. p. 215 *et seq.*

† I think St. Gregory I. said, *Pastores, non domini ; et dominicæ, non suæ, gregis.*

auditory is the whole Church. The single bishop has no authority to define an article or dogma of faith . . . No single bishop can define the faith, or condemn an opinion as heretical, on his own authority ; nor can all the bishops of a province, nor all the bishops of a nation, assembled in plenary council, nor all the bishops of the world, without the pope, the successor of Peter. There are many simple presbyters, who are entitled to far more weight in theological questions than the bishops ; for it by no means follows that the bishop is a great theologian or the best theologian in his diocese. Even the theological judgment of a layman is entitled to more weight than that of a priest or bishop, if he be a man more richly endowed by nature, and has superior theological learning and science. The grace of orders confers the power of performing sacerdotal functions, which the layman cannot perform ; but it is no part of Catholic faith or doctrine that it increases the quantity or quality of a man's brain, or the sum of his science or learning. Some bishops are great theologians, some can hardly be called theologians at all. The same may be said of some priests." This as concerns doctrine. As to discipline, the bishop "can, no doubt, if he judges proper, assigning his reasons therefor, prohibit or interdict the circulation among the faithful of his diocese, of any periodical or newspaper, and good Catholics would be bound to refrain from taking it until the interdict was removed, providing he does it on the ground of danger to Catholic faith and morals,—not for political, or simply secular reasons, for his authority is spiritual, not temporal. He is a spiritual pastor, not, in this country, a temporal lord. In the exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction, our own

bishop may interdict us as editor and publisher of this *Review*, but only so far as relates to the discussion of questions which he judges dangerous to faith and morals. He could not oblige us to suspend its publication, because we are a layman, and its publication is our lawful business. He could only interdict the publication in its pages of the matters which he judges dangerous to the spiritual welfare of his flock, and we should be obliged to obey him so far, till he himself should raise the interdict, or we, by an appeal to the supreme court, could succeed in getting it raised. This is essential to order, and must be conceded, or the bishop could not discharge his duty to the flock committed to his pastoral care. But even he must be governed by the law of the Church, and has no right to interdict us from slight and insufficient reasons, from mere will, caprice, or personal dislike. He must do it on legal grounds, for legal reasons, or otherwise his interdict is of no force and does not bind us."

The writer adverts to an erroneous notion "entertained by non-Catholics,"—and he might have said by many Catholics, too,—"that the laity count for nothing. The clergy," he says, "are not the Church, but are functionaries in the Church. The Church is not for them, but they are for the Church." The part of the laity among savages and barbarians newly converted is comparatively insignificant. In the Jesuit reductions of Paraguay, and for the last three centuries in Ireland, the clergy managed not only spiritual matters, but most of their temporal matters besides; and some persons were desirous of introducing the same subjection of the laity in this country. For various reasons Brownson contended for a contrary policy, one which would leave to

the laity all the work of every nature which may be lawfully performed by laymen. Since the advance of civilization and diffusion of education, the clergy have ceased to be the only educated class, or to possess any marked superiority over the laity, save in their sacerdotal character and functions; their superiority is no longer personal, but exclusively official. The laity having attained to equality in all other respects, their equality must be recognized.

Brownson, at the same time, condemned the despotic power of the bishops in the United States. He did not complain or even charge that this power was exerted by any of them,—that was not a matter which he took upon him to discuss,—but the mere possession of such power is injurious to the clergy, who are more elevated in tone and spirit, more zealous and cheerful in their duty, when protected by the rules of canon law, the normal government of ecclesiastical persons. Hence Americans, who are obedient but not obsequious, are distrusted and set aside, and few but foreigners or foreignized Americans are made priests or bishops. The foreigner or the son of the foreigner sympathizing heart and soul with the foreign colony of Catholics, is preferred as more flexible, and therefore more manageable.* The article, of which the foregoing is a brief summary, was published in the Review for April, 1862, and was very generally condemned by the Catholic journals. The notice in the *Herald and Visitor*, of Philadelphia, contained a personal charge against the Reviewer of so serious a nature as not to be allowed to go unanswered. The charge is referred to in the following answer:

* *The Church not a Despotism.* Works, Vol. XX. p. 215.

ELIZABETH, N. J., April 15, 1862.

To the Philadelphia Herald and Visitor:

Mr. Editor:—You intimate in a brief notice of my Review, in your columns of the 12th inst. that Rome has indicated to me some erroneous opinions advanced in my Review, and yet, though knowing she regards them as erroneous, I have not publicly modified or retracted them. Permit me to say, in this you labor under a mistake. Rome has indicated to me no opinion published in my Review which is *erroneous* and which she requires me to retract or modify. When she indicates any such opinion to me, it will be modified or retracted publicly according to her requisition.

Your inference is not necessary. Rome could be displeased with some remarks I made on the temporal power of the Sovereign Pontiff, and yet not require me to retract them. In those remarks there was nothing against Catholic faith or morals; and the most that could be said against them is, that they recommend a policy with regard to the Pope's temporal principality, which Rome does not approve, or judges it inexpedient to adopt. For such an offence as this, if it be an offence, the promise of silence on my part, is all that can be reasonably demanded. This promise I had publicly given in my Review without its being exacted and before I knew any complaint had been lodged against me at Rome. The Propaganda have asked nothing more of me; and with the general promise to make any retractions or modifications of any views I may have published or may hereafter publish, they expressed themselves satisfied.

Besides I have never opposed the temporal sovereignty of the Pope in the Ecclesiastical States nor urged its surrender, save on the hypothesis that it is already virtually gone and cannot be effectively sustained. Its loss when I wrote I looked upon as an accomplished fact, or likely to be so, in a near future. Assuming this, I suggested, argued, if you will, that the voluntary surrender by the Holy Father of his temporal principality, on the best terms then practicable would contribute more to the political and social interests of the Peninsula, and to the interests of Catholicity, both in Italy and elsewhere, than a prolonged and unavailing struggle to maintain it against the almost universal popular sentiment. I may or may not have been wrong in this opinion but you will not pretend that it is not an opinion which a good Catholic may hold.

You will bear in mind that I never questioned the right of the Holy Father to his temporal principality and never recognized the right in anybody, king or kaiser, prince or people, to dispossess him. I proposed nothing that was to be done without the judgment and consent of the Holy Father himself. He, if he believes it for the interests of religion and society to give up his temporal principality, has the indisputable right to do so. But he is the judge in the case, and in his judgment I and all other Catholics must acquiesce, whatever may be our own private opinions. I never went any farther, and so far I had a right to go; for the temporal principality is not a Catholic dogma or an essential element in the Divine Constitution of the Church. The Church does not stand or fall with that principality. The Holy Father judges, it appears, that it is in existing circumstances

necessary to the interests of religion and society to retain it. My private opinion may remain unchanged; but I must, in my action, yield to his judgment not as infallible, but as that of the supreme court in the case.

You are mistaken in saying that the doctrine with regard to the temporal power of the Pope over the sovereigns I formerly defended is erroneous and disapproved at Rome. I happen never to have asserted any temporal authority for the Pope, save over the temporalities of the church, out of the Roman States. I simply asserted the supremacy of the spiritual and moral order and the *spiritual* supremacy of the Pope as the supreme representative of that order. You will hardly deny this, or pretend that it is disapproved at Rome. It is easy to attribute to a man views he does not hold and get up a clamor against him. But a Catholic editor should seek to be just and truthful.

In conclusion permit me so say that you and many others are quite mistaken in your notions, inferences, and calculations about me, and show as little discernment as charity in your criticism on my lucubrations. Neither you nor your *confrères* will ever succeed in driving me into heresy or schism. You may not always understand me, but have patience and be slow to commit yourself against me, or to create in the minds of an indiscriminating and unreasoning public a distrust of my good faith or my orthodoxy. Never was I more worthy of the confidence and support of Catholics than I am now; never was my Catholic faith firmer, or my filial devotion to the Church warmer or more unreserved. Wait till you understand better what I am aiming at and see more clearly and distinctly the real character of my pro-

ceedings. I know very well what I am about and shall not swerve from the line of Catholic duty marked out for me, whatever the misapprehension, misrepresentation or the unjust criticism of which I may be the subject.

Very truly your obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

The next issue of the *Herald and Visitor* contained an official communication from the Bishop of Philadelphia, the nature of which is set forth in the following letter to the Bishop: :

ELIZABETH, May 2nd, 1862.

Rt. Rev. and Dear Sir:—In the *Catholic Herald and Visitor* of this week I have read what purports to be an official communication from yourself to the Editor of that journal, relating principally to me and to my Review. In that communication you say: “According to his (Dr. Brownson’s) programme, as announced in the January number, we are no longer to rank it as a Catholic Review, or a reliable exponent of Catholic doctrines and principles. We have been constrained, for some time past, to consider its tone and matter as often wantonly offensive, as disedifying to the faithful, and injurious, rather than beneficial, to Catholic interests.”

As to the request or order addressed to your Editor in regard to the course he is hereafter to pursue towards my Review, I have nothing to say, for that is a matter between him and you alone; but you must believe that I could not read without deep surprise your “official” declarations with regard to my Review itself, especially as you had failed to give me any previous information

of your displeasure. You had made no complaint, and given me no opportunity, before publicly denouncing me, to correct any errors I might have fallen into, or to remove the features you in your official capacity held to be offensive. I regret this very much, and it has surprised me very much, after the conversation we had touching the future conduct of the Review, at your house, a little over one year ago.

You say, according to my programme last January, my Review is no longer to rank as a Catholic review. Permit me to say that this is by no means in accordance with my own understanding of that programme. In that programme I state directly to the contrary. I assume the sole responsibility of the Review, not for the sake of relieving myself from responsibility as a Catholic editor, but solely for the sake of relieving you and all other Catholic prelates from any responsibility for what I might write or publish. I avow myself a Catholic, submit my Review to the judgment of the Holy See, and promise to make any corrections of any sort the Holy See may require or suggest; for I recognize her full right to teach and to govern the Church. Will you be so good as to tell me what there is in this or in any other part of my programme that withdraws my Review from the category of Catholic publications, for I assure you I certainly had no intention of the sort?

You say you have been constrained, for some time past, to consider the tone and matter of the Review as often *wantonly* offensive. That the tone and matter of the Review may have been offensive to you and many others I am not disposed to dispute, but will you tell me by what right you say they have been *wantonly* offensive?

The term *wanton*, as you here use it, necessarily implies a moral reproach, and in using it you assume to judge my heart, my intentions, and to condemn them. Allow me to say with all deference and due respect, this is more than you have any right to do. What I have written, I have written deliberately, conscientiously, with pure and just motives. I may have erred, but whatever error I may have fallen into, it has been only an error of judgment.

In a word, Right Reverend and dear Sir, I complain of your denunciation of my Review without specifying in what respects it has offended against Catholic faith, Catholic morals, or Catholic discipline. Your wholesale "official" denunciation may have the effect to crush my Review, and to do me a most serious personal injury; but it gives me no information as to what are my errors, in what particulars I have offended, or what I am required to retract, to correct, or modify. You seem throughout to proceed on the assumption that I am a proud, obstinate, headstrong man, incapable of submitting to discipline, and holding himself amenable to no correction. In this you do me great injustice, or else I am most wofully mistaken as to my own character. If I write or publish anything uncatholic, you have but to show me that it is uncatholic, and I am ready at any time to make the correction required. If at any time, in my conduct as a publicist, I violate any canon of the Church, commit any canonical offence whatever, I am and always shall be ready when that offence is made manifest to me, to make the best atonement in my power for its commission. But you must be aware that vague assertions, vague charges, where nothing particular is speci-

fied, and so shaped that it is impossible to meet them either by confession or a denial, are fitted only to offend my natural sense of justice, without enlightening or correcting my judgment.

I pray you, therefore, Rt. Rev. Sir, either to withdraw your official denunciation, or to favor me with a specification of my offences. Let me know precisely wherein I have offended, what canons I have violated, what laws I have broken, what specific things I have done, which a Catholic publicist is forbidden to do. I only wish to know my duty and to do it. In open questions I claim the right of holding and expressing my own opinions: beyond, I bow cheerfully to the authority of the church, as expressed by her pastors. Show me that I have in any respect gone beyond allowable liberty of opinion or expression, and you need apprehend no pride or indocility, on my part, will prevent me from making the called-for corrections and the most ample atonement in my power.

Perhaps what I ask of you will require some pains, but you owe me amends for your official denunciation of me, before giving me a hearing. Your denunciation may be sport to you, but it is beggary and starvation to me, and mine. You have a right, of course, to protect the rights and interests of religion without regard to me, but not by an act of cruelty and injustice to me, for we may never do evil that good may come. The wrong you have done me is great and irreparable; but I ask you to do what is reasonable and just to prevent it from being any greater.

Forgive the freedom with which I have spoken, and believe me, notwithstanding, a humble son of the church, and your most obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

To this letter the following answer was sent:

CATHEDRAL PHILADELPHIA, May 5th, 1862.

O. A. BROWNSON, ESQ.,

Dear Sir:—The publication of the *notice* complained of in your letter of 2nd inst. was simply a discharge of pastoral duty to the Faithful of my Diocese.

For yourself personally I cherish the kindest sentiments; but I could not pass by in silence the publication of your letter in the Herald and Visitor. I could not of course anticipate your approbation and am sorry that a necessity existed for a measure so painful to my feelings.

I am very respectfully your obedient servant, *

† JAMES F. WOOD,

Bishop of Philadelphia.

There is very little doubt that the Church authorities in the United States and some other countries, honestly believed they were acting in accordance with the wishes of the Holy Father; but there are several indications that Pius IX did not, in the reaction from his

* Lawrence Kehoe, well and favorably known amongst Catholic publishers and booksellers, writing to Brownson, says: "About Bishop Wood's card, I can give you an instance which floors him and his paper. The week after his card appeared, the paper had a notice of a most rascally book, 'The Indian Scout,' I think the name is. It is by a Frenchman. It has a beautiful (??) scene in a Mexican convent, which beats out Ned Buntline altogether. If you say anything about the card in your article, you might say that the next week, the same paper noticed favorably a book that nearly rivals Maria Monk in a convent scene."

early policy,—and that policy was the spontaneous expression of his own judgment and sentiments,—become what was called an *obscurantist*. Mgr. de Mérode was, more than most persons, in the Holy Father's confidence, and the following letter from his brother-in-law is proof that the *Univers* was not a trustworthy interpreter.

PARIS, April 22, 1861.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—I am unwell and overdone with fatigue, but I cannot refrain from thanking you for your most friendly and most useful article on the *Monks of the West* in your April number. I feel most grateful for your kind notice of my book, and also for some new and valuable ideas which I shall try to make use of in a second edition. I send you by this same post my last letter to Cavour. I know you do not quite agree with me on Italian affairs. But I am sure you must be as indignant as I am against both the Piedmontese and the Napoleonic policy. We must never forget that not only Christianity but natural morality forbids *de faire le mal pour que le bien en sorte*. Granted even that an united Italy and a *secularized* Popedom are results to be wished for, or not to be prevented, no Christian, no honest man can approve of the frightful *means* that are employed to bring on that result. But the point on which I most particularly wish to call your attention is this defence of the Pope's last *allocution*, so outrageously and maliciously misunderstood, not only by the revolutionary and anti-Catholic press, but STILL MORE so by the ultra-Catholic papers, both here, in Belgium, in Spain, &c. They go on asserting every day that the Pope has declared incompatibility between the

Church and *Modern Society*, the Catholic faith and political freedom, &c. Nothing can be more false. My wife, who is just returned from Rome, and whose brother, Mgr. de Mérode, is perhaps the most influential man there, says there is not the slightest foundation for such an interpretation. But Rome's great mistake, which she is now wofully rueing, is not in the antiquated wording of her public documents; it lies in the encouragement which she has lavished upon the slavish fanatics who have made her cause so justly unpopular throughout the world, and whose detestable influence has driven such men as Döllinger and Lacordaire to become more or less adverse to the secular powers of the Holy See. This school is more than ever predominant in the French clergy. Mr. Veillot's partial silence has not in the least weakened its hateful sway; its disciples don't care for talent any more than for honor or independence. Such dunces and Nones as Chantrel, Dulac, Rupert, and the every-day scribblers of the *Monde* are quite sufficient to meet the intellectual wants of our clergy who are determined to *ignore* everything and everybody else. Falloux, Broglie, Tocqueville, Foisset, Lenormant, Lacordaire, Dupanloup, are regarded as very dangerous or as if they were not in existence, because they do not belong to the sottish *colerie* which reigns absolute in our 30 thousand *curés*. They are all discontented with Cæsar; but they all dream of an orthodox cæsarism; they don't even quite despair of getting back their cherished Louis Napoleon, *l'homme simple et bon*, as Veillot used to write! I am delighted with your article on *le pape et l'empereur*,* which I deem of the greatest use, not only

* Works, Vol. XII. p. 489.

to your infidel adversaries, who will not read it, but to your Catholic friends, who perhaps will. I refrain from all comments on the state of things in the *United States*, as it is a source of unmitigated grief to me ; your reflections on the subject at the close of the article on the *Monks of the West*, are admirable, but at the same time leave little hope for the future. Let me hear from you, my dear Mr. Brownson, as soon and as often as possible, and let me hope you are well and happy. Believe me ever your most sincerely obliged and devoted friend,

CH. DE MONTALEMBERT.

The letter to Count Cavour, which is mentioned in the foregoing communication, had for its principal object the vindicating of Pius IX from the charge of having, in his late Allocution, declared the incompatibility of the Church with modern civilization, or of Catholicity and liberty, brought against him by the infidel and A Catholic press, and admitted and defended by the principal Catholic journals and a large part of the Catholic clergy. The Holy Father had declared no such thing, and whatever sympathy there may have been at Rome with the old political order, he had said nothing that could commit the church to its preservation or restoration, nothing that implied a condemnation or censure of those Catholics who, like Brownson and Montalembert, had steadily opposed Cæsarism and sought the freedom of the Church in the general freedom of the citizen.

When Leo XIII, in the early part of his reign, knowing that it was not in the power of religion to arrest the tendency of modern civilization by standing aloof from it and denouncing it, nor in the power of this civil-

ization to correct its defects or to elevate its character without the assistance of the Church, placed the Church in harmony with modern society, he excited no such opposition on the part of obscurantists as he would have done had he made "a new departure" in accepting the new state of things that was springing up, to turn it to the advantage of religion, and had his predecessor attempted to involve the interests of the Church in the fate of the old superannuated order then passing away.

Many of the bishops and most of the journals in this country, taking their cue from the French and Italian interpretations of the Allocution, could not but regard Brownson as an uncatholic innovator, and accorded him, as has been seen, less freedom than Rome unhesitatingly conceded. Here is how the French Count expressed sympathy with the Reviewer in the contest :

LA ROCHE EN BRENY, CÔTE D'OR,

le 14 Octobre, 1861.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—I have just received and perused your October number, and I cannot refrain from expressing to you without delay my sincere sympathy for your trials, for the state of things you so feelingly and graphically depict in the first and last articles of this last number. Whatever minor differences may have existed or may still exist between us, you may be sure that I agree with you *ex imo corde* on the most important subjects, and above all, on the principles which ought to lead Catholics in public and intellectual life. From what you say, I perceive that the same detestable spirit which has, since 1851, debased and un-nerved (*énervé*) the Catholic clergy and Catholic public in Europe, is also

flourishing in America; and that, like us, you have amongst you a set of men who do their best to make Catholicism an abomination and an impossibility in the eyes of all those who are not exactly like themselves, more particularly holding up to clerical and lay reprobation *those* Catholics who will not bow down before their spurious oracles. In this they quite agree with the worst enemies of Faith and Christian Morals; the *Siècle* (the great organ of democratic Imperialism and infidelity amongst us) laid down the law some days ago in these terms: that Catholicism such as the *Monde* (Veillot's paper) defines it, is a doctrine to be destroyed if possible, but quite logical and natural, whilst *Liberal Catholicism* was a ridiculous and most vicious anomaly. The revolutionary infidels easily understand that if Veillot and Ventura's doctrines were the only orthodox form of Catholicism, revolution and infidelity would have nothing more to fear in this world, but that Catholicism taking its stand on the ground of modern freedom and modern science is *à la longue* invincible . . .

I am afraid we are perhaps not quite d'accord on Italian matters; I take my stand on the same ground as Döllinger in his last declaration. I look upon the temporal power of the Pope as a necessity in the present state of society, and however devoted I may be to all really *liberal* principles, and popular rights, I cannot admit a portion of the Italian people should have the right to destroy all the old Italian governments, including that of the Pope, because it *pleases* them so to do. But I fully admit with Döllinger, that the Temporal power was in need of the deepest reform, and that such a government cannot and ought not to be carried on as

it has been latterly. I am still more convinced of the urgent necessity of a change in the whole spirit of Catholic policy and Catholic direction in the intellectual and spiritual world. The state of mind, the system of action you so feelingly and so fearlessly denounce, pages 450-454 and 493-495,* is fatal to all the interests which a true Catholic must have at heart. We are fettered down, in our political and intellectual action, by a knot of superannuated trammels which tend to make *fools* and *slaves* of all Catholics in the world, and which have, here in France, during the last ten years, led the immense majority of the Catholic clergy and the Catholic public to become successively the tools, the dupes, and the victims of Imperial autocracy. I much fear we shall not, in our lifetime, contemplate the indispensable change for the better which such a state of things calls for; but I feel sure that such a change must and will take place, that the *ancien régime* must and will be given up in every direction, and that the *dread of intellect* and of freedom, which pervades the Catholic world, will be done away with. We have, you and me and some others, done our best, through much obloquy and much vituperation, to bring about this improved direction of Catholic affairs and to win back something of our mediæval ancestors' energy and resolution. Let us *go on* as long as we breathe here below, helping each other in our arduous task by the tribute of brotherly affection and mutual prayers to our all-merciful Father for the good of our souls. Ever yours,

CH. DE MONTALEMBERT.

* Works, Vol. XX. pp. 112-114; 162-165; and 172-174.

It was a mistake for Brownson to treat the question of the Papal temporal sovereignty, for in the state of men's minds at the time, his remarks were sure to be misapprehended and taken in ill part, and therefore could do no good. He was accused, also, of having changed in regard to the Papacy. At one time, it was said, he was ultra papal, and defending the deposing power exercised by the popes during the middle ages as a power held by divine right, and now he denied the right of the popes to the sovereignty of the States of the Church. He really had not changed in the least with regard to the rights and powers of the Papacy. He never denied the right of the pope to govern as sovereign the States of the Church. He never claimed for the pope any temporal sovereignty, nor any temporal authority over temporal sovereigns, princes, or states. He never asserted for the pope any power but spiritual power; and whatever power in regard to sovereigns he had defended for the pope he had defended it as inherent in the spiritual order and pertaining to him as the divinely constituted representative of that order on earth. Of the limitation or extent of that power, as well as of the time and conditions of its exercise, he at all times maintained that the pope is the supreme judge.

When in 1860 he published the article on the "Rights of the Temporal," it gave offence, was complained of to Propaganda at Rome, and was very generally regarded, if not as contrary to the faith, at least as offensive to the general sentiment of Catholics. The design of that article was not to place the temporal above the spiritual; far from it; but to maintain that as the temporal really exists, and since founded by God, has a

legitimate right to exist, the spiritual, though superior to it and governing it, must govern without absorbing or destroying it. Questions had arisen in this country between the ecclesiastical and secular authorities which made it seem to Brownson proper to discuss the subject. In discussing it he had occasion or made an occasion to speak of the papal states then threatened by Sardinia and the filibuster Garibaldi, and believing that they would be wrested from the Church, he advanced the opinion, that the Holy Father would promote the cause of religion by making a virtue of necessity and yielding those states to the kingdom of Italy on proper guaranties and due indemnification. This opinion may have been right or wrong ; it was only a private opinion, and was in itself offensive neither to the papal authorities nor to the papal dignity, for it was not to be done without the papal consent, and the pope was expressly recognized as the supreme judge in the case.

The article, as originally drafted, was different in several respects from it as published. The writer had maintained that the pope was only a spiritual sovereign in regard to the Roman States. He regarded those states as the patrimony of the Holy See, and held as her temporality. They were held by the general title by which the church holds temporal possessions, and were not held by the pope as a temporal principality of which he was the sovereign, but governed by him as Bishop of the See, on the principle always claimed by the church that she has the right to manage her own temporalities. Property of any kind given to the church becomes spiritual in its destination and use, and therefore rightfully subject to the control of the spiritual authority. But as

the pope, as representing the spiritual authority in its plenitude, can condone the secularization of church property when he judges it for the interest of religion, so he can alienate, for a like reason, the temporal possessions of the Holy See, if he judges it for the good of religion.

The article was submitted to the theologian and canonist designated by the Archbishop of New York to supervise the writer's articles before printing and he rejected this whole theory with regard to the papal states, assured the writer that in canon law they were not assimilated in any respect to church property, and that in regard to them the pope was a temporal sovereign, reigning by a secular title only. As Cummings was a more learned canonist than himself, and was moreover his censor, Brownson submitted and rewrote the article in accordance with his directions and suggestions, which, after being submitted to him again and revised by him, was sent to the printer. Whether Cummings's view, which assimilated the pope in regard to the States of the Church to other temporal princes, and gave him only a secular title to govern them, was right or wrong, it was only through obedience to the Archbishop's delegate that Brownson accepted it; and the passages in the article which gave offence were based on that view, and simply asserted that in regard to his states the pope was merely a temporal prince, and like all temporal princes, held his power as a trust from God through the people, and that it might be revoked at their will. There was in all this no change of view. Brownson submitted on this question to the proper ecclesiastical authority, presuming it to be better informed than himself, as he

might submit to the eminent jurist he had consulted in regard to a civil suit,

It would be easy to go further and show that Brownson's changes were very much greater in appearance than in reality. But looking back on the long career of his life, and knowing how little he cared for the praise of consistency, and how little pains he took to be consistent, the wonder is that he changed in questions of vital importance so seldom and so little; not that he changed so frequently and so much. He maintained through life the same principles, and, since he had faith, the same faith. Before he was a Catholic he had no faith, and nobody ever heard him pretend that he had. He had opinions, some of which he always retained, and some of which he rejected: he wanted faith and sought for it, more earnestly than the world gave him credit for, but faith he had not. Principles he had from his early youth, from his childhood; these he never changed, and these, not opinions, make the man. As a Catholic, not only did his faith remain firm, but in no instance can he be accused of having resisted legitimate authority, or of refusing ready and cheerful obedience to the orders of authority when speaking in its own name. All that can be said is that he constantly refused to recognize newspaper editors or writers as authority, and held that he was not bound to obey where authority refused to assume the responsibility of commanding.

Brownson was accused of having very much changed in theology, though the influence of Gioberti, from the views he defended for the first few years after his conversion. This is not true. The theology he first embraced on becoming a Catholic was that which he

ever after held, though he may not have understood it so well then as he did later. The Jesuit Fathers, with whom he became acquainted created, after 1848, some doubts in his mind, and for several years he inclined to their school, and on several questions disputed in Catholic schools, he accepted too hastily the conclusions of the Molinists. That Gioberti had some influence in bringing him back to the school of his first love is very probably true; but the chief influence was the action of his own mind in seeking to grasp and develop in their relations with natural reason the great principles held alike by all Catholic schools. He was, theologically speaking, in the main, an Augustinian, and not a Molinist. He could not, as he understood it, accept the doctrine of *scientia media*, nor admit that the *status naturae purae*, as it is called, was even a possible state. Consequently, he rejected the doctrine of natural beatitude, or natural end, as he did the natural origin of man. Man's origin and end are alike in the supernatural, that is to say, in God. He had the right as a Catholic to hold these views, and he did so because they seemed to him to harmonize best with Catholic faith; but those who take the views generally held by the members of the illustrious Society of Jesus have an equal right to hold theirs. The questions are, no doubt, important, but they are scholastic questions, not questions of faith, and therefore open questions.

Even in philosophy Gioberti's influence was not by any means so great as generally thought on Brownson's mind. Brownson never professed to have any philosophy or system of philosophy as his own till 1842, and though he developed and regularized his views later on,

he did not change them. He wrote his "Synthetic Philosophy" in 1842, some chapters of which were published in the *Democratic Review*, for 1843; and he called his philosophy synthetic in after years for the same reason that he had done then. He was supposed to have taken that philosophy from Gioberti, but he held substantially the same philosophy in 1842 that he held in 1862 or 1872; and he never read a word of Gioberti and knew nothing of his philosophy till March, 1849. He frankly acknowledged that he had profited much, in the details of his philosophy, in clearing up and systematizing his views, from Gioberti's works, but he derived from them no principle or method which he had not adopted before ever hearing even his name mentioned, and he was not aware that he had abandoned any doctrine through acquaintance with them. Gioberti helped him, as did many others, but never became his master, and he never accepted or rejected a principle through his influence. In his writings generally where their views were coincident, he gave Gioberti the credit of them because he preceded him in their publication; yet in point of fact, neither borrowed from the other. The coincidences were due to the fact that both drew from the same sources, and had similar internal struggles to maintain. They were both indebted to the philosophers of France, and though Gioberti, in other respects, borrowed much from Leroux that Brownson discarded, they arrived at substantially the same philosophical system, very different indeed from Leroux's and from Cousin's, but to which they could hardly have come if they had not studied the works of the French philosophers.

But while it can be asserted that Gioberti was not a master at whose dictation Brownson accepted or abandoned any doctrine of importance in philosophy or theology, his influence on Brownson's tone and policy in other respects is very clearly seen in the course pursued by the *Review* from 1860 to 1864. The Reviewer listened with too great sympathy to Gioberti's doctrine, in his "Primato morale e civile degli Italiani," that there is no necessary antagonism between the church and the world and that it is only a narrow and one-sided view of Christianity that prevents the establishment of a permanent peace between them. The great error of Gioberti was that he sought to make his philosophy and theology the basis of a moral, social, and political system more gentilitic or pagan than Christian. He maintained that, all the works of God being dialectic, the church and the world can be only the two opposite parts of one dialectic whole; and that the great aim of Christian philosophy and theology, and especially of Catholic politics should be to conciliate them, which, in other words, means to harmonize gentilism and Christianity.

Brownson had studied St. Augustine's work on the "City of God" too carefully, and had been taught the principles of Catholicity by Bishop Fitzpatrick too correctly, for his better judgment to go with Gioberti in maintaining that the Church ought to accept the spirit of the age, which is always identically the spirit of the world, as the spirit of Christ. Nevertheless, repelled as he was by various causes from the sympathy of all but liberal Catholics whether here or abroad, he sought to coöperate with them as far as he could without departing from the strict letter of Catholic faith and morals. He

was induced to think that in seeking to remove the prejudices of the outside world, and to win A Catholics to the faith, he should study to make the distance between them and Catholics as short as possible. He wished to find in what they held most dear a basis to support his argument for Catholic truth, vainly hoping thereby to induce his countrymen to listen with less prejudice to the teachings of the Church. Contrary to what he had formerly insisted on, he labored to present Catholic truth, not so much in its strength and integrity, as in a form as little offensive as possible to the spirit of the nineteenth century. He yielded to an erroneous view of expediency, and encouraged a tendency which, had not divine grace restrained him from following it to its end, might have led him into heresy and schism. The policy he followed lost him the confidence of the Catholic public, and produced no other effect among his A Catholic countrymen than the suspicion that he had grown dissatisfied with the Church, and the expectation that he would soon be back among them as before his conversion. He is to be blamed, not because he ever enunciated an heretical opinion, for that he never did knowingly, at least; but because he yielded, against his better judgment, to a dangerous and uncatholic tendency, which has brought upon those who carried it a little further the condemnation of the Holy See, as contained in the letter of Pope Leo to Cardinal Gibbons, of January 22nd, 1899. It was the first, and only, time in his life, since he became a Catholic, that Brownson yielded to a policy of expediency, and forgot that a bold, energetic, and uncompromising assertion of the truth that the most directly opposes the errors of one's age or country is always the best and

only true policy.* The liberal policy emasculated Catholicity without winning the good will of its enemies.

The syllabus of errors appended to the Holy Father's encyclical, *Quanta Cura*, of December 8th, 1864, shows to every Catholic how the Church deals with the world, and those who would conform to it, or follow the so-called spirit of the age. She makes no compromise, no concession, for she is God's Church, and infallible as well as indefectible; indeed could not be indefectible if she were not infallible. The Supreme Pontiff does not, in asserting the irrepressible antagonism between the Church and Liberalism, hold that there is a necessary and invincible antagonism between heaven and earth, between this life and the life to come; and his objection to liberalism is not that it seeks to promote earthly well-being, but that it seeks it as the end of life, and by means that do not and cannot secure it.

Gioberti claims, and rightly, that this world has its place in creation, and as all the Creator's works are dialectic, proceeding from one and the same eternal and unchangeable Reason, it cannot be antagonistic to any other part of the Creator's work. We are placed on this earth, and the work of our daily life relates to it, and should tend to cultivate it, and advance its interests. The religious duties of the mass of mankind must consist in cultivating the land, preparing its crude products, and in exchanging them in the form of merchandise; and political, social, or mechanical improvements which facilitate the acquisition of a proper supply of the necessaries of life are in themselves not bad, and may be desirable.

* A similar error, when he was a Unitarian preacher, is pointed out in his "Early Life," pp. 428-430.

But these things are not to be sought for their own sake. Man does not live to delve. nor live that he may eat; but he delves and eats that he may live. But live for what? Christianity answers that God has made all things for himself; that he is the only First Cause and the only Final Cause, our origin and end; and that the incarnate Word is the only medium of attaining to our end.

Liberalism mistakes the end and rejects the medium, and therefore necessarily fails, both in regard to this life and that which is to come; for the principle of life in all worlds is one and the same. But even if it could, which is impossible, secure the good of this life, it would be a matter of small moment in comparison with the life it loses. The good of every creature, of every life, is in fulfilling its destiny, or attaining to the end for which it was created. This end is God, who is not only our good as our end, but is the supreme good, the good in itself. This end liberalism loses, for it does not propose it, does not recognize it, and it rejects the only means of attaining to it. By living and laboring for this life only, it is impossible to attain to it, for it lies in the 'supernatural order, far above the plane of this natural life, and therefore attainable only by supernatural means, provided in the Incarnation. Hence liberalism invariably and inevitably defeats itself. Every departure from the divine order is necessarily evil, as universal experience proves.

A liberal Catholic is a contradiction to himself; for so far as liberal he is uncatholic, and in so far as Catholic he is not liberal. Brownson, in this sense, was never a liberal Catholic; but the leaders of the obscurantist party term liberal Catholics all Catholics who will not join

them in opposing all freedom of expression, or of action, that would tend to bring men's minds out of the worn ruts of absolute despotism in Church and State, especially in the state; all who labor for any change, however necessary; and all who possess, or give promise of any genius or originality. Reforms are always necessary in every thing human; and though the Church on her divine side is irreformable, her ecclesiastical discipline has always been, and always will be susceptible of reform and in need of it. The same may be said, with stronger reason, of political governments. It is a difficult course for a writer of strong feeling to steer between the dangerous rocks on either side, and not strike on obscurantism or liberalism; but Brownson was no destructionist, and when in combatting obscurantism, he found himself at war with the Hugheses and Spaldings, the Woods and Purcells who governed the Church in America, it seemed that perhaps it would be better to give up his attempts for reform than by urging them, bring about a worse state than that already existing. He even feared that he had gone too far, and in the heat of controversy might be driven into liberalism. He accordingly determined in 1863 to withdraw his *Review* from the field of theological discussion and religious controversy, and to restrict it to those great public questions and general interests of civilization which could be discussed without trenching on any ground debated between Catholics and Protestants. He, layman as he was, could be under no obligation, civil or religious, to write or publish any thing in exposition or defence of his Church, especially as the opposition of some bishops and most of the Catholic newspaper organs tended to destroy any influence

he might otherwise have exerted either on those within or those without the Catholic communion. The *Review* began, therefore, a new series in 1864, called the *national series*.

CHAPTER XI.

M. J. SPALDING.—THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.—PHILOSOPHICAL CORRESPONDENCE.—CATHOLIC INTOLERANCE

ABOUT the time of the beginning of our civil war, Brownson was afflicted with a painful inflammation of the eyes. He first felt it after an evening passed in whist-playing at John Bryan's house in Fifth avenue, New York. Since he went to reside in Elizabeth, New Jersey, he used only lamps with kerosene oil, in the absence of daylight, and no doubt the gas-light was trying to the eyes, and may have been the occasion of the disorder first appearing in those organs. His physician, Dr. Henry S. Hewit, pronounced it gout in the eyes, and when he recovered the full use of his sight, the disease seized upon its usual home in the foot. For the rest of his life, Brownson suffered severely from gout, first in the feet, and later on, in the hands. This explains the frequent allusions in 1861 to his inability to use his eyes, and a dozen years later, to use his hands in writing.

One of his sons, who assisted him in editing the *Review*, and whom he had counted on to lighten his labors, departed for the war when the troops from Mass-

achusetts were cowardly assaulted by the Chivalry of Baltimore in their passage through that town to the seat of government; and his youngest son, then about to graduate, was called home to write the Review at his father's dictation, though he returned to St. John's College at Fordham to pass his examination and get his degree. As soon as his father could use his eyes freely, this son too went off to the war, where after two or three years' service he was mortally wounded, dying in his twenty-first year of age.

This may be called a trying period for Brownson. With his own archbishop denouncing him to Propaganda; almost the entire Catholic press of the country abusing him either for his theological or his political doctrines; the very existence of his beloved country in doubtful balance; and his eyes in such condition as greatly to lessen his power of either writing or reading; it was sometimes all he could do to keep from being disheartened. But he knew that to despair of the republic was not the way to save its existence. Though democracy had had more influence in corrupting the Catholic population than Catholicity had had in forming the people to sentiments and habits of virtue necessary to save and carry on political society, he put his hope in God and his providence. Knowing that men, as a general rule, will not turn to heaven till they begin to despair of the earth, he hoped that the imminent loss of our material prosperity would gradually humble our pride, disabuse us of old prejudices, destroy our confidence in the popular idols we had hitherto worshipped, and dispose us to listen to the words of truth and wisdom, and

to submit to the moral and spiritual discipline necessary to prepare us alike for earth or heaven.

Among the disagreeable things that happened to Brownson at about the same time as those just mentioned, and greatly pained him, was the loss of the Bishop of Louisville's friendship. He always looked on Spalding as one of the strongest in character and most learned in doctrine of our American prelates; and though he thought his efforts to secure equal rights for Catholic education in the United States unlikely to succeed, and therefore unadvisable to put forth, there was on most matters a general harmony between them. But when the Bishop published his "History of the Reformation," Brownson reviewed it, and though praising the "History" very highly, and treating the author with extreme courtesy and friendship, the critic indicated what he thought the author should have brought out and developed in his work, and which he said the author had not done, because writing for the people, he had not attempted to give the deeper philosophy of the Protestant movement. It was Brownson's doctrine that no great movement that is wholly unreal, founded wholly on a falsehood, and sustained by sheer depravity, can ever acquire force enough to carry away large bodies of the people; that all real effective power is in truth, in reality, and the devil is powerful only by virtue of the truth and goodness he misinterprets, misapplies, or perverts; that falsehood derives all its strength from truth, for as pure falsehood it is pure negation, has no bottom, is nothing, and therefore can effect nothing; that no movement is explained by setting forth what in it is false and evil; that we have not explained it till we have shown what it contains that

is true and good. He accordingly wished the Bishop to give the world another volume, in which he should take pains to analyze the Protestant movement, to show what it was seeking that, when separated from the false and the wicked, was true and good. For its causes were various and not the same in every locality; but in most places were considerations and interests which individuals and nations may be moved by without necessarily ceasing to be Catholics. In the complication of matters brought about by political and social changes always going on in society, the church, or rather churchmen, in their temporal interests were found united to and upholding an order of things as necessary to religion, which, however good it might have been in its day, social progress and the wants of the times required to be modified and which with proper understanding and moderation on both sides might have been modified without abandoning anything really Catholic, or assuming a really anti-Catholic position.

Brownson's remarks and suggestions not meeting the Bishop's approbation, the *Louisville Guardian* contained a reply written by that prelate which "we, out of our profound respect to him as a prelate, our high appreciation of his merits as an author, and our gratitude to him as a friend, transfer entire to our pages, without other comment than to request all our readers to buy the bishop's valuable and interesting History, read it carefully, and decide for themselves whether our criticisms are well founded or not. It will give us great pleasure to find that we were in the wrong." Spalding, in his reply, attempts to show that he had omitted nothing which Brownson said should have been brought out;

and says that "this very view of the Reformation is a prominent element," because he proves that it retarded liberty and thwarted sound civilization and he does not know what more he could have added on this very subject. Spalding could not or would not see what Brownson meant. To make the sophism plain, let us suppose that the History had been of the French Revolution of 1789; that Brownson had objected that nothing had been said of Bourbon tyranny and licentiousness and the oppression of the people, that caused an uprising of the nation against wrongs that were no longer endurable; and that the historian answers: "I have taken that precise view; for I have shown that the Reign of Terror did not advance, but rather retard, liberty and civilization." That would hardly be thought an explanation of the causes that led to a movement which had had these results. It may be that a Catholic bishop hesitates to speak, in a popular work, of the real condition of Christendom as it was in the XIV and XIV centuries, and feels that he must write as a partisan; but unless the necessity there was of reform is shown, the attempt to effect it is not explained by showing that that attempt was not successful.

Some of Spalding's remarks on Brownson, in this reply, are a little less courteous than should have been expected from him; but his evident irritation must excuse such expressions as "we fear that something must have occurred to sour his temperament, and to disturb his orthodoxy," and "we could scarcely expect of one who had been so long following implicitly the rush-light of human reason to bend at once, and without reluctance, to the teachings of faith, and to enter into all

the feelings of a simple child of the Church, reared up under her teachings, and imbued, through his mother's milk, or rather through the holy laver of baptism received in infancy, with the docile spirit of a true child of the Church."

Brownson appended to the Bishop's reply, the sentence: "We do not recollect that the elder brother, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, was commended for being angry at the reception the returning prodigal received from his father."

In a country where so many of the prominent Catholics are converts, as is the case in the United States, and where the conversion of those outside of the Church is supposed to be a proper object of a bishop's zeal, it is difficult to reconcile this abuse of converts with wise policy. It affected too many others besides the individual intended. How it appeared to others is shown by a letter of Dr. L. S. Ives, the former Episcopal Bishop of North Carolina, who immediately after reading the Review for April, 1861, wrote: "It is a noble defence of the truth, sound in philosophy, conclusive in logic, and inimitable, except by yourself, in style. Your answer to the silly article of the good Bishop is a *sledge hammer*. It was only deserving of *one sentence*; and that sentence you have given. More would have sacrificed your proper self-respect, and clothed the matter with undue importance."

The examination of Spalding's History and Merle d'Aubigné's, of which it professed to be a review, led Brownson to write his "Essays on the Reformation," * in which he shows the dialectic, not merely the sophistical

* Works, Vol. XII. p. 514.

side of the Reformation, in a calm and Catholic tone, with a spirit of justice, and a comprehension of the movement as a world movement. His wish was to show its truth and its error, its good and its bad, and to fix its real character in relation to the evolution of truth and the progress of civilization. His hope was, by treating the characters of the heterodox with justice and their understandings with respect, to gain from them a hearing in order to recall them to Catholic unity. It is not making a compromise with heterodoxy to recognize in the heterodox some elements of truth and to commend in them what is worthy of commendation. If we bring up our children to believe that Protestants have nothing but falsehood in their doctrines, and wickedness in their practice, the first decent Protestant they meet will convince them of our own want of truth and honesty; for in many things very commendable, and very important to the progress of civilization, there are Protestants who are superior to not a few Catholics. These essays were philosophical, theological, and historical; but at the time of writing them, the author was carrying out the policy of attempting to effect a reconciliation of the Church and so-called modern civilization, somewhat in the sense of those known as liberal Catholics. The spirit of liberalism pervades these, as it does the rest of his writings from 1861 to 1864, and detracts from their value in some degree; but the doctrine he maintains, and the propositions in which it is set forth can hardly be impugned with success, and are as far from that liberal Catholicism which becomes radicalism as from the opposite extreme of conservatism which he termed obscurantism. He took into account man's descending tendency as well as

his ascending tendency, and which finds expression in human society. It is the duty of the clergy to labor to conform society to the Christian type, and consequently to oppose any tendency on its part to deviate from that type or to place obstacles in the way of its realization. They may be right and they may be wrong in resisting society and refusing to go with it, and a discrepancy between the church and society may arise from her resisting abnormal changes, or from her slowness in approving normal changes. Consequently, the clergy are often found behind their age or country, instead of being in advance of it; and are more likely to be so in an age and country when and where the intelligence and education of the laity are not inferior to those of churchmen.

But aside from this, the essays on the Reformation are unsurpassed by anything the author has written, in depth of thought and clear, concise, and philosophical explanation of the revealed dogmas and mysteries, and the main facts of history. The author's plan contemplated a full discussion of the causes to which Protestantism owes its origin and continuance, and a complete investigation of its principles, doctrines, and observances in relation to those of the church. The causes to be developed were ethnical, political, economical, commercial and industrial, and religious and theological. Of these only the first, or the struggle between Rome and Germany, was fully examined; because he found it unsatisfactory to publish a work of the character and extent called for by his original design piecemeal in a periodical, and he intended to complete it and give it to the world in a separate publication.

In the first essay on the Reformation the writer sums up his judgment of both Spalding's History and J. Merle d'Aubigné's, by saying that the latter "proceeds from the assumption of two principles—Divinity and Satanity—in eternal conflict, without any medium of reconciliation or dialectic harmony between them. Being a Protestant, Rome represents for him Satanity, and Protestantism Divinity, and the significance of the great movement of the sixteenth century was God rising up to put down Satan. All his facts are adjusted to this theory, and those which do not tend to sustain it are omitted, misstated, or explained away. The distinguished Catholic Bishop of Louisville, not rising always to the point of view of the Catholicity he professes, and not always bearing in mind that Catholicity is Catholic, and embraces and integrates in itself all truth, differs from the Swiss historian very little, except in assuming in opposition to him that Protestantism represents Satanity, and Rome Divinity. For him, though there were abuses among Catholics that needed reforming, the Reformation was Satanic in its inceptions, progress, and termination. It originated in impatience of restraint, in the spirit of disobedience, in the love of riches, in a craving for license, and hatred of truth and holiness. Its significance for him is as an uprising of Satan to dethrone the Son of God, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, and the Author and Finisher of our faith. He corrects many of the errors and misstatements of his Protestant contemporary, brings and places in a prominent light many facts the Calvinist had neglected or suppressed, but from him hardly more than from his adversary can we get a real insight into or understanding of the Protestant Refor-

mation as a world movement, or production of the *Weltgeist*. From neither, nor from both together, can we get a full, clear, faithful, and impartial statement even of the sensible facts in the case. Neither, in fact, writes history. Each writes as a controversialist, and each introduces only the facts necessary to make out his case, and establish his side in the controversy. One is almost as sectarian as the other, and neither approaches the subject from the real Catholic point of view, and studies it in the light of the Idea, which, as theandric, embraces at once in their distinction and union of all the truth of God and all the truth of man, and whose life is the life of the Church or the regenerated human race. Both remain as far as possible in the sensible region, and the Catholic Prelate makes almost as little account of the theandric Idea and life of the Church as the Protestant Minister himself. . . . We do not suppose we have said anything to which the eminent prelate, whose *History of the Reformation* we have referred to, for he is a Catholic prelate, and far more learned in Catholic theology than we are, would object. We venerate his character, and have heretofore prized, and should still prize, were he not disposed to withhold it, his private friendship. All we permit ourselves to say is, that in our judgment he does not write his history from the really Catholic point of view, and though he is orthodox, as to the dogma, he is sectarian, partisan, in spirit and tone. Also, that he fails to penetrate the external fact, and to seize its methexic sense. We think there is more in the movement than he sees, that it has a deeper and a less unchristian sense than he detects, or than we ourselves had detected in our earlier essays on the subject."

After perusing the first and second essays on the Reformation, the Reverent A. F. Hewit wrote Brownson:

NEW YORK, September 12th, 1862.

My dear Sir:—I have been thinking repeatedly, of late, that I ought to write to you, to express the great pleasure I have found in the speculations on the Trinity and Incarnation in your recent numbers. I was too languid in mind to give my full attention to them when they first appeared. But while at Bridgeport I took them up, with a brain invigorated by exercise and recreation, and I have never yet found any thing more profound and sublime in the whole range of my reading. Dr. Osgood, whose acquaintance I made at Fairfield, was equally delighted with them, and he appreciates the Review generally, very highly. I trust that whatever changes you may make in your Review, you will not discontinue that series of Articles.

I sent the Article "State Rebellion State Suicide" to my aunt, Miss Hillhouse, and I found on calling to see her, that she had been very much pleased with it, and that Prof. Porter had seized on the number as soon as he saw it. Aunt Mary paid me the extraordinary and undeserved compliment of attributing some of your articles to me.

The way is open in Connecticut, as well as in other parts of New England, for the Catholic faith, if advocated by the right men and in the right way, to make great conquests. I have never received so many marks of respect as in my recent visit. Unhappily, it seems as if the clergy generally were alienating themselves more completely than ever from the New England people.

Even Bishop McFarland strikes me now as a thorough European as he is most assuredly a thorough Southerner. It seems as if a strange instinct made every Catholic who is not an Anglo-Saxon by birth and education a hater of both Old and New England. Whatever there is of vigorous, noble, and hopeful life and energy in the intellectual and moral order, seems to me to have its expression in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and that the Catholic Religion, if it would exercise its power successfully must master that element. I hope, if we are to be made the victims of a compromise with the South or submission to her, that New-England will cut loose, and seek a destiny for herself. My brother has gone with McClellan's army, as Director of Franklin's Division. I trust Almighty God will give you the wisdom and courage to persevere to the end in the heroic career which you have commenced. And with respects to Mrs. Brownson and family, I am yours very truly,

AUG. F. HEWIT.

Brownson's philosophical writings in his latter life were so numerous, and treated of such various questions, that an analysis of these essays would be incompatible with the plan of this work; and as they are for the most part published in the second volume of his collected Works, the philosophical reader will be better satisfied to peruse them entire.

One of the philosophical articles that perplexed him the most was the review of Ward's book, of which he says in a letter to a son, October 18th, 1860: "Since finishing my October No. I have been engaged in reviewing Mr. Ward's *Philosophical Introduction to his*

treatise on Nature and Grace,* and finished it only yesterday,—a most difficult and perplexing job. I have, however, I think, written an article of some importance on Intuition and the Principles of Morality. Mr. Ward is my old opponent in the Dublin Review on Development. He has an able, but a very crooked mind.”

Twelve years later, in speaking of the Dublin Review, he wrote: “It is an able and learned periodical, but it lacks the grace, the charm, the vivacity, and unction of its earlier days. Dr. Ward, its editor, is an able man, and we are told, is held by Englishmen to be a great writer and a profound philosopher. We acknowledge his ability and his learning, we love and honor the man; but, some how or other, we can hardly read a page of his writings, no matter on what subject, without having our patience tried, or our irascibility excited, we should say, our pugnacity aroused, and we want to fight him, metaphorically, not literally. He writes good English, we suppose, but he is often well-nigh unintelligible to us. We are frequently at a loss to make out what he is driving at. He describes instead of defining, and fails to reduce his utterances to their principle. He mixes up the subjective and the objective in a most perplexing confusion. Like Protestant writers, he seems to write without unity or catholicity of thought, and to reason always from particulars, sometimes subjective particulars, sometimes objective. His philosophical articles are to us as unintelligible as Dr. Newman’s ‘Essay at a Grammar of Assent,’ of which we can make neither head nor tail. It is our fault, we presume; for we have so long been accustomed to proceed from the

* Works, Vol. XIV. p. 348.

universal to the particular, and to using particulars only as illustrating a universal, or rather, a generic principle, that our mind cannot get out of its old grooves so as to understand the logic that from the particular concludes the universal. In a word, we are not of Dr. Ward's school of philosophy, and we believe the human reason, as far as it goes, sees things as they are, and as they are seen by superior intelligences. Neither do we accept his or Dr. Newman's theory of development * of Christian doctrine; and we believe the Christians of the first century held as *explicitly* the whole Christian faith as we do of the nineteenth century. Yet we like the *Dublin Review* upon the whole. It is perhaps rather John Bullish for a periodical with an Irish name; but we like its bold and manly tone, we respect its learning and ability, we reverence its uncompromising Catholicity, and we feel Catholic science and literature in the English-speaking world would suffer a grave loss without it. We try not to judge others by ourselves, or by what, after all, may be our own idiosyncrasies. If of English descent, we are not English bred, and have been formed, if formed at all, in a very un-English school, at least not in an English school of the present time. The English school of philosophy now in vogue seems to us a cross

* The theory of development, or evolution, which was advocated at this time (1873) by the *Dublin Review*, the *Catholic World*, and Mivart, was summed up by the *Catholic World*, saying, a Catholic is free to hold "that all living things up to man now on the face of the earth have been evolved by natural laws not only from minute life-germs directly created, but even from inorganic matter." This is false; no form of life can be evolved by natural laws, nor by miracle either, from inorganic matter, unless it contains them in principle, in germ, or *causaliter*; and if it does contain them it is organic, not inorganic; otherwise it would be creation, not evolution.

between Locke and Coleridge, and to have originated in the mad attempt against the advice of my Lord Bacon, to apply what is called the inductive method to the study of philosophy, instead of restricting it to the study of the physical sciences alone, as it should be restricted.”*

The peculiarities of Ward's mind are shown in some extracts from his correspondence with the Reverend Robert E. Guy, O. S. B. at that time Prefect of Studies at St. Gregory's College, Downside, near Bath, in England. Father Guy was then writing a text-book of Philosophy in the English language. Though scarcely thirty years of age, Father Guy, or Brother Ephrem, as he was called in the order, was well versed in the principles and literature of philosophy, and Brownson was well pleased with the plan and outlines of his book, which he sent him, and which followed the same philosophy which Brownson had been advocating.

In a letter of August 9th, 1860, Guy wrote:

“A friend of mine [W. G. Ward], who takes immense interest in these matters, and who is at present engaged upon a Theological Treatise of some magnitude—Vol. I of which I hope soon to have the pleasure of forwarding to you—writes to me as follows: ‘My own feeling about Brownson's doctrine is this:—Those whom you call the psychologists, are quite certainly wrong: their philosophy is nothing better than contemptible. On the other hand, Brownson's formula *deserves* to be true; it makes such an admirable foundation for philosophy and is all-sufficient. But I have never been able (to my great regret) to see a *particle* of evidence

* Works, Vol. XIX. p. 591.

for its truth.' I also met this objection in a manual of Philosophy by the Rosminian Pestalozzi. I have endeavored to meet it by showing the absurdity of rejecting the truths of revelation, in case we are believers therein, when we set about philosophizing. Hence, assuming the dogma of creation as a starting point, in the Theodicy I endeavor to show that it is the only reasonable explanation of the connection between Ens and Existentiæ. Am I right? If you could give a few lines to this objection when you happen next to be treating of these matters, good would be done, I am bold enough to predict, in many quarters. He says again: 'Is it or is it not within God's power to infuse into my soul a present impression which is phenomenally indistinguishable from an act of memory, but which is *not* an act of memory? which makes me believe (as I really have believed) that I remember certain things which never did happen? If this *be* possible, then previously to trusting my act of memory I must be assured that it *is* a real act of memory, and not an impression which is *not* memory, yet is phenomenally indistinguishable. If you say, this is *not* possible, then such impossibility has to be proved; and I don't see how the principle of contradiction will help you to prove it. I am very confident myself that the whole view about founding all knowledge on the principle of contradiction is utterly unsound. The "psychologists" are very fond of basing truths upon that principle; but I really believe it quite opposed to Brownson's theory. I should like you to ask him. It would much lower my opinion of his philosophy if I thought otherwise.' This is but the repetition of an objection to which I had answered that,—Memory (which is either of the Intuitive or

Reflective order) is but the retaining (Intuitive) or reproducing (Reflective) past acts of consciousness. These past acts must have been based upon some reality (as he allows every thought to be ego -|- non ego). Hence to say that memory is untrue in her reproductions is to say that we don't remember at all—or rather to say that we remember and do not remember at one and the same time, which is opposed to the principle of contradiction. This he calls a *petitio principii*, inasmuch as I assume that memory is the reproduction of a past perception. The alleged instances (thinking things to have happened which never did happen) go to strengthen his position. The plain truth, however, seems to me still to be this that memory means what I have ascribed to it in the minds of all men, and that the instances are but exceptions similar to such cases as occur in sensible perception, where e. g. we take the pinchbeck (on some occasions) for gold and nevertheless trust our senses as before.*

“He continues: ‘It seems to me that the first which a philosopher has to do is to express the grounds for believing that we may legitimately trust our reason. Even if all truth were derived from the principle of contradiction, this principle itself is only known to be true because *reason* declares it; but this fact would not prove its truth *unless reason could legitimately be trusted*; hence this latter is a still earlier philosophical truth. Scepticism surely is not an accidental question, but one on the solution of which the very possibility of philosophy depends.’ The difference between him and myself appears to be that he makes himself to be the starting point of

* Brownson's opinion is in his Works, Vol. I, pp. 88-90.

his philosophy and to begin with truths that are first known by himself, whereas it seems to me fitting that a true philosophy should begin with those truths which are in themselves first—which have existed long before any thinker could think them. Only then will philosophy be in accord with reality. Only then will it be strictly a science, if by science be understood the building up, going over, or framing ideally what has already been built up, gone over, or framed really. . . . Am I or my friend in the right? You can scarcely imagine the eagerness with which I—and there are many others in a similar case—look for enlightenment on these fundamental points. Indeed I feel it almost impossible to proceed with my studies until I am settled with respect to them. May I earnestly beg of you, dear sir, to favor me frequently with the results of your study of these all important points?

“In conclusion let me assure you of the gratification your note at the end of your Review for April afforded some at least of your numerous English admirers and friends. Yes, sir, you have many such in England. One bishop told me that the whole of our Hierarchy regarded you as a sound and staunch supporter of the doctrines of Holy Church; another, one of the most learned men I ever met, Dr. Hendren, late Bp. of Clifton has long been thinking of writing to urge you to continue your labors in the cause of truth,”

August 12, 1861, Father Guy wrote:

“The friend of whom I spoke in my last is the self-same Dr. Ward whose ‘Nature and Grace’ you have reviewed. I was on the point of forwarding you a copy

of his Vol. I when he told me that he had already sent one. Shortly after your review of it appeared, he wrote me a note upon it which I would forward but cannot lay my hand upon it just now. In it he begged me to thank you for the very kind way in which you had spoken of him personally and to assure you how much esteem he had for you as a good Catholic and powerfully philosophic writer. He has in preparation a reply to his several reviewers, and possibly after this has appeared he will enter upon a correspondence with you about both his Appendix itself and the points you kindly wrote upon in your letter to me which Ward has. I have but just ended a criticism of what he deemed to be the pith of your philosophical doctrines. He drew it up soon after your article on his book appeared—and I need hardly say that in some important points he (to my mind) misunderstood you.

“We are great friends and I only wish you were near enough to join us in our vacation ramble upon his princely estate in the lovely Isle of Wight. He is like yourself a layman, and has a large family. The letters in the Rambler upon Education signed W. G. W. are by him. He has been charged with making light of the intellectual business to be got through in our colleges, but unjustly. No man is more alive than he is to the great want in this respect throughout our Catholic Colleges. He has a house near the Cardinal's (Wiseman) Seminary at Old Hall and taught Dogmatic Theology there, gratis, of course, for seven years.

“Our milk-and-water Weekly Register ran its brittle reed at you for your January (?) article upon the Papal Question. I know many, however, who were delighted

with the able, Catholic, and respectful manner in which you handled the subject. To me, for I have scarcely ventured to give my mind to the matter, the whole business seems an annoyingly vexata quæstio ; but your article expresses more nearly my feelings than any thing else I have met with. Lord Granville was in Rome some year or two back and his wife, a zealous and wonderfully intelligent Catholic,* stuck close to him the whole time to make any explanation she thought required. On his return to England Lord G. said that the Roman system of administering justice was a disgrace to any civilized nation, and Lady G. had not a word to say in defence of it. A friend of mine, in telling me of this, added that so numerous are the offices held by several of the Roman officials that they are obliged to get subs—and some of them most ignorant—to do work cheaply. Yet what McGuire puffs as the parsimony of the R. government towards its ministers may be quite true. Is it not in fact an explanation of the necessity these ministers are under of getting hold of as many appointments as they can ?

“Wallis, the editor of the Tablet, said to me a few months ago, upon mention being made of your name : ‘That’s a man, too, to whom as to Lucas I don’t know how much I am indebted. My mind is formed upon his writings.’ I find that all our colleges read your Review most assiduously. A Professor from Lisbon College even was quoting you away to me the other day right and left. He told me that you were quite an authority there among all. Possibly we in England are more

* Lady Granville was the Duke of Dalberg’s daughter and Lord Acton’s mother.

removed from those pettinesses which so often stand between the eyes of the little-minded (what a large class!) and their own good. When you are dead—God grant the time may be far distant—you will begin to be universally appreciated. We are all the better for truth. Even my little woes do me a world of good. I often think of your great ones as incentives to do the work I have to do in spite of every thing. Consistent principle must ever be at war in this horribly inconsistent world. Ward and myself were having a long chat but a few days ago upon the universality of bothers and troubles, the wonderful differences of opinion upon almost every point between all the eminent men of the day, and the utter hopelessness of gaining any thing in the long run by cowardice.

“The book of which I submitted the skeleton to you has been untouched during the past year. I purpose now setting to work at it after I have been teaching for a year or two. What think you of this delay? About the only work I have done lately has been a collection of passages from St. Austin, whom I am reading through, illustrative of the orthodox doctrine. I could quote passages from him for almost any notable sentence in your writings.

“Have you seen McCosh’s ‘Primitive Intuitions of the Mind Inductively Considered’? Ward almost swore by it a few months ago, and it is certainly an able book. I have at length succeeded in shaking him, and he is now at work with McCosh himself (a Protestant—and according to Mansell ‘the ablest metaphysician of the day’). I want, through Ward, to force McCosh to study and accept your doctrine. It is the only one that can

give him the basis he seeks, and at times his love of truth makes him write as though he already possessed it."

Sometimes, in private correspondence, Brownson's views are set forth in language which to some is plainer and more easily understood than in his elaborate essays; and a few extracts from his letters may be of interest.

To a theological student who is now a well-known Redemptorist, he wrote in answer to some questions or doubts proposed in a letter showing philosophical ability of a high order :

ELIZABETH, July 10, 1860.

My dear Sir;—The difficulty you suggest cannot be solved within the limits of an ordinary letter. Yet it may help you, to bear in mind, that we have immediate intuition of the intelligible only, and apprehend the sensible only through the medium of the intelligible. We apprehend the sensible itself, that is, the sensible thing, not simply its phantasm or representation, but not in itself, or by itself, for it is not intelligible in or by itself. It is apprehensible intellectually only by virtue of the light of the intelligible which illumines it.

Sense as the faculty of apprehending the sensible is not feeling but intellect, and in itself, or at bottom, the same faculty with which we apprehend the intelligible. We must never lose sight of the unity and simplicity of the soul. We must be careful also not to confound the organic affection with the perception of the sensible object. In sensible perception the affection of the bodily organs is a necessary condition of perception, but is not perception. The perception itself is purely intellectual

and in man the basis of sensation is intellection, the reverse of the doctrine of the sensists.

You must also bear in mind that the formula *Ens creat existentias* is not an empirical but an ideal formula, and precedes and accompanies all experience, as its necessary principle and condition. It is what Kant calls an a priori judgment. It is the apodictic element of every empirical judgment, the creation and basis of our whole intellectual life, and precedes every intellectual act, as life precedes every act of life. In that ideal formula we are contained as existences, as thinking existences, if you will, but not distinguished as self, whether as soul or body.

In it we are not told, so to speak, that we are at all, for that is an empirical fact derived from experience, as much as the existence of a tree, a horse, or any other particular object. I do not hold that the primitive intuition is distinctly intuition of ourselves as the predicate, or that the primitive intuition is an empirical intuition or perception at all.

This point is capital. It is because they confound the ideal perception of the terms of the formula with the empirical perception that the opponents of the formula reject it. They suppose we mean that we have an empirical perception, an intuitive vision of God, as the subject and of ourselves as predicate, but this is not our meaning. The judgment is not *ours*, but is the judgment of God presented to us and creating us in the act of presentation existences and intellectual existences. Hence you will understand why I so earnestly maintain that what theologians call *conservation* is a continuous creation.

These considerations, I think, supposing my doctrine to be sound, will go far towards removing the difficulty you suggest. Undoubtedly the formula *Ens creat existentias*, or *creans existentias* is the primum, but not for this are you to suppose that the body must have been formed prior to the creation of the soul. Our first apprehension of our own existence includes soul and body if you will, but I see no difficulty in supposing the generation of the body and the creation of the soul to be simultaneous. The Church you say has condemned the proposition that the soul exists prior to the body. I think she has also virtually condemned the proposition that it is created in corpore jam efformato, for she has defined the soul to be *forma corporis*, prior to the soul then the body can be only in *potentia ad formam*, that is, no real, actual or living body at all, for it becomes an actual body only by virtue of the form, or forma, *idea* in the language of Plato. We must then, it seems to me, hold as of faith, that the generation of the body, and the creation of the soul and its union with the body are simultaneous and constitute but one total act of production. In the first instant of conception we exist as soul and body united. Hence I am able to understand the definition of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady. If we suppose either the soul or the body to exist prior to the other, we could maintain her immaculate conception only in the second instant, as was the case with the older Thomists. But if we suppose the generation of the body and the creation and union of the soul simultaneous, we can understand that she was conceived without original sin, because in the first instant of conception grace filled her whole being. You have only to

suppose the bestowal of the grace, whence she became gratia plena, was simultaneous with the act of conception, or, as I have said, total act of production.

I hold, and in this, the later and better physiologists concur, that in the first instant of conception there exists a human being, a living soul and body, in their union. Hence I reject many physiological notions that have been accepted by not a few of our moral theologians, as well as much of the prevailing medical jurisprudence. As soon as there is conception there is in the fetus a proper human life, not simply an animal or vegetable life as some physiologists picture and hence I hold the procuring of abortion at any period is murder, and should be so treated by the confessor and the law. I am confirmed in this by the definitions of the church, especially the recent one of the Immaculate Conception and my own practical study of embryology.

Now it seems to me, that by assuming the simultaneity of the generation of the body and the creation of the soul, you escape running athwart any definition of the church and avoid the philosophical difficulty you seem to fear. But I do not myself hold that there is any sensible intuition in the primitive intuition, for all sensible intuition is empirical, and supposes the sensitive subject already existing and active. Sensible perception is *our* act, but the primitive intuition, or intuition proper, is not our act, but the act of the Intelligible creating us, and creating us intelligent existences. In it there is the mystery of creation, and we are active in it only as we are active in the reception of life or existence, that is to say, our activity begins with its presentation, for its presentation or the Divine affirmation is our creation. Be-

ing affirms himself creans existentiam and we exist, immediately and in the same act, simultaneously, in the very affirmation itself presents himself as the direct object and we exist intelligent existences. The sensibilia enter into the intuition only as included in existences, in the ideal object, not as a distinct object.

I feel that I have but imperfectly met your difficulty, but I have not space to meet it more fully at present. I am much pleased with your letter, and shall be most happy to hear from you again and often. As you are studying theology, let your theology enlighten your philosophy. Thank you for promising to remember me in your prayers, and believe much honored by your confidence and kind expressions,

Yours most truly,

O. A. BROWNSON.*

J. Henning.

A subject hardly touched upon in his published essays, that of the quality of the human body after the resurrection, is thus discussed in answer to some speculations of one of his sons in a letter dated October 18, 1860:

* One practical application of the doctrine maintained by Brownson that the soul and the body begin at the same moment, is in the condemnation of foeticide. Brownson also, though it seemed out of his line, supported his friend Dr. Gunning S. Bedford in taking with the Professor of Obstetrics "the Catholic side of the question" in the discussion of the Cæsarian operation, and the wanton destruction of foetal life growing out of the unpardonable fondness cherished by too many of the profession for the unnecessary resort to instrumental delivery. "We are satisfied," Brownson said, "that the Cæsarian operation resorted to in season is far less dangerous [than it has usually been represented, and may often be the means of saving the life of the child without seriously hazarding that of the mother.

“Extension Descartes maintains is the essence of matter. Leibnitz denies it, and for good reasons. That it is not of the essence of body, or is only an accident of body, we know from the Real Presence in the Blessed Eucharist. You know you and I disputed on this point when you were translating Balmes. I hold in the main F. Boscowitch’s doctrine, reject the atomic theory, and agree with Leibnitz that substance is *vis activa et semper involvit conatum*. Our bodies in the future state will be transformed, or glorified, made like unto the glorious body of our Lord, which we know was impassible, and encountered no resistance in what we call matter. Yet as what we call extension is simply the force of the body, or the energy of the *vis activa*, there is no difficulty that I can see in supposing it to retain in the future its exterior form or circumscription. It would thus have extension in heaven in the same sense it has here, It is necessary to be on our guard against supposing that even now it is a congeries of molecules. These are accidents, and may be changed, without changing the body, and disappear without its disappearing.

“I see on recurring to your letter that I have not quite met your difficulty. Only the *vis activa remains*, or at least, so we may hold. The blood is separable from the body in one sense, it is true, but not from the living body; otherwise communion in one kind would not suffice. In the living body the blood and the body are inseparable, indivisible, as communion in one kind teaches.

“The body and blood of Christ are indivisibly in the Holy Eucharist, and I am not sure that you have a right

to say that blood is not of the essence of the human body, for the moment you shed the blood you destroy the body, which is properly speaking no longer a human body, but a carcass. Moreover, the soul is *forma corporis*. Yet I am not prepared to maintain that the body is a simple, or rather a single monad or *vis activa*. I see no objection to supposing body is composite, the union of two or more monads, a living union produced and sustained by the union of soul and body. The stigmata which our Lord showed to Thomas, and which he still bore, may be explained on the supposition that his body was not yet glorified, as he had not yet ascended to his Father, or they may be regarded as *habits* of the body, and retained in the glorified state, as are the habits of the soul. We know the soul carries with it its habits, or else it would not retain the sanctity infused or acquired in this life. Why then may not the body retain its habits?

“Heaven I regard primarily as a state rather than as a place, as I do hell. Heaven is not above the stars, any more than hell is under or in the centre of the earth. I will not say that it is not a place, but I am not in the habit of thinking of it as a place. God is here and everywhere, in us and without us. The souls of the departed are not physically at a distance from us. The saints are above us by virtue and beatitude, but they are still near us, within reach of our voices, so that they hear us when we pray to them. Space, and therefore place, is nothing in itself, and what we call space is only the relation of existences to one another, and simply designates the relative degree of their respective forces. The distance of two existences from one another is not a distance of

place, but the difference of their respective forces. Equalize in all respects the *vis activa* of each, and there will be no space, no distance between them. In this sense we must understand the differences of orders in heaven. All participate of being, of God both as first cause and as final cause, and their difference is in the different measures in which they participate, which comes at last substantially to what you say, only you speak as an ascetic and I as a philosopher, or speculative theologian. Whether all souls are created equal or not, all souls do not attain to equal virtue, and therefore all do not participate in an equal degree in God their final cause or beatitude, and hence the difference in the degree or measure of their happiness.

“Your main difficulty, it seems to me, grows out of some remains of the old doctrine or false notion of space, and from regarding heaven as a place, instead of regarding it as a state. Space is the different degree in which existences, spiritual or material, participate in being, that is in God as first cause, and the different degrees in which we participate in him as final cause, or the different degrees of our virtue and happiness may be called *moral space*. In some sense space may be considered as being in heaven or eternity as well as on earth, though not time, because in heaven there is no change or vicissitude.”

That Brownson accepted Gioberti's formula, to express what various philosophers, from Aristotle to Cousin, had taught to be the categories of reason, or the simple enunciation of what we know and what we can know, was right enough; for nobody will deny that we know and can know nothing else; but in his first fervor

on finding the formula he had long sought for, he was more grateful to the Italian than was perhaps requisite. He already had it in the first words of the Bible and of the Christian creed. There was much that he liked and that was true in Gioberti's works, and much that he disliked and was abominable to him; but he often spoke of Gioberti in terms that tended to make his reader interpret him in Gioberti's sense when that was far enough from his own meaning. Brownson says expressly that he found the Italian interpreting his formula in a pantheistic sense, whereas the American philosopher understood it in a sense that refutes pantheism.

The influence of Gioberti had much to do with Brownson's tendency for a time towards liberalism, and his anxiety that the Church should more nearly conform to modern civilization. This, combining with his sympathy with Montalembert and Lacordaire in Europe, and Hecker and his friends here, and also the changed attitude of many of our bishops and priests in his regard, must have tended to bring his feelings into accord with his views of the policy he was pursuing. His position in 1862 was uncertain, and so far as his Catholic friends were concerned, he was under a cloud. He could easily have dissipated that cloud; but not without abandoning the work to which he purposed devoting what remained to him of life and strength. He was attempting to gain, what he lost when he became a Catholic, the ears of his own countrymen. He had theretofore had few but Catholic readers, and them mostly Irishmen and irishized Americans, between whom and Americans proper there was very little in common. They had praised him, but they had seldom understood him. He availed himself

of the condition of our national affairs at that time to address the American public at large, and to get the honest, intelligent, and fair-minded outside of the Church to read something on Catholicity. To succeed in this he believed it necessary to recognize the modern spirit, and accept it as far as possible. He had very decided convictions on the subject, and he feared that it would never be possible to make Catholics accept modern liberty, as he and his friends understand it, till there should be no longer a prince-bishop, and the Holy See no longer be under the necessity of supporting a superannuated policy in order to save its temporal sovereignty.

His Review had lost about two-thirds of its subscription list. But about half of his losses were occasioned by the rebellion of the southern states, and the greater part of the other half, aside from his circulation in Great Britain and Ireland, wholly stopped by the failure of his London publisher, was due to the stand he had taken against negro-slavery; for our Catholic population were very generally opposed to abolitionism, and disposed to favor the Rebels. Bishop Bailey, of Newark, in which diocese Brownson resided, was his personal friend, and sustained him, without precisely sympathising with him. He had confidence in his orthodox intentions, but confessed himself disposed to distrust men who philosophize. But what could Bailey and other bishops who felt as he did, do to remedy the evil arising from Catholic tolerance in matters of faith and intolerance in matters of opinion? Would not anything they might say serve but to make it worse? American Catholics labor under grave difficulties. The government leaves them free discussion, but public opinion establishes a censorship almost as

injurious to free and independent thought as the government censorship in most European states. This is peculiarly the case with our English-speaking Catholics. They are not satisfied with the restrictions imposed by the Church, or to leave us the liberty she leaves us ; but they would bind us down in matters not of faith to their own peculiar opinions, to those extra-Catholic traditions which originated in the worst of times, and which are at war with the altered condition of Catholics and Catholic interests, They are intolerant, not in matters of faith, where they should be intolerant, but in matters of opinion, where the broadest liberty should be held sacred.

The consequence of this intolerance was that Brownson was forced to follow along the old beaten track, confound all questions, religious, political, social, philosophical, or find himself isolated from the great body of his Catholic countrymen. This was a very sore evil while it lasted, and which time alone could cure.

Relying on authority for their faith, there seemed to be among the more devout portion of our Catholic population a disposition to rely on authority in everything else. As a body, they lacked self-reliance, and seemed to fancy that there is no religion out of the monastery or nunnery. They did not think for themselves, did not inquire into the nature of things and act from rational conviction, but from impulse, passion, caprice, or fashion. Hence it was impossible for Brownson, unless he would belie his principles and his convictions, to discuss any matter of practical importance without running foul of some prejudice or passion. It is the necessary result of the conflicting elements of which

Catholic life in the United States is made up, and the reconciliation of these elements is apparently as far off now as it was then, and perhaps is destined to be perpetual.

CHAPTER XII.

BUCHANAN.—SLAVERY.—SECESSION.—DISLOYALTY OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

As President of the United States, Mr. Buchanan was as patriotic and constitutional in his administration as any of his successors, with the single exception of Mr. Cleveland, and perhaps as much so as any of his predecessors since the second Adams. That he was wanting in the force of character and strength of judgment which ought to be desired in a man in his position, was deplorable, but not surprising to any one who had seen the Clays, Calhouns, and Websters, set aside for the Harrisons, Polks, and Pierces; and even as far back as Mr. Van Buren's term, Brownson had foretold that never again would a statesman of the first order be chosen President.

What Brownson greatly regretted in Buchanan was to find him acting as the president of a party, and bringing the whole force of executive influence and of party machinery to bear on and to crush every member of his party who believed himself in honor and patriotism bound to depart from some of his measures; and to see him dismiss honorable gentlemen from office for not sup-

porting his favorite candidates in state or municipal elections. The president has no right to interfere in elections, and to do it in the interests, not of patriotism but of party, is bringing into our elections a foreign element which has no business there, and to injure political purity and independence. It is incompatible with the maintenance of liberty, of a wise and just policy for a state, to substitute a race of selfish, timid, crouching party slaves kept in or whipped into the party traces through fear of losing or never gaining office, of losing all political standing and influence, in the place of high-minded, independent men who will stand by their honest convictions, and pursue what they hold to be just and honorable.

The strength of the Democratic party lay in the southern or slave-holding states, and it was the knowledge of this, and the desire to strengthen the party that decided the President's policy towards Kansas. The free-labor system and the slave-labor system are mutually irreconcilable, and neither can tolerate the other. One or the other must dictate the policy of the government, or there will be two distinct and hostile peoples. Since Mr. Jefferson's election, the slave-system had for the most part of the time been suffered to govern the country. But the interest of free labor, so depressed in all the slave states, where it durst not even complain, seemed now resolved on asserting its independence and its supremacy. As Mr. Seward said, it made no difference whether the action of congress on the Kansas imbroglio was regarded as the last defeat or the first victory of the free-state party; no new slave state could be admitted into the Union.

“Free labor,” wrote Brownson, in the first half of 1858,* “is destined to no more defeats. What then will the slave interest do? Submit it cannot, for it must rule the government, or be ruined. Slavery is so interwoven with the habits and manners, the whole social and private life of the South, that emancipation is out of the question, and moreover, is not at present desirable for the mass of the slaves themselves; and under a government that consults the interests of free labor alone, slavery becomes ruinous to the masters. The contest for ascendancy has come, and the battle cannot any longer be evaded by declamations, either against the abolitionists of the North or the so-called ‘Fire-Eaters, of the South. † These extremists, as you call them, are extremists only because they better represent the real tendencies of their respective parties than the moderate, *via media*, or so-called Union men.”

As to the secession of either the free states or the slave states from the Union, he wrote at that time: “The dissolution of the Union is an event that I have never allowed myself to contemplate even as possible. I know no right that a state has in or out of the constitution to secede, for it cannot secede without a breach of faith,—certainly not, unless it has the formal consent of the other states, parties to the Union. That consent will never be obtained. Only the weaker and defeated party

* *Conversations of Our Club*, Works, Vol. XI p. 372.

† With all their boast of chivalry, the redoubtable Butlers and Toombses of the south showed far less of real courage, of true bravery, in those days, though they blustered and bullied, and called themselves “Fire-Eaters,” than Seward, and Sumner, and Hale, and their associates who led a disunited and unsympathizing North so unwaveringly against them.

will ever dream of seceding, and being the weaker, it will not be suffered by the stronger to secede. Threats of secession may be thrown out to stay the encroachments, or assumed encroachments, of the ruling interest, but I do not think there is a state in the Union that would not shrink from the difficulties of carrying them into effect. . . . Secession cannot be effected peaceably, and I do not believe it can be by force, or against the force that would inevitably be brought to bear against it, especially as the army and navy would remain under the command of the federal government."

Brownson relied somewhat on the non-slave-holding population of the slave-holding states, who constituted the great majority of the inhabitants of those states, recognizing that they had even less interest than the free population of the North in sustaining slavery; but that he was mistaken in this was proved by subsequent events. He also relied on the influence of the ruling classes in the free states, who, however much they might for political reasons favor free-soilism, were really interested in sustaining slavery, and would support no legislative measure seriously hostile to it. Boston, New York, and Philadelphia were hardly, if any, less interested in sustaining slavery than Charleston, Mobile, or New Orleans; for it was directly or indirectly interwoven with the interests of the whole country, and its abolition would derange the business and social relations of the free states hardly less than of the slave states themselves; and from this he concluded that the slave system was in no immediate danger, but was quite able to protect itself, and therefore there would be no sufficient ground for secession.

But the Democratic party, under the lead of Buchanan, presumed too much on the endurance of the Northern people. The "squatter-sovereignty" theory of Douglas, that although Congress had no power to legislate in favor of or against slavery in the territories, it might confer the power so to legislate on the people of the territories; Chief Justice Taney's opinions and arguments by which he explained that the court had no jurisdiction in the Dred-Scott case; and Buchanan's course in the Kansas affair, had driven from the party many of its supporters, who had too much common sense to believe that Congress or any other body can give what it doesn't have; too much sense of justice not to know that the presumption of law is in favor of freedom as well as innocence, and that odious laws, laws restricting freedom and natural right, are to be strictly construed; and also too much honesty to accept as the constitution of Kansas the manifest fraud presented to congress by the Lecompton convention.

The Democratic party was still further weakened by the withdrawal of most of the southern delegates from the Charleston convention in April 1860, and the consequent nomination of two Democratic tickets. The Republicans at Chicago very wisely proclaimed their main policy to be opposition to slavery in the territories on constitutional grounds.

Brownson at first thought he could support no one of the four candidates seeking election as president. He certainly could not vote for Douglas with his doctrine of popular sovereignty, or Breckenridge and the Lecompton fraud. In common with all the descendants of the original colonists, he was conscious of the sentiment to

which the American party under the leadership of Bell and Everett appealed; but the remedy which that party proposed for an evil which every American deplored was likely to prove far worse than the disease; and even under its best aspect the party was narrow-minded and bigoted, and its platform too weak and too narrow for a full-grown man to stand on. There then remained the Republican party, the main plank in whose platform was acceptable; but it included the greater part of the northern fanatics, abolitionists, philanthropists, total-abstinence advocates, free-lovers, free-religionists, and women's rights men, as well as opponents of slavery extension on constitutional grounds, and had in consequence thrown over Mr. Seward for Abraham Lincoln.

Brownson summed up his views of the Republican party in his Review for July, 1860, in these words: "As far as it has Whig antecedents we are not hostile to it; as far as it is the Free-Soil party under a new name, we have no sympathy with it. In its opposition to the further extension of slavery we believe it right and just, and go with it heart and soul, but in the respect that it proposes to prevent its further extension by Wilmot provisos, or congressional action, we dissent from its policy, for we regard such legislation and provisos as unconstitutional. Inasmuch as it is a sectional party, though in reality no more so than the Democratic party, we are not pleased with it. Its position on the question of slavery is too far one way, while the position of the South is too far the other way. On the question of slavery, like the Democratic party, it is partly right and partly wrong, and is preferable to the Democratic party only in the respect that it is not pro slavery, and if we must violate the con-

stitution, or usurp for congress powers not conceded it, it is better to do so in favor of, than against, human liberty. Aside from the slavery question, the Republican platform strikes us as in the main not objectionable and free from the filibuster element that we detect in the platform of the Democratic party, and by no means necessarily commits the party to the ultra-democracy we so earnestly oppose. Yet the elevation of the party to power with Horace Greeley as one of its most influential leaders, without a southern state or the hope of obtaining the vote of a single slave-holding state, unless the little state of Delaware, is a serious matter, and one must think twice before he makes up his mind to support it. It is not the secession of the southern states, or the dissolution of the Union we fear, but the want of a proper conservative element. We do not like to have power as now wholly in the hands of the South; we should dislike equally to see it exclusively in the hands of the North. We should regret the defeat of the Republican party, for that would involve the triumph of the slave interest, and subject to it the policy of the government; and we should regret its success, for that would open the door for the reappearance of political abolitionism. The candidates of the party are not such as we prefer, but perhaps they are better than the Democratic party will support. Turn the question which way we will, which side in or out, up or down, it has an ugly look, and whichever of the two parties accedes to power, we must expect trouble, confusion, and not much good to compensate for it." *

* *Politics at Home*. Works, Vol. XVII p. 119.

As the time for voting for a president drew near. Brownson was led by his devotion to the Union, against which the Southern politicians declaimed fiercely, to enter the political arena, and made speeches in support of the Republican party. He writes to his son in France, October 18, 1860, "I have taken a slightly active part in election. I go for Mr. Lincoln of Illinois, the Republican Candidate, who will without much doubt be our next president. Horace Greeley and I both addressed a political meeting the other evening at the Port. The Democratic party is very much divided, and has two candidates in the field, Douglas and Breckenridge. The Americans have Bell of Tennessee and Edward Everett for president and vice-president, but their leaders fuse, some with Douglas and some with Bell. The South threatens terribly, but will submit. Tell our friends in Europe to have no fears for the Union."

The state of the country a few months after the election is thus briefly described by him: "The closing days of Mr. Buchanan's administration, which had managed to bring the country to the brink of ruin, were gloomy and sullen, and we were disposed to take a somewhat desponding view of the crisis in our national affairs. The Republicans, who had triumphed in the election of Mr. Lincoln, were apparently divided among themselves as to the course the new government should take, there seemed nowhere, either North or South, any decided attachment to the Union: and rebellion was as openly avowed, and almost as fiercely defended in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, as in Baltimore, Charleston, and New Orleans; there was a general distrust of the officers of the army and navy; traitors were every-

where; wisdom, energy, patriotism, nowhere. The gulf states pretended to have seceded, and had formed a provisional government under the name of the 'Confederate States of America.' North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, if not Kentucky and Tennessee, it was known, were ready to withdraw from the Union the moment that it was clearly ascertained that they could no longer effectually serve the cause of rebellion by remaining in it. Arkansas was pledged to the confederacy, and there was a strong secession party in Missouri. A confederate army was organized, and the rebels had plenty of arms, taken from the forts and arsenals of the United States. The treasury was empty; the credit of the government was low; and the feeble federal army and navy were so dispersed as to require months to concentrate them, or to render them of any efficiency in supporting the Union. A long peace and a general belief that wars on this continent were no longer to be apprehended had left our militia without effective organization, and, for the most part, nothing more than the mere raw material of soldiers. The great bulk of the people seemed to be wholly engrossed in trade and speculation, selfish, and incapable of any disinterested, heroic, or patriotic effort. What wonder, then, that we were despondent, without hope for the future?" *

When Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated, in March, 1861, Brownson was as much opposed to the abolition of slavery where it then existed, by the act of the Federal Government as he was to its extension by such act to territory where it had not a legal existence. While satisfied that chattel slavery was an evil, and a greater evil

* Works, Vol. XVII p. 121.

to the slave-holding population than to the slaves themselves, he did not believe it the only evil in the country, nor perhaps the greatest evil. He was no more satisfied with the constitution of society at the North than he was with its constitution at the South. He had voted at the last election with the Republican party, but not with it as an abolition party, and he had no sympathy with that wing of the party which hailed its success only as a means of abolishing slavery. He voted for it chiefly because he was satisfied that the Democratic party was rotten inside and out, as recent developments had proved, and because the North had submitted long enough to the disunion threats of the South. The real curse of the country was in its sectarianism and its democracy. Universal suffrage he declared to be one of the best hits the devil had ever made, and any people who attempted to make it the basis of their institutions sure to go to destruction.

He urged upon the new administration a Union policy, and to cut itself loose from the abolition and ultra-democratic section of the party that had elected it. He cared nothing for Chicago platforms or any other platforms except the constitution. If the administration was to save the country at all, it could do so only by planting itself on broad conservative principles, placing the Union, the wise, just, firm, economical administration of the government above all questions relating to slavery, either for or against it. Its first step should be to disavow in its acts and measures the democracy that was ruining us, to disavow the revolutionary doctrines and principles defended by the American press generally, to assert the authority of the government, and prove that

it respected itself, and could make itself respected. If to arrest the revolution, vindicate the insulted flag of the Union, and assert the majesty of the law, it became necessary to suppress armed insurrections and hang traitors, let it perform its constitutional duty, for civil war could not be worse than no government.

But the face of the country was suddenly transformed. At the first news of the rebel attack on Fort Sumter, in April, 1861, militia regiments offered their services, for immediate emergency, and within six weeks from the fall of Sumter, a land force of 150,000 volunteers was organized, armed, and equipped, and as many more would have cheerfully responded had the government been willing to accept them. Ships of war were recalled, a powerful fleet fitted out, and nearly all the ports of the rebellious states effectually blockaded. Party lines seemed obliterated and divisions healed, our flag was displayed from the public buildings, the churches, and almost every house, and the only audible cry of the northern people was: "The Union, it must and shall be preserved." The exhausted treasury was replenished; and despondency yielded to hope, many, and among them the Secretary of State, predicted the suppression of the rebellion within ninety days.

Brownson's views with regard to the controversy between the states have been frequently adverted to in this and former volumes. No man, according to his ability and influence, had done more to prevent the spread of abolitionism, or to defend against fanatics of either section of the Union the constitutional rights of the South or slave-holding states. From 1828 down to the outbreak of the rebellion, he never faltered or

wavered in his defence of state rights, or in his opposition to centralism or consolidation. He was the personal and political friend of John C. Calhoun, and for a time defended even his doctrine of nullification. His sympathies had always been with the South, and his warmest personal and political friends had been in that section of the country. But he had always been attached to the Union of the states, and felt that his loyalty as a citizen was due to the federal government. He had always looked upon the several states as integral parts of one common country, and patriotism with him meant love to the whole country under the jurisdiction of the federal government, and was not restricted to his native state or to the state of which, for the time being, he happened to be a resident. He had always regarded the federal government, though a government of express and delegated powers, as possessing, within the sphere of its constitutional powers, the character of a real government, vested with true sovereignty. He had never admitted the actual right of any state to secede from the Union, and the doctrine of nullification, which he at one time held, he had disavowed as long ago as in 1847.*

Though opposed to the abolition movement, he had never approved of slavery. Regarding slavery as a local institution existing only by municipal law or usage, he had always treated it as a subject over which the Union had, in the ordinary exercise of its powers, no authority, and as lying in our political system wholly within the jurisdiction of the state in which it was established. In his political action he always insisted on

* Works, Vol. XVI. p. 45, note.

leaving it to the slave-holding states themselves, to be disposed of as they should judge proper. But as a man, as a philosopher, as a Christian, and as a statesman, he had always been opposed to it. He had regarded it as a flagrant violation of those fundamental rights of man on which our republic professes to be founded, no less than of that brotherhood of the human race asserted by Scripture. He believed it wrong in principle, mischievous in practice, a grave evil to the slave, and a graver evil to the master. He had always believed it a grievous moral, social, and political evil, and hence he had always been opposed to the extension of its area, and wished to circumscribe it within the narrowest limits permitted by the constitution. He had believed it more important to maintain the union of the states under the existing constitution, and more in the interest of liberty, than to seek the extinction of slavery by unconstitutional action, or by the political interference of the citizens of one state with the institutions, domestic or social, of another. As far as slavery could extend itself legally under the constitution, he had always deemed it his duty to refrain from interfering with it. The great majority of the people of the non-slave-holding states held the same views; they detested slavery, and regretted its existence within the limits of the United States; but had always been willing to discharge to the letter all their constitutional duties towards the slave-holding communities of the South, and notwithstanding all the provocation and insults heaped upon them by their southern brethren, they were still prepared to discharge faithfully all the duties in regard to slavery that any fair and honest interpretation of the constitution imposed upon them.

In an article on *The Great Rebellion*, published in July, 1861,* the Reviewer proves that the rebellion of the southern states was treason, and without excuse on their part, and that the federal government was in the right in the war for the Union,—a truth universally conceded in these days, but at that time needing to be demonstrated. Though fully convinced that the United States would be successful, he did not expect them to succeed without a long, severe, and bloody struggle. In this he differed from the administration, but was right in his prediction. As to its final effect on slavery he ventured no prophesy; but, although the war was not engaged in with any intention of putting an immediate end to slavery, but solely for the purpose of vindicating the constitution, enforcing the prevailing laws, and preserving the Union, a protracted and embittered struggle must result in the liberation of the slaves. For himself, he did not seek this result, for he saw not what disposition could be made of them, if emancipated. But while he disapproved of all attempts to excite the negroes to insurrection, he distinctly protested against the employment of federal troops in its suppression, or any assistance in restoring fugitive slaves. Leaving the slaveholders to employ their own forces to keep their slaves in subjection would diminish their strength; “and if, in order to preserve the Union, it is necessary to allow the slaves to emancipate themselves, we shall not grieve, but shall be much better pleased than we are with the necessity under which our fathers felt themselves, in order to found the Union, to bind themselves to give up to his owner a fugitive slave.”

* Works, Vol. XVII. p. 121.

Writing, in August, an article for his October number,* Brownson says: "Events march, and men who mean to be successful, or not to be left behind, must march with them." The disasters of the first Bull's Run and of Wilson's Creek went far to prove that Mr. Lincoln had undertaken an impossible task, and that it would be necessary for him to choose between the preservation of slavery and the preservation of the Union, and Brownson stoutly maintained that, though the majority of the people in the free states shrank from this issue and believed it might possibly be averted, no extraordinary sagacity, or foresight was required to perceive that if the war was to be continued it must become a war of liberation, and that the North would demand in return for its blood and treasure the emancipation of the slaves and the universal adoption of the free-labor system.

"Certainly," continues Brownson, "we said in the article on *The Great Rebellion*, the North has not taken up arms for the destruction of negro-slavery, but for the maintenance of the federal government, the enforcement of the laws, and the preservation of the Union. This is true. The liberation of the slave is not the purpose and end of the war in which we are now engaged. The war is a war against rebellion, an unprovoked and wicked rebellion, engaged in by the rebels for the purpose of making this a great slave-holding republic, in which the labor of the country shall be performed by slaves, either black or white; and if, to defeat the rebellion, the destruction of slavery be rendered necessary and be actually effected, it will change nothing in the character or pur-

* *Slavery and the War*, Works, Vol. XVII. p. 144.

pose of the war. It will have been necessitated by the rebellion, and the rebels will have only themselves to thank for the destruction or abolition they force us to adopt in defence of liberty, the Union, and the authority of the government." *

This is plain and explicit and cannot be misunderstood. An extract from a letter of Dr. M. L. Linton, dated St. Louis, 16th October, 1861, will show how it was misrepresented: "That slavery should be abolished if its abolition be necessary *as a means* to the restoration of the Union and the dominion of the constitution, no good Union man of intelligence will deny. Those who regard the perpetuation of negro-slavery as of more importance than the Union itself are neither Union men, nor patriots, nor even good men, according to my 'ideal' of good men.

"I have just read in *The Herald* what purports to be a review of your article by Archbishop Hughes. I do not believe that the Archbishop wrote the review. It falsely states the issue, by accusing you of advocating the war as the *means* of abolishing slavery, whereas you advocate the abolition of slavery as a means of conquering the rebels *and thus* ending the war. The article in *The Herald* treats the question of slavery as though the nation were at peace and not in the midst of a terrible war. In short, it is a miserable article, and a disgrace to its author. If the Archbishop wrote it, 'how are the mighty fallen !!'

"Your article has been republished in St. Louis in pamphlet form and will do good. I am sorry that the *Truth* has compelled you *to be so severe* on some of the

* Works, Vol. XVII. p. 146.

Catholic clergy, and laity too. I have grieved over that fact that there are so many secessionists among priests who have sworn to support the general government. It looks to me like perjury. I should not like to be *shriw'd* by a secession priest. Would you not have thought that Catholics would naturally be on the side of the Union?"*

The part of Brownson's article which Linton refers to as severe on some of the Catholic clergy and journals should be read in this connection. "We have from the first," the article declares, "maintained, and with the fullest approbation of the Catholic authorities in this country, that Catholic morality enjoins upon all Catholics, whatever their rank and dignity, to be loyal to the legitimate government of their country, and to be ready to defend it, when called upon, at the sacrifice of their property, and even of their lives. That the federal government is the legitimate government of the American nation, no Catholic can reasonably doubt. We may as Catholics, lawfully resist tyranny or usurpation, but we cannot conspire to overthrow a legitimate government, which has not transcended its constitutional powers, or resist its authority, without failing not only in our civil, but in our Catholic duty. The federal government is no usurpation; it is a legitimate government; and it has never lost its legitimacy by any act of tyranny or

* The N. Y. Tribune said of Hughes's communication to the *Herald*, "which has undertaken the task of fostering controversy and division among the people of the loyal states," that it is "an attempt to parry the blows which Dr. Brownson powerfully deals at Slavery and Rebellion, by scurrilous attacks upon him personally. Such a mode of treating this grave question is, in itself a confession, on the part of the friends of Secession, of their incapacity to meet Dr. Brownson in fair debate."

oppression. No such act has been or can be pretended. Rebellion against it, therefore, is not only a crime, but a sin. The principle here asserted is that which we defended for years against the revolutionists in Europe, and it has been on the ground that such is the teaching of the Catholic religion, that we have repelled with indignation the charge brought against us by Know-nothings, that Catholics are not and cannot be loyal American citizens. We have labored, in opposition to the Know-nothings, to show that Catholics are bound by their very religion to be loyal; and we have ventured to assert that, if the republic were threatened, or attempt made to dismember the Union, Catholics would be the first to rush to its rescue, and the last to desert it.

“The assertion we ventured has not been entirely justified. The conduct of our Catholic population, especially that of their leaders, has not wholly answered our expectations. Of the twelve journals in the English language, published in this country, and professedly devoted to Catholic interests, we can name only *The Catholic*, published at Pittsburgh, and *The Tablet*, in this city, as decidedly loyal. *The Telegraph and Advocate*, published at Cincinnati, is occasionally loyal, and so also, perhaps, is the *Buffalo Sentinel*. *The Metropolitan Record* was, when last we read it, striving hard to be on both sides. All the rest are really secession sheets, and exert, whether avowedly or not, all their influence against the federal government, and in favor of that of the southern confederacy; for we count every journal favorable to the secessionists, that opposes the war, and clamors for peace. Of the clergy, the greater part of whom have been born or educated abroad, a large

majority have southern sympathies, and a portion of them, a small minority, we hope, are decidedly disloyal. The Bishop of Charleston, South Carolina, sang, we have been told, the *Te Deum* over the fall of Sumter. Much allowance, no doubt, must be made for bishops and priests residing in rebel states, and it would be too much to ask them to proclaim on all occasions and under all circumstances Union sentiments; their silence may often be excusable, and sometimes justifiable. Still they are bound by their religion to instruct their own people in their duty of fidelity to the government of the Union, and they have and can have no authority under that religion, or in consonance with it, to hold disloyal sentiments, denounce the loyal states, and sing *Te Deums* over the defeat of the government to which they owe allegiance. The bishops both of Charleston and of Richmond appear to have done this, and if they have done so, no reverence or respect for their episcopal character should be allowed to excuse their treason, or make us hesitate to charge them with violating their Catholic duty, and doing all in their power to justify the Know-nothings in their grave charges against the loyalty of Catholics. Catholic morality is as obligatory on priests and bishops as it is on laymen, and from its obligations they can neither absolve themselves, nor be absolved even by the pope. The right of the supreme pontiff to absolve from their oath of allegiance the subjects of a prince who, according to the law of God and the constitution of the realm or empire, has forfeited his right to reign, we have uniformly maintained, and still hold; but we have never maintained, and cannot maintain, that he has the right to absolve from their allegiance the subjects of a prince

who holds his power legitimately, and has done nothing to forfeit his trusts; and certainly we cannot concede to simple bishops and priests a power which we do not and cannot concede to the supreme pontiff himself. We do not, in such a case, deny the absolving power to their chief in order to claim it for them." *

The Archbishop of New York not only reviewed the article on *Slavery and the War* in the New York Herald, but also published in his "official organ," *The Metropolitan Record*, of October 12th, 1861, an elaborate discussion of the same article, and must have written it within a week after the letter to Brownson contained in the ninth chapter of this volume. Owing to the writer's position among Catholics, Brownson thought proper to take notice of the Archbishop's answer to him, even though it was contrary to his usual practice to reply to criticisms of weekly newspapers, and in spite of warnings from friends.† Replying to the Archbishop's article,

* Works, Vol. XVII pp. 156-7.

† One of his best friends among his contributors, the Reverend Edw. Putnam, of North Whitesfield, Me., wrote him in April 1861, "I humbly, but earnestly, trust you will not be led into controversy with a certain dignitary, at whom a severe passage in your last article seems to be pointed. He is formidable as an adversary, because of the measures he may be provoked to employ to your pecuniary disadvantage. He may be above this; and it may be that you yourself have already 'counted the cost'; but I entreat of you for the love of Jesus Christ, to have patience for the infirmities of those whom God has appointed to the high places, and whatever scandal may come, to be able always to declare that it has not come through you.

"If this advice seems presumptuous, do not think that any dictation is intended, but impute it to the over-solicitude and jealous affection of your grateful friend."

Dr. Henry S. Hewit, wrote from New York, October 16th: "The Archbishop, is *wroth*—in fact savage; and if times had not changed, you and the Review would probably have the pleasure of contributing to the brilliancy of a wood-pile in full blaze."

he said, "it has the stamp of his peculiar genius, the well-known characteristics of his somewhat original mind and is what we should expect him to write on the subject discussed." In fact, Brownson knew that the article was written by Hughes, though not signed by him, and his authorship was gravely disputed by some of the public journals, for various reasons, which, however, he thought neither weighty nor conclusive. "They proceed on the assumption that the article, or the chief portion of it at least, is a defence of slavery and an apology for the slave trade; and therefore conclude that it could not have been written by him, for no Catholic archbishop would or could defend the one, or apologize for the other . . . His authorship has also been denied on the ground that its style is deficient in that dignity and classic purity always to be presumed in the writings of an archbishop, and is a close imitation of the 'slang and billingsgate' of the *New York Herald* than could be expected in a writer who for years was on no friendly terms with its editor, and persistently refused to suffer a copy of it to enter his palace. But this imitation is not close as is pretended, and even if it were, it would not necessarily be conclusive against his authorship. The man who writes not merely to prove that he is a fine writer, but to produce an effect beyond his personal glory, adapts his style to the understanding and tastes of those he seeks to influence; and it may be said in the archbishop's defence, if he indeed wrote the article, that he was writing in the columns of a newspaper, and for a public whose taste and judgment had, to a great extent, been formed by the *New York Herald* and kindred journals."

He did not, he said, accept the sympathy of those friends who pronounced the article "a brutal attack" upon his Review, for it was not written against any principle or doctrine he had set forth or maintained, which was true in fact, because the principles and doctrines ascribed to Brownson in that article were so distorted and falsified that they were no longer his. Thus Hughes wrote "Dr. Brownson maintains that the end and purpose of the war is not, or at least should not be, merely to sustain the constitution, government, and the laws of the country, but to abolish slavery in the southern states," that is, beyond sustaining the constitution, government, and laws, the war should be prosecuted for the abolition of southern slavery. "This proposition," Brownson replies, "he undoubtedly controverts; but his assertion that it is ours must be regarded as made in his character of a newspaper writer, and be taken in a newspaper or 'Pickwickian' sense; for he knew very well that we had maintained nothing of the sort."

With free use of sarcasm and irony, at times playfully, and anon with severe condemnation, Brownson examines the different points of the archbishop's article one after the other, and while apparently aiming to refute the charge that Hughes was advocating slavery and the slave trade, quotes the passages which the charge was founded upon, but contends that the archbishop must not be understood as his language implies, because in that case "the writer has unquestionably incurred the interdict pronounced by the church, for she not only excommunicates all who are actually engaged in the traffic, as he alleges, but 'absolutely prohibits and interdicts all ecclesiastics and laymen from maintaining that this traffic

in blacks is permitted, under any pretext or color whatsoever; or to preach or to teach in public or in private, in any way whatever anything' in its favor or extenuation." * Brownson concludes his remarks on the Archbishop's strictures in words that clearly express his feelings as to the relative importance of suppressing the rebellion and of liberating the slaves of rebels, by saying that, though Hughes and many others differ from him in policy, "We think them wrong, very gravely mistaken in their policy, if they are really in earnest to put down the rebellion, and save the integrity of the nation. Not otherwise do we believe it possible to save the national life, and secure a peaceful and glorious career for American civilization. But we can believe that these people are as honest in opposing as we are in advocating the liberation of the slaves, and as far as they will engage in downright earnest to defend the Union, and crush out the rebellion, we are ready to accept them as loyal citizens, and to work heartily with them. The life of the nation is at stake, and the salvation of that is now our supreme law. We must, in the forcible language of Cromwell, 'secure the *being* of the commonwealth, before proceeding to discuss its *well-being*.'" †

A few days after the publication of this article Hughes said to Brownson, with a meaning smile, "I will never write any thing against you again."

The Archbishop's article was translated into French and published in Veuillot's paper; but his explanations, as made to some anti-slavery gentlemen in Paris seemed to take from it the meaning that most readers found in

* Gregory XVI, Bull of November 8, 1839.

† *Archbishop Hughes on Slavery*. Works, Vol. XVII pp. 179-210.

it. He went to Europe on a mission from the state department and left this country so hurriedly that he had no opportunity of consulting any of the bishops in regard to it before his departure. On his arrival in Europe he wrote Cardinal Barnabò that his mission was one "of peace between France and England on the one side, and the United States on the other;" for there was danger of the former powers recognizing the southern confederacy, and even of their giving it open support.

The Archbishop further wrote: "I made known to the President that if I should come to Europe it would not be as a partisan of the North more than of the South; that I should represent the interests of the South as well as of the North; in short, the interests of all the United States, just the same as if they had never been distracted by the present civil war. The people of the South know that I am not opposed to their interests."

Of all the friends of freedom in Europe none was more zealous and efficient than Cochin, Mayor of the Tenth Arrondissement of Paris, and one of the contributors to the *Correspondant*. Here is a letter from him on the subject.

PARIS, 25 Janvier 1862, 25 rue St. Guillaume.

Monsieur:—Absent de Paris jusqu'au commencement de ce mois, j'ai eu le regret de lire très tardivement l'article que vous avez bien voulu écrire dans le *Quarterly Review* d'Octobre [*Slavery and the War*], à propos de mon livre sur *l'abolition de l'esclavage*.

Je ne puis vous dire assez combien j'ai été reconnaissant de l'honneur que vous me faisiez, et en même

temps quelle satisfaction j'ai éprouvée, en voyant une voix aussi estimée que la vôtre, parmi les Catholiques Américains, s'élever nettement et énergiquement contre l'esclavage.

Aussi, grande a été ma surprise, lorsque j'ai été prévenu que deux articles avaient été publiés dans le *Monde*, sous le nom de Mgr. l'Archevêque de New York, dans le but de combattre votre article ; plusieurs journaux n'ont pas manqué d'en conclure que ce respectable prélat et ce journal, repandu dans une partie du clergé, étaient favorable à l'esclavage . . .

Il m'eût été plus pénible encore que cette mauvaise cause fut défendue par un prélat aussi éminent et aussi respecté que Mgr. l'Archevêque de New York.

Mais précisément, Mgr. Hughes était à Paris; il m'a reçu avec la plus grande bonté ; il m'a expliqué qu'il n'avait signé aucun article, ni donné à qui que ce fût l'autorisation de traduire les pages du *Record*, en les lui attribuant. Sans doute, il réproouve les excès des abolitionnistes, il souhaite que les catholiques ne se divisent pas sur la question de l'esclavage, il pense qu'on ne doit aborder et résoudre cette brûlante question qu'avec prudence et patience ; mais il regarde, autant que vous et moi, l'esclavage comme un fléau, comme une injustice et une inhumanité. Mgr. l'Archevêque a bien voulu m'expliquer son sentiment de manière à me donner toute satisfaction, en même temps qu'il m'inspirait pour sa personne autant de respect que de reconnaissance.

Félicitons-nous donc, Monsieur, de constater que tous les cœurs chrétiens sont unis sur cette grande cause, quelles que puissent être leurs dissidences natu-

relles sur les moyens de la servir. Au lieu d'élargir ces dissidences, montrons qu'elles sont secondaires, et ne cessons pas d'élever la voix, et de grouper toutes les voix que le ciel et la terre peuvent entendre, contre le fléau de l'esclavage. Je l'ai tenté pour ma très petite part, et je vous remercie d'avoir si puissamment secondé mes faibles efforts en les accueillant avec tant de faveur et de sympathie.

Agréez, Monsieur, l'assurance de mes sentimens les plus respectueux et dévoués,

AUGUSTIN COCHIN.

It is true that the writer only reports Hughes as denying that he *signed* the article in the *Metropolitan Record*; but there can be no doubt that the impression he meant to convey was that he had not *written* it; and Brownson so understood it when writing to Montalembert he alluded to it in the course of his letter.

ELIZABETH, N. J., April 11, 1862.

My dear Count:—I owe you a return for two most kind and interesting letters, which I have neglected to answer, partly because my eyes prevented me from doing so with my own hand, and partly because I had no heart to do so till I could find some assurance of the preservation of free institutions in my own, my dear mother country. Fighting with us is not yet over, but I think I can assure you that the life and integrity of the nation will be secured, and that liberty will come out from the conflict triumphant, purified, and strengthened by the trial.

The trial came none too soon, and Providence has sent it in mercy. A few years, as we were going on

and it would have been too late. There would not have been virtue enough, public or private, to save us. As it is, we have but barely escaped defeat. The struggle is not yet over, and it will be some years before things settle down into a normal state. Yet two things you may count on as determined, the utter extinction of negro-slavery at no distant day, and an effectual check for a long time to come, of revolutionism and ultra-democracy. We shall be a more sober, and less extravagant, a wiser, and I trust a more amiable people than we have heretofore been. I may be deceived, but I have hope of my country, and that I shall not have hereafter to blush for her before you Europeans.

I find by a letter from your friend, M. Augustin Cochin, that he has had an interview with the Archbishop of New York, and that the Archbishop left upon his mind the impression that he was not the author of the article against me, translated for *Le Monde*, and that he is a decided anti-slavery man. The Archbishop wrote, that is, dictated the article in question. Of that there is no doubt, and it was written for the express purpose of checking the anti-slavery sentiment of the country, and to bring the pro-slavery prejudices almost universal among the Irish Catholics of this country to bear in crushing me and my Review. The Archbishop is a man whose word cannot be relied on, and he remembers to speak the truth only when truth best serves his purpose. I know him well. But he is old, broken in body, and enfeebled in mind, and though he is determined to ruin me, I pray to God to keep me from harboring any uncharitable or vindictive feeling towards him. It will take

half-a-century to repair the evils he has done and is doing to the cause of Catholicity in this country . . .

O. A. BROWNSON.

The Bishop of Wheeling, R. V. Whelan, wrote December 14th, 1861, in reference to sending "payment for the coming year—a step which I have not taken without hesitation, nor without entering my protest against the articles on what you are pleased to call the 'Great Rebellion.' Both of these articles abound in sophistry, false and unfounded assumptions, and arrogant assertions unworthy of a Review supposed to be Catholic in tone and purpose. Portions of them would better suit a publication under Red-republican direction; indeed would not misfit a Marat or a Robespierre." At the same time, a young priest of the same diocese, J. T. Sullivan, when ordering the Review stopped, wrote: "The Robespierian spirit which formed the most conspicuous feature of the article 'Slavery and the war' was of itself sufficient to induce me to discontinue for the present and permanently if the same unchristian, inhuman spirit should continue."

On the other hand, Brownson was more favorably judged by a woman of a higher order of mind than either of these, Sister M. Eulalia (Pearce), who wrote from her Academy of Mt. de Chantal, near Wheeling: "I am not surprised that your changing conviction should deprive you of the confidence of superficial thinkers and readers. Your position as a Reviewer, during many years forced you on various occasions prematurely into contact with the public. A powerful intellect, united with a kindly sensitive nature and deep tenderness of heart,

requires the operation of time to maintain its ascendancy in a sovereign degree: for this you could not afford to wait; and this reflection supplies me with the key which opens at once a heart and brain so hidden from the common gaze. In all your fearless suggestions, painful probing, and unsparing irony, I saw neither pride nor ill temper, but a passionate yearning to draw into the fold of Christ the brave souls and noble intellects groping in darkness and sighing for the light with which we were illumined, and a generous swelling of indignation at the obstacles wantonly thrown in their way by the children of light. With the same spring of action urging me on, I knew but too well what it was to look around with dismay at the intellectual stagnation among Catholics, and I could not behold without the warmest sympathy your unremitting efforts to stimulate thought in serious literature, or theology. Intuitively aware of the course you had marked out for yourself, the hostility you incurred inflicted upon me the bitterest of pangs. I have known something of what it is to travel in seven-leagued boots amid a company of snails, even though *some* wear cassocks and *some* a mitre, therefore my feelings became identified with your own, and never for a moment could I share the doubts of those who sadly prophesied the shipwreck of your faith. Ever warm in your defence, I of course had to share your obloquy, and when at times bewildered by the sinister forebodings of those whose station, piety, and learning commanded my veneration and esteem, I would seek in vain in your writings for a corroboration of those fears, I would go before the Blessed Sacrament and implore for you strength and courage for your soul in proportion to your terrible trials.

Thank God, I was right, and by the mysterious conduct of Divine Providence you have given in your own person a fuller and more glorious testimony of the power and divinity of Catholicity than the accomplishment of your and my dream could possibly have effected."

Much rude language was used on both sides. "Politics makes strange bed-fellows" at the best of times; but the passions aroused by our civil war estranged good friends and harmonized bitter enemies. In Charleston, S. C., Lynch and Thornwell* were almost like brothers. The Catholic Telegraph, of Cincinnati, edited by the Archbishop's brother and Dr. Rosecrans, called Brownson an infidel, and lauded the Presbyterian champion (Thornwell) as a teacher of orthodox politics. It similarly denounced James F. Meline for defending the Union in a controversy with that paper. The conduct of the reverend editors of that journal in the Meline controversy is well set forth in the following extract from a letter of the Bishop of Erie, a straightforward man who meant what he said. Writing to Meline, April 2, 1861, Bishop Young says: "A very long time has passed since I have been so much mortified and grieved as I have been by the course of the *Telegraph* in aid of treason. I could not conceive what madness had seized the editors. I had thought of addressing them a remonstrance, but I was restrained by fear of losing my labor. You may believe then, that I hailed your effort with great satisfaction. But my mortification has been intensified by the answer to your argument. The editors ought to know that personal abuse does not weaken any one's reasoning but his who uses it. The Christian

* See *Brownson's Middle Life*, p. 15.

Religion is upheld by a man I don't like, therefore it is false! Such an argument is unworthy a doctor in theology or a lawyer who uses it in your case, I don't like you, therefore your argument, no matter how plausible or forcible in the hands of another, is in yours of no force.

"I confess I have to some degree shared the prejudices of one of the editors against you *from his representations*, but I must admit that he has put himself into your power more completely than I could have anticipated. His greatest enemy can hardly have wished to see so humiliating a spectacle. But as you love your Religion, pray don't draw from him any further exhibitions of this sort.

"When thirty years ago I was connected with the Telegraph, Father Bruté used to reprove us sharply and frequently for mentioning Protestant preachers with any commendation, even as mere *litterati*. You can conceive his indignation, if alive now, at the praise bestowed on the rabid anti-popery libeller, Dr. Thornwell (see Brownson, 1848, p. 452).* His 'calm and dignified pamphlet' is of a piece with his book against Popery, for logic hardly worthy to be praised by a logician, much less by a theologian or a patriot.

"I would wish to avoid any admixture in your mere personal quarrels, though as a patriot, on every fitting occasion, I am bound to assert the right. My testimony is due to you, and I cheerfully render it, but with the request you make no public use of it without consulting me, at least such as would seem to put me into an unfriendly attitude with the editors or 'the head of the dio-

* Works, Vol. VI. p. 519.

cese,' whereas while grieving over their unfortunate position, I am still their friend and anxious to rescue them from it."

Meline had written Brownson a day or two before : "MM. les rédacteurs appear to have taken leave of their senses, denounce me as a bad Catholic—a very naughty man—and issue a quasi excommunication by denouncing me by name.* The 'head of the diocese' approves all these proceedings."

Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore, rendered good service to the cause of loyalty when many of the clergy of his diocese broke away from the customary reading of the "Prayer for those in Authority" at high mass on Sundays and Holidays by issuing an order that it should be read without "addition, diminution, or change," and inflicted a severe blow on the secessionist feelings of a large number of his Catholic friends.

The Bishop of Philadelphia, having some time previously withdrawn his condemnation, his "official organ," the *Herald and Visitor*, took advantage of the appearance of the number for October, 1861, to make what it intended to be an advance towards peace, and was as much so as was consistent with the editor's natural flippancy. As the key-note of its article of October 19th was given in all likelihood by Bishop Wood, if he was not the writer, one or two extracts from that article are here inserted.

"This number," it says, "has attracted unusual attention. The *Christian Advocate and Journal*, of New

* Meline's articles had been signed "A Catholic," and he kept his incognito till after confiding his identity to the editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, McMaster informed Hilton of Cincinnati, who communicated it to the *Telegraph* editors.

York, the ablest and probably the most widely circulated of the organs of the self-styled evangelical press, has endorsed the number somewhat, the Reviewer somewhat more, and the article on slavery somewhat most. Horace Greeley, a man of marked talent and notorious eccentricity, has placed Brownson in the first rank, nay, as the very first of all Catholic writers who use the English language. The Tribune copied almost the whole of the fourth article of the Review [*Slavery and the War*], and recommended it to the attentive study of statesmen and politicians, to Protestants as well as Catholics.*

“This is reputation enough for one number; but it is only the beginning. The ‘Evangelical Press’ reëcho the voice of the *Christian Advocate*. The Free-soil, Abolition, and Fourierite organs repeat in varying but accordant notes the song of the *Tribune*. The number is a success; and Brownson ought to mark October 1st with a white bean, and weave a laurel crown on its every annual return. May he have many a laurel thus to weave! May he have many beans yet to count!

* This refers to what was published in the *N. Y. Daily Tribune* of October 9, 1861, viz: “We devote a large portion of our pages this morning to the reproduction of a remarkable article from Brownson’s Review upon the mutual relations of Slavery and the War. It is, of course, from the pen of Dr. Brownson himself; and, like every thing which proceeds from this ablest of all the Catholic writers who use the English language considers the subject from the standpoint of a Catholic philosopher and theologian. Dr. Brownson discusses his theme in its varied aspects with a sincerity of conviction, an elevation of thought, and a force of logic which must command the attention and the respect even of those who are unwilling to admit his conclusions. He contends that emancipation is the only means by which the pestilent cause of the war can be reached and cured, and by which alone the republic can surely be rendered homogeneous and permanent. While this argument is presented in a manner more particularly intended for readers of the Catholic Church, it is at the same time so broad and so imbued with earnest patriotism that thinking men of every persuasion, and still more, statesmen of all parties, will do well not to overlook it.

“The Catholic papers are not quite in harmony with each other, and far less with ‘Advocates’ and ‘Tribunes’ on their cantatas on the last number of *our* Review. The *N. Y. Tablet* is gentle, apologizing, and for the first time condemnatory. The notice in the *Tablet* ought to soothe any wounded feeling its criticism might cause. It shall have the effect on us, which was evidently intended for all its readers. We shall ‘set down naught in malice’; far more we shall be (as ever we have been) kind to the Reviewer, and kinder for the *Tablet’s* gentle words.

“The best notice of this number, as far as we have read, is that of the Pittsburgh *Catholic*. It is brief, manly and kind. It is a summary of objections and approvals, well and clearly stated; and concludes by urging us all to take and *pay* for the *Review*. Unfortunately, the *pay* has not been what it should have been; what it would have been had talents and learning such as Brownson’s been devoted to any cause less than Catholicity.

“Of the unkind notices, some are bitter, some extravagant. An able and keen criticism appeared in the *Metropolitan Record*; an onslaught in the *Mirror*; a thrust in the *Pilot*.

“Amid these conflicting opinions of friends and foes, we have drawn our notions of the present number of the *Review* from itself. We have entered into this detail because Dr. Brownson makes himself so large a portion of his remarks, that we could not more kindly treat his personal presence in his own pages, than by saying how his contemporaries bowed before him, or refused to bow.

"Of *Slavery and the War* we have nothing to say. It is out of our line, and free ground for those who choose to enter into its consideration."

CHAPTER XIII.

DISLOYALTY OF CATHOLICS.—PIUS IX'S INTERVENTION.—
BROWNSON NOMINATED FOR CONGRESS.—CHARLES SUM-
NER.—EMANCIPATION.—STATE RIGHTS.—LINCOLN.—FRE-
MONT.—ROSECRANS.

It was a sort of traditionary understanding that Catholics in this country must support the Democratic party, and quite a number of Catholics threw up Brownson's Review, at the end of 1860, not because it supported the Republican party, for it did not; but because its Editor, in his private capacity as a citizen, it was understood, preferred that party to any of the other parties who had presidential candidates in the field. Now, men of different political parties might, perhaps, very reasonably require the editor of a Catholic review to refrain from making it a partisan review; but was it essential to one's Catholic character that one should vote the Democratic ticket, especially when, as in 1860, it was exceedingly difficult to decide which was the Democratic ticket? and is a man required by virtue of his Catholicity to do what he can to injure the Catholic who chooses to vote another ticket? It has been observed that Catholic Democrats are the most intolerant proscriptive Democrats in the world, and populations trained under Catho-

licity, when they break out for popular liberty, as in the old French Revolution, and the Italian Revolution in 18-48, go to an extreme that shocks universal humanity. Brownson denied that, in order to be a good Catholic, he was required to set this fact down to Catholicity, and hoped that without impeachment to his Catholic spirit he might set it down to other causes, and conclude that this intolerance, this despotism in the name of liberty, was due neither to Catholicity nor to Catholic training. Were the facts on which our adversaries relied to prove our religion despotic and the grave of every species of freedom, of Catholic origin, and to be defended by Catholics as strictly Catholic, or was he at liberty to distinguish them from Catholicity, and condemn them as uncatholic?

The Know-nothings, a few years previously, had demanded the exclusion of Catholics from every office, on the ground that Catholics are not, and cannot be loyal to the Republic, and in case of war are more likely to side with its enemies than with its friends. If it had been the settled purpose of Catholics to confirm this charge, they could have taken no different course than they actually took, by sympathizing openly with the southern rebels and with the institution of slavery. In New York, where there were more Catholics than in all the rebel states put together, the mass of them were followers of Fernando Wood and James Brooks, and James McMaster, who defended slavery and encouraged rebellion apparently out of hatred of "Puritans" and "Yankees" who were anti-slavery, as much as for any other reason. Indeed, Brownson said that if he had not been a New-Englander by birth and descent, or if he

had been willing to denounce his Puritan ancestors as a set of palm-singing hypocrites without a single virtue, he would have been a great favorite with Catholics, and if he had been willing to make his *Review* a tender to the New York *Freeman's Journal*, he had no doubt that McMaster would have been a staunch Union man; for "he is," he said, "a man incapable of acting from other than personal or sectional prejudices, and we have sometimes fancied he would rather go *below*, than enter heaven with a Yankee, or as other than the chief of his clan."

"In vain would Catholics cite our *Review*," wrote the editor, "for though that has been uniformly loyal and true to the government, the enemies of Catholics could easily prove that in being so it lost the confidence of the Catholic community, and was interdicted by the Bishop of Richmond [McGill], denounced by the Bishop of Wheeling [Whelan], and officially declared by the Bishop of Philadelphia [Wood] and the Archbishop of Cincinnati [Purcell] to be no longer a Catholic review. In vain should we appeal to the *Telegraph and Advocate*, the New York *Tablet*, and the *Pittsburg Catholic*, for these journals have not been uniformly anti-slavery or decidedly loyal, and at best are only exceptions, and by no means fair exponents of the sentiments and opinions of the Catholic body in the United States. In vain should we appeal to the large number of Catholic volunteers in the army, for that number, as large as it has been or even is, we are told by Archbishop Hughes, is not relatively so large as is the proportion of Catholics to the whole population of the loyal states, and besides, it may be said that the mass of them volunteered not from loyalty,

but for the sake of the high bounties and liberal pay offered, and in the case of the Irish, for the purpose of acquiring military experience and distinction, to be turned to account in a war against Great Britain for the liberation and independence of Ireland. Should it be so said, we should find it difficult to prove the contrary. It is undeniable that no religious body in the country stands so generally committed to slavery and the rebellion, or as a body have shown so little sympathy with the effort of the government to save the unity and life of the nation, as the Catholic. This fact is known, and we need not be surprised to find it some day made use of to our prejudice ; besides, it is not a legacy we should like to bequeathe to our posterity."

The position of our Catholic population was not improved by the letter of Pius IX, in October, 1862, to the Archbishop of New York, calling upon him and his associate bishops to do all in their power to dispose the government and people to make peace, and to put an end to the further effusion of blood. This was all the rebels demanded, and would have been tantamount to a surrender on the part of the government to its enemy. As Brownson remarked, the secession of the southern states war put on quite another footing from the secession of the Pope's own provinces ; as though Catholicity taught the duty of allegiance to an individual ruler, but not to the laws and constitution of a lawful government that was republican in form. "We revere," he said, "the paternal care of his Holiness for our country ; but we must be permitted to say that he cannot require the nation to surrender its rights and dignity, and voluntarily, even for the sake of peace, consent to dismember-

ment. We have not learned that he has himself as yet consented to the secession of his Æmilian provinces, made peace with Victor Emanuel, and recognized the Kingdom of Italy. His Holiness must be well aware that we are doing only what his own government attempted when it raised the Irish legion and collected all the military forces it could, and placed them under the command of the brave and accomplished General Lamoricière. His government would have recovered his seceded states and brought them back under his temporal authority, if it had been able, and we presume would do it to-morrow if it had the requisite military force. The popes have, in times past, waged more than one war, against their rebellious subjects or vassals, for the recovery and maintenance of the integrity of the Roman State. When the Holy Father was asked, for the peace of Italy, and the interests of religion, to resign his temporal rights, with ample indemnification for their loss, he answered, *Non possumus*. He said he could not do it without violating his oath and betraying the trust he had received from God, through the church; he surely then cannot complain of our government if, when asked to consent to national dismemberment, it answers, *Non possumus*; we cannot do it without violating our oath and betraying the trust we have received from God, through the nation. The bishops from all parts of the world, assembled at Rome last year, in an address to the Pope, warmly applauded his conduct; and how can our American bishops disapprove a parallel conduct in the case of our government, since, in both cases, the question concerns the temporal sovereignty alone?

“Our filial reverence for the chief of our religion, and our high-toned views of the papal power, which we have never hesitated to assert and defend, and which are well known to our readers, do not permit us to regard with indifference such a letter as this which is ascribed to his Holiness, if assured of its authenticity. We cannot treat as of no importance the Pope's recommendation to peace, for the mission of peace is peculiarly his as the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. But we are certain that the letter published as his in the newspapers either has been forged in his name, or has been solicited and obtained on a gross misrepresentation of the actual state of American affairs. It is no Catholic doctrine that the magistrate bears not the sword, or that a sovereign nation has not the right to defend itself, to maintain its unity and the integrity of its territory, so far as able, against any and every foe, foreign or domestic. . . . There never was any need of his Holiness or the American bishops to labor to dispose the government and loyal people to peace, for they are and have been so disposed from the first; and the quickest and surest way of getting peace is for our bishops and priests, backed by the earnest wishes of the Holy Father, to use all their influence to prevent divisions at the North, and to persuade their own people to give their united and hearty support to the government. It is not the government nor the loyal people that prolong the war, but the opposition they meet with from the Democratic party, with which the great body of the Catholic people are associated. Detach from the Democratic *peace* party its Catholics supporters, and it would be too weak seriously to embarrass the government, for there is not a state that

has not seceded in which, without the Catholic vote, it would not be in a hopeless minority. Strengthen the loyal party by the cordial and united support of the Catholic population, and the government could speedily bring the rebels to terms, and put a just and honorable end to this frightful civil war." *

The Republican party of the district of New Jersey in which Brownson lived, nominated him for representative in Congress, in 1862. It was hoped that by Brownson's nomination a sufficient number of Catholics could be drawn over from the Democratic party, which was in a majority in that district, to secure the election of a Union man; but the result was the reverse of that; and many Republicans refused to vote for a Catholic representative. A short time after the election, as Brownson was travelling between New York and Elizabeth, a prominent politician of New Jersey, who was well up in the degrees of Free-Masonry, occupied a seat near him and in the course of their conversation Brownson mentioned that he had once been a Mason, whereupon the other said: "Had we known that, we should have elected you." "But," said Brownson, "it is more than thirty years since I have been in a lodge, or had any connection with the order."—"That makes no difference," the other insisted, "if we had known it, you would have been elected."

One of those who most desired Brownson's election was Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, who wrote October 12th. "It seems almost too good to be true that you should be nominated. Pray, be elected. Don't fail." In fact, Sumner and Brownson were now

* Works, Vol. XVII pp. 437-440.

brought very close together in their views of what statesmanship required of both the president and congress, though neither had changed his views of slavery, or of the agitation for its suppression. Brownson had never loved the institution any more than Sumner; but he gave the first importance to the preservation of the Union and the constitution, whilst he believed that Sumner was endangering both by his anti-slavery agitation. They both now demanded emancipation; the Senator for its own sake, Brownson, as a means of preserving the Union, by weakening and punishing the rebels. He looked upon emancipation as the first step in the extinction of the negro race in the United States. If he had wished to preserve the race he would have kept the Black man a slave; but he believed humanity was more interested in saving the White race than in saving the Black race, and therefore he advocated emancipation. He demanded justice for the Negro, but believed he never would get it, and that his condition as a freeman would prove more wretched than his condition as a slave. It is not yet certain whether in this he was right or not. Our boasted Anglo-Saxon race, he argued, has no conscience towards inferior or colored races. The doom of the Negro is to suffer and die. He can never form one community with the White man, and being the weaker, the less enterprising, the less able to vindicate his rights, he must gradually recede before the advancing white race. "Hemmed in or crowded out by an ever advancing tide of white population, more vigorous, more energetic, and more enterprising, their numbers will diminish day by day, and gradually the great mass of them will have disappeared, nobody can tell where, when, or how. It will

take several generations, perhaps centuries, to complete the process of elimination, but the process is sure to go on till consummated.

“Could we have had our way, and had we wished to preserve the negro race in the United States, we would never have emancipated the slaves; we would have changed the form and condition of their servitude, and converted them from chattels into *adscripti glebæ*, or serfs’ But we could not have our way, we could not try the efficacy of our ‘Morrison pill,’ for the South would not have consented to it, and we could not reach the slaves at all except under the rights of war, and these rights know nothing of any emancipation but immediate emancipation. Moreover, we had, and have no wish to preserve, here or elsewhere, the negro race. Do not be shocked, my dear madam; you know I am no philanthropist, and you must expect me to speak as a reasonable man, who respects things, not fine phrases. I would not wrong a negro any quicker than a white man. I would deal out to him and his far-off cousin, the American Indian, the same even-handed justice, and discharge towards either, promptly and cheerfully, all the claims of humanity and Christian charity; yet I own that I should joy rather than weep to see both races disappear from our continent, if they should disappear without any wrong or injustice on the part of our own race. Let the disappearance be by the operation of a law of Providence, not by human wrong or oppression, and we shall have no tears to shed over it. We respect the amiable feeling which sympathizes with the inferior races and dreams of their elevation, but although I have a mellow spot in my heart, as well as you, my dear

madam, in yours, I do not yield to it, for I never allow myself knowingly to attempt the impossible, or to war against the inevitable. I cannot 'make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.' The inferior races had the same origin that you and I had, but they are inferior, because they have, with or without their fault, degenerated further from the normal type of the human race than we have. Pray, do not doubt, whatever you think of me, that you, with your tall queenly figure, your graceful walk, your Grecian face, your sparkling eyes, bright golden hair, and bewitching smile, approach nearer to our common mother Eve, than that black, greasy, thick-lipped, flat-nosed, woolly-headed, tub-figured, and splay-footed Dinah. Treat Dinah kindly, speak gently to her, don't despise her, don't turn away disdainfully from her, for she, too, is a daughter of Eve, a creature of God, and has both a heart and a soul; but don't ask me to regard her as the type of womankind and yourself as the one who has departed from it.

"The inferior races, the yellow, the red, or the black, nearly all savage, barbarous, or semi-barbarous, are not, my dear sir, types of the primitive man, or so many stages in man's progressive march from the tadpole, chimpanzee, or gorilla, up to Bacon, Newton, Napoleon Bonaparte, George B. McClellan, and you and me. They mark rather so many stages or degrees in human degeneracy. The African negro is not the primitive man, the man not yet developed, the incipient Caucasian; but the degenerate man, who, through causes which neither you nor I can explain, has fallen below the normal human type, and stands now at the lowest round in the descending scale of human degeneracy, and for

him, save by the transfusion of the blood of a less degraded variety, there is no more development. He has ceased to be progressive, and when a race has ceased to be progressive, nothing remains for it but to die."*

He did not say it ought to be so, but that it would be so. With him, the negro held only a subordinate place, and he was more intent on maintaining our marvellous political system than he was on securing negro-equality, and when in legislating for the negro we suffered the constitution to be impaired, and the President to usurp the legislative functions of the government, liberty, he said, would be rendered impossible for either white man or black man; and if members of congress were not vigilant and heroic, all the blood and treasure expended in the civil war would be thrown away. The President's course in establishing provisional governors and apologies for states caused him to fear the executive more than the southern confederacy.

And Brownson was able to find in the constitution the power to suppress the rebellion and to abolish slavery in the rebel states, without renouncing the doctrine of state sovereignty which he had always held. He had enlarged, not changed his views on the origin and constitution of government since he discussed the subject in the *Democratic Review* in 1843. He still held that the sovereignty vests in the states; and only so far modified his views as to maintain that it vests in the states collectively or united, not as he once supposed, in the states severally. He had always been as he was now, a Union man, but opposed to consolidation or cen-

* Works, Vol. XVII. pp. 557-9.

tralism, and in favor of state rights. He was still as much opposed to centralism and in favor of state rights as ever he had been, and could resist the one and maintain the other as effectually on the supposition that the states are collectively sovereign, as on the supposition that they are severally sovereign, and that too without danger of disintegration. There was here no recall of political principles. He wanted always state rights held independent of the general government, but without danger to the integrity of the Union; and secession and the war that followed showed him that this was impracticable on the theory that the states are severally sovereign. This led him to investigate the historical facts in the case as he had never done before, and these historical facts proved to him that the states are sovereign indeed, but collectively or united, not severally; and there never was a time when he would not have held this view if the distinction between states collectively sovereign and states severally sovereign had been clearly pointed out to him.

The substitution of Stanton for Cameron was regarded by Brownson and those with whom he had the most sympathy in political matters as a great accession to their strength. Sumner wrote him February 2nd, 1862: "The new Secretary of War *is with us*. I know him personally and well. I hope for great things from him. With a military education he might organize victory; now he will inspire it.

"I think the President will rise. Unless hostile influences should prevail you will be satisfied with him. *Inter nos*, he has counselled with Chase and myself on a proposition of greater magnitude than was ever yet sub-

mitted to a deliberative assembly. I say to him constantly, Courage! Courage! *

"Yesterday I told the President that though I am against capital punishment, I am yet for hanging the slave-trader, condemned in New York. It must be done (1) to deter slave-traders, (2) to give notice to the world of a change of policy, and (3) to show that the government can hang a man." †

When Brownson adopted Sumner's formula that State Rebellion is State Suicide, Sumner wrote, May 25th: "I feel proud of your good opinion. The distinction, which I elaborated in my speech, seems to me to save us from all those constitutional scruples by which people have been disturbed. It is vain to resort to war, if we have not all the rights of war.

"I see a cloud in the East—from foreign nations. Nothing but great triumphs, and a positive policy on slavery can save us from some form of intervention. It may be what is called 'Moral'; but, whatever it may be, its effect in strengthening the Rebellion will be complete. It seems to me that, if we do not remove slavery we shall be compelled to acknowledge the independence of the rebels. That is our alternative. And I fear that history teaches that protracted contests for dismemberment lead to foreign intervention, *vide* Holland—United States—Spanish Colonies—Greece—Belgium—Italy. But give us Emancipation and the terrible strife will be

* I believe the proposition was a measure of Emancipation.

† After Appleton Oaksmith, son of Seba and Elizabeth Oakes Smith, two well-known authors, was condemned for slave-trading, Brownson interceded with Lincoln and he was allowed to go. Brownson, however believed Oaksmith guiltless, persuaded by the arguments and entreaties of Mrs. Elizabeth Oakes Smith. Perhaps it was as well so.

glorified. I cannot thank you enough for your powerful article on State Suicide."

None of Brownson's friends was more quick in perceiving the important bearing of his distinction in advocating emancipation as a war measure, warranted by the war power of the nation, from the question of colonization of emancipated slaves which could only be resorted to under the peace power of the Constitution, than Sumner, who wrote, September 1st, 1862: "I like your distinction. Emancipation is a war measure. Colonization a peace measure. To take up the latter now is to carry weight. Like all that you say, this speech is most powerful and instructive. But did you leave the President without moving him forward? Or is he stolidly inert? I am curious to know your last impressions. It is hard to read of all this blood and sacrifice and to think that it might have been averted—which I most solemnly believe." *

Brownson condemned the President's measures, because they were unwise and impolitic in themselves, but still more because by usurping the powers of the Congress, he was endangering the liberties of the country. Sumner opposed them mainly in the interest of abolitionism, inasmuch as they favored the preservation of slavery in some districts, where the authority of the Congress would extinguish it. This appears from the following letters to Brownson.

* Colonization, if authorized and practicable, would have met Brownson's approbation; but it was contrary to the wishes of old abolitionists, who wanted to retain the slaves that by their votes, when enfranchised, they might sustain the Republican party in power.

WASHINGTON, 4th January '63.

Private.

My dear sir:—I wish that I could converse with you; I cannot write.

Our country, great and glorious, is acephalous. And yet my faith is so strong, that I believe it must triumph.

Our Potomac army is where it can do nothing but dissolve, decompose and die. There must be some speedy extrication, or its present encampment will be a Golgotha. *

There is an injunction of secrecy on our doings with regard to the Cabinet. I have insisted upon its removal. If all were known, the relative positions of certain persons would be altered.

But let me confess, that I see great difficulties in organizing a true and strong Cabinet. Who will you take? Some at least that you would select would object, especially if in the Senate.

My own idea would be Chase as Secretary of State, and a New Yorker for the Treasury; and let the whole Cabinet be Anti-Slavery, and have this inspiration—each one *omnis in hoc*.

Butler returns chafing at his removal, which, under the circumstances, he regards as a surrender to Euro-

* The Army of the Potomac, when this was written, was at Falmouth, opposite to Fredericksburg, Va., under Gen. Burnside. If that general did not come up to the expectations of those who were most active in obtaining for him this command, it may be said in his defence, that he never sought the position, and when it was thrust upon him, he did his best, which is all that any one can do. In September, 1862, the day before the battle of Antietam, I told him that my father had written me that it was decided to give him the command of that army, and he answered: "My God, I hope not, I am not fit for it."

pean bullying. Banks seems to be wavering. There are many who begin to predict his failure. Gen. Hunter knows New Orleans well: he takes a gloomy view.

Ever sincerely yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

Where is your January no?

BOSTON, 5th February '63.

My dear sir:—I have just read your last number. I am glad you consider again the terms of re-union. I have taken up again the subject, and was struck by the concurrence between us. *It is important to secure for Congress the control of the Rebel Region.* Let this be done, and all the rest will follow.

I believe that the moment any territory lapses under the *exclusive jurisdiction* of Congress, Slavery ceases;—because of its essential incompatibility with the Constitution of the United States.

But without relying on this postulate, it is clear that if the territory is under the jurisdiction of Congress, the Congress may affix terms of restoration, or, if it please by special legislation trample Slavery out and keep the territory in pupilage until the discipline is finished.

Our people need education on this head, and I am glad that you have given it to them so clearly.

I enjoyed much the passage in another article on the letter of the Pope and the position of the Archbishop. *

Ever sincerely yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

* See *ante* pp. 356-368, and 378-81.

To this letter Brownson in his answer says: "I have just received your kind letter of the 5th inst. I agree with you fully as to the importance of obtaining for Congress the management of the lapsed States. It belongs constitutionally to Congress, as much as does that of any other population and territory belonging to the Union and not yet erected into states, and it cannot be left to the President without extreme danger to our constitutional system of government.

"We are now in the crisis of our fate, and we are more in need of statesmanship than of generalship, though much in need of the latter. The President is no statesman, is no constitutional lawyer, and has no conception of our real system of government. In his Springfield letter he assumes that he is the depositary of the whole war power of the government, and forgets that the power is vested by the Constitution in Congress, and that he can wield it only in executing the laws of Congress. As Commander-in-chief of the army and navy, he can do whatever in a military point of view is necessary to accomplish the military ends determined by Congress, but nothing more. He is simply the executive in military as in civil matters.

"You have shown this very clearly in your able article in the last *Atlantic*. The whole theory of government subordinates the military power to the civil, and only the executive portion of even the war power is vested in the president. This is precisely what the President does not understand, and on which Congress must insist. I am far from believing that Mr. Lincoln wishes to usurp power; I give all credit to his good intentions; but he is weak, ignorant, and wrongheaded, precisely

the sort of man to ruin in times of crisis the liberties of a nation. It is essential that Congress should control him, and keep him within the limits of the Constitution, or it will avail us little to have effected the military suppression of the rebellion.

“There are comparatively few among us whose views of the war power are not vague or confused. Many confound it with the simple military power of the government, and suppose it belongs of right to the military commandant. I need not tell you that this is a dangerous mistake. The war power is with us vested in Congress, and the President under it, I take it, can govern no state or territory by himself or his major generals, further than necessary to the military operations authorized by Congress. He could appoint General Foster Commandant of the military department of North Carolina, and authorize him to govern it by military law, but where did he get the authority to appoint Mr. Stanley, Governor of the *State* of North Carolina? Mr. Stanley, though termed military governor, was not the military governor of North Carolina. He was, if anything, simply a civil governor, and the President can appoint civil governors only by law of Congress.

“This whole matter must be looked into and set right, or we shall lose our republican institutions. I see from your article that you understand and fully appreciate it. I fear more the bungling statesmanship of the President and Cabinet than I do Davis and his armies. We have very few men amongst us who are up to the level of the situation. We have good intentions, patriotic ardor, and country attorneys, but a fearful dearth of statesmen. You must do all you can with your brother

senators. Our only hope is in congress. The people are eager to have the war end, and are anxious that it should end by extinguishing slavery, but they are in mass not much better or wiser than their President. They can be led either right or wrong.

"There is a growing disposition to reëlect Mr. Lincoln, but though I like in the main his Springfield letter, I do not see that he is yet the man we want. Seward, I think, is disposed of, or will be when we find ourselves at war with France. Chase, I suppose, is your man, but he cannot be elected. Of the Cabinet, Stanton is my man, but I have not thought of him in connection with the presidency. None of the generals will do, though I have heard both Banks and Butler, neither of whom is a favorite of mine, sometimes mentioned."

Sumner either had fixed on no favorite candidate, at this time, or if he had, was not ready to name him; for, in his next letter, he says: "The more I reflect on the presidential question, the more I regret its premature discussion. The country ought not now to be diverted from the war, and the means financial and political—money and principles—by which it is to be sustained and our cause advanced at home and abroad.

In April Sumner wrote: "You are right in pressing the absurdity of the government policy with regard to the states in rebellion. There is no clearness of vision in our government. There are two things which should have been done. (1) Early in the war, while the whole country was hot and plastic, it should have been fixed against slavery, by presidential action. (2) Congress should have assumed jurisdiction over the whole rebel region. Only in this way can it be properly governed,

its lands divided and its slaves secured in their freedom. But, had these things been done, our victory would have been too easy and without sufficient expiation. Providence requires us to suffer more."

When Lincoln sent his annual message to congress, December 9th, 1863, to which was appended a proclamation authorizing the tenth part of the voters in the ten rebel states, on taking the oath of allegiance, to reorganize their state governments, Sumner seems to have only looked upon the message and proclamation as satisfactory because they were favorable to his theories, and to have found no fault with them as acts of usurpation. He wrote to Brownson a fortnight after their transmission to congress: "The President's recent message and proclamation have two points that are important and will be memorable. (1) He makes emancipation the corner-stone of reconstruction. (2) He treats the rebel states as now 'subverted' and as practically out of the Union, and provides for their reconstruction out of the Union before they shall be received. How this differs from what is called 'the territorial theory' I am at a loss to perceive, except that it is less plain and positive. In short, the President's theory is identical with ours, although he adopts a different nomenclature. But my single object is to settle the question permanently by the obliteration of slavery, and I am ready to accept any system which promises this result." *

* That Sumner saw every thing through his anti-slavery spectacles was very evident to me as early as December, 1861, or January, 1862, when he told me that there was a strong movement among senators and representatives in congress to impeach and remove Lincoln, for his tenderness to slavery, and his attempt to save Kentucky, Western Virginia, and Eastern Tennessee to the Union, sacrificing the rest of the South. He thought they would do better with Hamlin as president. My own impression was

Very different was Brownson's judgment of the message and proclamation. It was well known that Lincoln was invincibly opposed to any scheme of immediate emancipation of the slaves. Over and over again had Brownson urged him in private conversation to proclaim the immediate emancipation of the slaves belonging to the rebels, as a military necessity, to deprive them of the labor which enabled them to draft nearly the whole able-bodied free white population into their army; and all in vain, until finally he was frightened into it, as he told Brownson, by the threatened intervention of France and England in our domestic quarrel. In August, 1862, when Brownson urged him to give orders to his generals commanding departments in the South to proclaim, each in his own department, the emancipation of the slaves, Lincoln ridiculed the idea, said it would do no good, would only lose him fifty thousand bayonets, and weaken instead of strengthening the Union cause. Brownson replied that it would do good, but not so much good as it would have done if he had given the orders nearly a year and a half before, when the nation was startled by the fall of Sumter, and before there was time for the anti-war party to reorganize and oppose him at the North. And when he did issue his so-called emancipation proclamation, he did all in his power to prevent its taking effect; for not only were the slaves he proclaimed

that the majority of the Republican party leaders were afraid to bring back the southern states, which would have deprived them of their power by the immense addition to the northern Democratic vote, already greater than the Republican in the largest states. This same politic apprehension of the loss of supremacy made them keep the conquered states out of the Union till they got negro suffrage to counterbalance the intelligent southern vote, though even to effect this they found it necessary to disfranchise all the respectable white voters.

free left surrounded by a broad band of slave territory through which they had to pass to become practically free, but in the very proclamation of their freedom he exhorted them to remain where they were and to continue to labor for their masters as before. Now he issues a proclamation telling the rebels how they can reorganize their states and recover their lost rights in the Union, and adds, that if they choose to retain their slaves, that is, the men he had professed to free, in bondage for a time, he shall make no objection. "If the rebellious states are still states in the Union," wrote Brownson,* "the President violates their constitutions, and wars against the essential principle of every state organization in the Union; if they are not states in the Union, but, as we maintain, population and territory belonging to the Union, then he transcends his province as the executive branch of the government, and undertakes to do on executive authority alone what only congress can do." In either case the President could have nothing to do with their civil reorganization till congress had acted, and then only to carry out the law of congress; and congress was competent to reorganize them only under the peace powers of the government; for under the war power only military governments can be instituted.

The New York *Times*, organ of Seward, the Secretary of State, claimed the message and proclamation as decisively discarding Sumner's doctrine, which Brownson adopted, that the secession of a state is its suicide, and that consequently the population and territory in rebellion were not states in the Union, but simply population and territory belonging to the Union. But Brownson

* Works, Vol. XVII. p. 516.

showed that on no other ground could any defence of Lincoln's scheme for the return of the rebellious states be attempted except that by their secession they had ceased to be states.

The *Chicago Tribune* was one of the principal journals that approved of Brownson's article on the President's Message and Proclamation, and the editor wrote:

CHICAGO, January 18, 1864.

DR. BROWNSON.

Sir:—Your January number of the *Quarterly Review* ought to be placed in the hands of every member of congress, and in the hands of the President and his Cabinet. Your article on the amnesty, if read by them, will prevent a fatal step from being taken. It will cause the error already committed to be retraced or healed by timely legislation. You are entitled to the thanks of thinking men for your masterly exposure of the dangers in which the amnesty involves the country. Cannot your publisher devise some means of furnishing the Republican members of congress each a copy of the January number? An editorial in Forney's *Washington Chronicle* perhaps would cause members of congress to purchase it. Some person in Washington should be charged with the duty of getting a copy into the hands of all the administration members of congress. I have written to several Western members advising them to purchase and read this issue of your *Review*.

Yours truly,

J. MEDILL, Ed. *Tribune*.

Early in 1864, a strong opposition to Lincoln's reelection was manifested on the part of the radical

Republicans. James W. White, a former judge of the superior court of New York, was deputed to Washington to consult with a committee of similar views in that city. In a letter dated Willard's Hotel, February 27, he says to Brownson: "As you were not very decided in your preference of a candidate for the presidency in your last number, and as you seemed to have a good opinion of Mr. Chase, I have thought that, perhaps, it is still an open question with you. I have expressed to you my preference for Mr. Chase. He has some one or two objectionable points; but I think that, on the whole, he is our best man, and that we can make a better canvass with him than we could with Butler or Fremont. The people have been allowed, or rather encouraged to identify Mr. Lincoln with the principle of national unity and liberty, until they have come to regard him as the mighty and providential leader of his people in their struggle for national existence. You and I, and every intelligent man who has known how the government has been administered for the last three years, understand clearly how gross a delusion this popular notion rests upon, and how most unfit, of all our public men, Mr. Lincoln is for a national leader in a time like the present . . . What I wish to ask you now, in confidence, is this: Can you support Mr. Chase for the next presidency? We are going to make a mighty effort for him. There is such an utter aversion for Mr. Lincoln among so large a portion of the radical people of the country that, if nominated, he will inevitably be defeated; and the main question should be, 'Which of our leading men ought we to present to the people as a candidate for the succession?' I hope we shall not be as

slow in deciding this question as Mr. Lincoln himself would be. For myself, I would take Chase first, Butler next, and Grant as my third choice, for I know less of him than I do of either of the others."

White, on March 4th, writes: "I received this evening your favor of the 2nd inst. and telegraphed advising that you should do nothing until you heard from me. I write this note now to explain my telegraph. Since I wrote to you, matters political appear as if they might speedily undergo some important changes. I will know by Thursday next, and perhaps earlier, the result of the present fermentation; I may know to morrow how it will end." March 12th, White was back in New York, and wrote: "I arrived from Washington this morning. You have seen, no doubt, Mr. Chase's declension. There were also at the time I wrote you *last*, negotiations pending between Mr. Lincoln and the Radicals, which, however, since then resulted in nothing.* The Radicals will therefore take up General Fremont or General Butler, or both, as against Mr. Lincoln for the nomination."

Brownson thereupon proceeded to write the article on "The Next President," and it was finished and in type for his April Review, before he had any communication with Fremont in regard to that General's nomination. Fremont's first letter to Brownson on the subject was dated New York, 21 W. 19th street, March 29th, 1864, in which he says he "was informed from Washington that an article against the administration of Mr.

* It was afterwards thought that Lincoln compromised matters with Chase by the promise of the Chief Justiceship of the United States Supreme Court, then sure to be soon vacant.

Lincoln was about being published or had been proposed to be published in your Review, but that in consequence of a misunderstanding its publication might be delayed or its character altered. . . I have a farther and great satisfaction that you are in your own convictions decidedly opposed to Mr. Lincoln and that so far at least we shall be working to a common end. I was intending to make you a short visit to talk the matter over with you, but found I could not just now. . . . But I will find a time when I can go that may also be convenient to you."

The nomination of a Republican candidate for the highest office in this country was to be made in June, 1864, and in his Review for April, which was his last opportunity to address the delegates to the nominating caucus (we now call the assemblies by the ill-advised name of conventions), Brownson gave his reasons why Lincoln ought not to be put forward. Wishing to speak of Lincoln in terms befitting himself and the President's high position, he nevertheless felt disposed to be severe; for he did not consider Lincoln qualified for the office at any time, especially in a time like that. He had patience, good humor, and capacity to labor; but the mental qualities, the education, the manners, the personal presence and dignity, the knowledge of history, philosophy, literature, civilization, men and things, or of the human heart itself, which one would demand of the Chief Magistrate of a nation, were lacking. His administration had been loose, fluctuating, unsystematic, weak and insufficient in all save expenditure of men and money, in which he showed appalling extravagance. As early as August, 1862, Lincoln told Brownson that the number of men on

the military rolls receiving pay from the government was six hundred thousand, and yet the number present in the several armies was only about three hundred and sixty thousand. Some of those absent, the President said, were in hospitals, but the greater part were well and hearty, at home, tending bar, at work on railroads, or on farms. By a brief summary of the military and civil acts of Lincoln's administration Brownson shows why he judged him an unsuitable person to be president, though he regarded his reelection as an unavoidable evil. He would prefer Chase, but if he and Lincoln were to become rivals, the most that could result would be that each would kill the other. All he said of Fremont in the connection with the nomination was, "The names of John C. Fremont and of Benjamin F. Butler have been mentioned, either of whom would be infinitely preferable to the present incumbent, we had almost written *incumbrance*. General Fremont has been politically wounded by Messrs. Lincoln, Seward, Blair & Co., and we fear his chance is not much better than that of Mr. Chase, though it would give us pleasure to see him nominated by the convention, and if so nominated, we would most heartily support him, for we like him and respect him personally, General Butler has ability, genius activity, fertility of resource, and would if elected, make an able, efficient, and popular president. He is, also, a hard man to kill. Of all the men named, he would be best able to survive a rivalry with Mr. Lincoln. But even he cannot do it. The government patronage would crush him."

The Republican caucus at Baltimore, as was expected, nominated Lincoln, and on the 31st of May, a

caucus of Republicans opposed to Lincoln with some war-Democrats, at Cleveland, nominated Fremont. Being assured by Fremont that he would persist in the contest until the election was over, Brownson wrote an article in his July Review, "Lincoln or Fremont," advocating the election of the latter in terms which show that even he could go further in eulogizing a man that he liked than his calmer judgment would approve. Certainly, those who knew Fremont well were far from thinking, with Brownson, that the little General combined more elements of greatness than Webster, Calhoun, and their contemporaries, and was fitter for the office of President, especially in times like that. In fact, Fremont's withdrawal from the contest soon after, satisfied Brownson that he had overrated at least one of his candidate's claims to greatness. Brownson's youngest son had been on Fremont's military staff until the General was relieved of all command; and in his boyish enthusiasm for his chief accepted and communicated to his father Fremont's view of what he had done and would have done, which joined to what Fremont and his supporters claimed, led Brownson to write such passages as this: "By his Missouri proclamation, he showed himself the man for the times, . . . he proved that he knew how to get rid of slavery without violating the Constitution, and . . . he displayed his remarkable energy and activity in creating, almost from nothing, in the short space of a hundred days, an army with which he could have marched from St. Louis to the Gulf, suppressed the rebellion in Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, planted himself at New Orleans, and opened and kept open the Mississippi River, and in six months accom-

plished more than all our Generals and powerful armies have as yet accomplished for the suppression of the Rebellion."

What Fremont might have done, no one can say; but his plan of clearing the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans, was understood to be by marching by land through southwest Missouri and Arkansas, investing in the way Columbus, Vicksburg, and Natchez, driving General Price before him from Springfield. It is not an unlikely supposition that if he had attempted to carry out this plan, Price would have cut off his supplies, perhaps also his retreat, and even destroyed his army.

It was currently reported of Fremont during his brief authority at St. Louis that he could only be approached in his luxurious headquarters through his California friends, whom he appointed private secretaries, and whom he enriched by giving them the building of the silly fortifications of the city and other works at an expense much above the market value of such work at that place. When Lexington was besieged, the messenger sent for reinforcements had to wait four days for an answer; Lyon's messenger from Springfield was obliged to wait the same length of time to see the General; the Governor of the state called, but had to leave without an interview. Though General Sherman was admitted more promptly, what he says in his *Memoirs*, shows that his was an exceptional case, and that he had hardly expected the good fortune of finding an old California friend in Fremont's household to secure him reception. The Shenandoah campaign, in which he failed to show the great qualities of a General which his friends claimed for him, was enough to open Brownson's eyes, to say nothing

of Fremont's printing copies of Professor Nicollet's geographical survey and explorations as his own, which first gained him reputation, Colonel Benton keeping back Nicollet's report, printed by Congress, till after Fremont's.

It must not be supposed that Brownson wrote as he did of Fremont for the mere purpose of bolstering up his candidate for President, for he had published the same view before the General's name had been mentioned as Lincoln's rival. Nor was it owing to the partiality of friendship; for he was far more friendly with General Rosecrans, and yet criticised him with great severity, and as he afterwards said, with undue severity, based on false reports officially published. It was undoubtedly the expression of his honest convictions. Twice it seemed to me, he was induced by female eloquence to adopt views which his better judgment would have rejected. Mrs. Fremont was a woman of unusual strength of character, and I set down Brownson's unfortunate support of her husband to her persuasiveness; just as I find it impossible to account for all he said about "Maria Monk's Daughter" except by the influence Mrs. St. John Eckel exerted on him, just as she did on the New York Jesuits and Sisters of the Sacred Heart.

Brownson's criticism of General Rosecrans was rather more severe, all things considered, than was altogether just.

"General Rosecrans," he wrote in his Review for January, 1864, reviewing Halleck's Report to the Secretary of War, "does not appear to so good advantage as we had hoped he would. General Rosecrans is a true-

hearted patriot, loyal to the core; a man of unsurpassable personal intrepidity, of great ability, education, literature,* and science, to whom his country is indebted for great and valuable services; but as a general he is too much after the McClellan type, refusing to move till he has everything ready, and never able to get everything ready. In spite of his attention to his preparations, he lacks, what McClellan did not, necessary caution, as we may see at Iuka, Corinth, Stone's River, and above all at Chickamauga. He is excellent to plan, perhaps in that respect has no superior in the army, but he fails in execution, and rarely attains the practical results counted on. At Stone's River he won at best only a barren victory, and that at a terrible cost; at Chickamauga he ought not to have suffered defeat. Had he remained on or returned to the battle-field, on the 20th, instead of retiring to Chattanooga, and giving up all as lost, he would have made his defeat a victory, for as it was, General Thomas having, with only a part of the army, to resist the whole Rebel force, stood his ground and compelled the enemy to retire. On that occasion General Rosecrans does not appear to have shown his usual personal energy and pertinacity. We fear, too, he had not proved himself a good disciplinarian, and had not made sure of having his orders strictly and promptly obeyed. His failure came very near losing us Tennessee and Kentucky, and throwing us back where we were at the opening of 1862. But we do not suppose his failure was the cause of his being relieved of his command. He was relieved because it was resolved to place the

* When a young Lieutenant he contributed an article to *Brownson's Review* on "The Army and Navy."

armies of the Tennessee, the Cumberland, and the Ohio under a single commander, and General Grant, as the senior officer in those armies, was entitled to it. There were reasons enough why General Rosecrans could not hold a subordinate command under Grant, and therefore there was no alternative but to relieve him. His personal honor is unimpeached and unimpeachable, and we trust he will not long remain without a command in which he can still serve his country."

Rosecrans wrote in reply:

YELLOW SPRINGS, O., Jan. 22nd, 1864.

Dear Doctor:—Inclosed is five dollars on account of subscription to your Review. I congratulate you on your "New Programme" and article on the Federal Constitution. In the impending struggle between military despotism and political despotism on the one side, and constitutional freedom, you have arrayed yourself with the latter. Fight on and fight bravely! Extremists and large numbers of the Democratic party will be found favoring military despotism.

I regret to notice in your last number a most unjust assault on my military reputation! You talk of my "never getting ready." The statement is an outrage on truth and justice! and whether you said with or without authority ought not to have appeared in your Review!

You say my "want of caution" may be seen at Iuka! Pray, how? Was it not agreed that I should get in the enemy's rear while General Grant attacked him in front? Was not the time fixed? Was I not there in time? Were not two of General Grant's Lago and Dickey with

urgent that we should attack in time? * Did I not do it? Did not Grant's troops fail even to aid by a reconnaissance or demonstration? † Did I not fight therefore unaided the entire forces of Price and beat them despite the failure of the troops under Grant to cooperate.

What you refer to at Corinth—where Price and Van Dorn with 38,000 attacked me, having but 15,700 and got badly beaten?

I had a post to defend and defended it as I had supposed successfully and creditably, *until* I learn from your Review to the contrary. My friend, Dr. Brownson, whose time is spent in finding out the truth and writing, finds I lacked that military virtue for which General McClellan is so distinguished—caution!—I possess McClellan's vices intensified and lack his virtues!

On those battlefields where I thought history would award me some credit, my friend Dr. B. finds I have displayed a want of that great military virtue without which one cannot be a great general. But he praises a bloodless heroic commander-in-chief who never smelled the gunpowder of a great battle and who won his renown by "gradual approaches," with a superior to and capture of the place where the "rebels had been."

I tell you Dr. B. and impartial history will declare that all we risked and we lost at Chickamauga was risked and lost through the criminal neglect of that same

* Perhaps the meaning is that Grant urgently insisted that Rosecrans should attack in time, sending two officers, Colonels Lagow and Dickey, on that errand:

† It was said that Grant sent Ord to attack Price in front, but not to commence action till he heard Rosecrans's guns; but the wind being the wrong way, Rosecrans defeated Price before Ord knew that the battle was begun.

General Halleck and the "amiable and affectionate" Secretary of War, to make any provision to meet the very emergency which arose in that battle—an emergency which they ought to have foreseen—one of which they were forewarned.

You write a review of General Halleck's report and don't notice the ridiculous parade therein made of orders for reinforcements to the army of the Cumberland on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of September to troops from 20 to 50 days distant, when the battle began on the 18th and ended on the 20th. Why, Doctor!! That report also contains untrue statements, but enough! I could put up with the barking of the hounds of power who started at my heels as soon as I was relieved from the command of that army which under my guidance had done good work for the Union: I will not even complain of calumnies in the Freeman's Journal. But I must say I do complain of you.

W. S. ROSECRANS.

DR. O. A. BROWNSON,
New York, N. Y.

In his April Review, writing on "Military Matters and Men," Brownson sought to make amends to Rosecrans as public as had been the injury. He said: "Now we are on this subject, we have a word or two to say of another able General of high rank, and in apology for having ventured to express an opinion of his military character with only a partial knowledge of the facts in the case. We allude to General Rosecrans. We were induced to offer a brief criticism on the military character of the late commander of the Army of the Cumberland, because we found our Catholic friends pretending that

he was relieved of his command because he was a Catholic. We wished to combat that pretension, and by showing that the government had other reasons for its act. We have found fault enough with the administration and are not in the habit of sparing it, when we think it in the wrong, but we do not think Catholics have had any reason to believe that its conduct has in any instance been influenced by hostility to Catholics; indeed, we think a contrary charge could be more easily sustained. Favor has been shown to more than one officer in the army that would not have been had he not been a Catholic and an Irishman. Indeed, we think the administration has gone at times too far in this direction, and sustained very unworthy men because supposed to be favorites of Irish Catholics. But in endeavoring to repel an unfounded and unjust charge against the government, we went too far, and did, we are assured, injustice to General Rosecrans himself. The terms we used would have been softened if a dangerous illness had not prevented us from correcting the proof of our remarks. But we retract them, and the judgment on the General's military character we expressed; for whether just or not, we expressed it on insufficient authority, and it ought to be a rule with us to express no judgment on the strictly military character of military men. Some of the information we relied on we have since discovered to be incorrect, and the rest may possibly admit an explanation very different from that which we adopted. Our judgment at best was rash, and therefore we regret having expressed it, or any judgment in the case."

And further on, in the same article, are the following remarks on war correspondents, which are very just

as applied to those during our civil war, but not equally applicable to the correspondent as he has since become: "We have generally been sparing of *unfavorable* criticisms on our military men, and we should have done better to have been more sparing still. Great evil is done by newspaper correspondents in fastening upon a general officer with little or no military merit, and laboring to puff him into notice and reputation to the disparagement of greater and far more meritorious officers, and as a rule we may set it down that any officer frequently and extravagantly praised by these gentlemen is worthy of no great confidence; but a greater evil is done by unfavorable criticisms upon officers high in command when they meet with a reverse or an unexpected failure. It is hardly possible for us to know all the facts necessary to a full judgment of the case; besides un-military men are not always capable of forming sound military judgments. Military men are in general the best judges of military men, as in all professions, professional men are the best judges of the merits of members of their own profession."

CHAPTER XIV.

PLANS OF PEACE DEMOCRATS.—HUGHES MAKES ANOTHER ATTACK.—THE JESUITS.—WAR TROUBLES.—HEALY'S PORTRAITS.—HAMILTON AND LINCOLN.—MONTALEMBERT.—DISCONTINUANCE OF THE REVIEW.

FROM the beginning of the civil war in the United States till near its close, Brownson spent much time in lecturing and the incidental travelling, as before; but the

lectures now were no longer religious, or addressed to Catholics, as such. He saw the existence of the nation threatened by a rebellion more powerful than any mentioned in history, which failed of success. Lincoln had been elected by a vote of 1,866,350 against 2,810,501. True, only one-third of the states were in open war against the government and the Union, but the allies of rebellion were numerous in many of the other states, and when they put forth their full strength proved to be a majority in the great states of New York, Ohio, and Indiana, and in Connecticut and other less important states. As late as 1863, they came near getting control of both houses of congress. Their plan is thus told by Wm. D. Kelly, of Pennsylvania,* in a letter of June 7th, 1863. "I have ceased to sigh, and almost to wish for decisive victories in the field. An early settlement of the war—with Seward at the helm, would settle the question which underlies the war against the North for ever, or give posterity a greater struggle than this has been or need be had we a strong President and pure and patriotic Secretary of State. I am therefore devoting myself pretty much to the work of showing the people that the contest is between two orders of civilization, and that any peace which does not secure the complete and unquestioned ascendancy of freedom will be but a treacherous, though it may be protracted armistice.

"Are you aware that the Peace men are urging the Southern leaders to encourage the election to our Congress of members enough to give them the organization of the House,—and in the event of the loss of Port

* For some account of the early life of this distinguished Republican congressman, see "Brownson's Early Life," p. 228.

Hudson and Vicksburg, to ask an armistice during which they may elect Senators and members from all the states? This, they tell them, 'will give them the House so thoroughly as to enable them to prevent appropriations for interest &c, until northern capitalists will force the government to assume their debt and give them the guaranties they need.' Emerson Etheridge's infamous letter to the Herald is conclusive evidence that he, who makes up the role of the House for organization, and who hopes for reëlection, has faith in the execution of this plan. Against these dangers your counsels would have protected us. But alas, I know not what but the insane pride of the Southern leaders can save us now. It is true that public sentiment advances in spite of the feeble counsels and more feeble action of the Administration, but it is not, or not likely to become vehement enough to resist a demand for peace on the condition that the validity of the Emancipation Proclamation shall be deemed an open question for the judiciary to settle. Seward's position is, I believe, that the proclamation acted upon individual slaves but did not abrogate state laws. To you this proposition need not be elaborated.

"I took the liberty of pressing your views upon Col. Forney at our Union League House yesterday, with a result that I report to you with pleasure. . . The Army is almost entirely cured of the effects of MacClellanism. We may say it is all right. Cannot the Administration be purified or exalted also? I know no more proper agent for the work than you."

It is certain that Brownson, by his lectures as well as by his writings greatly contributed to the strengthening of the loyal sentiments of the Northern people, both

Catholics and others, and the determination to put forth the energy required to suppress the rebellion. In spite of the peace feeling and rebel sympathy of their leaders he brought over a large number of Catholics to a sense of their duty, and at the same time found that his memory and influence with those who had listened to his words in the old days before his conversion were still fresh and powerful. The demand for his lectures was greater than it had ever before been, and never had he appeared more powerful as a public speaker.

This loyal activity seems to have been one of the main causes of the increasing hostility of the Archbishop of New York towards him. In June, 1861, Brownson had been selected by the Jesuits at Fordham to address the students at the annual commencement. In his discourse he dwelt strongly on the obligation of loyalty and patriotism. At the close of the exercises Hughes, as customary, made a short address, and, as one of the most venerable and venerated bishops in this country writes: "wound up with some remarks very severe on Dr. Brownson and his school. It was a bolt out of a clear sky. There was consternation on every side. The Jesuits were greatly alarmed lest the affair should find its way into the newspapers. Through the help of some friendly reporters it was kept out. A letter was, however, published in a New York daily paper, signed 'A Catholic Priest,' and purporting to come from Boston, which was very severe on the Archbishop, and also attacked his administration, Calvary Cemetery, &c. The Archbishop threatened a libel suit, and demanded the name of the writer. The paper gave the name of Father McElroy of Boston. Of course Father McElroy's name

was a shameless forgery. He was too good a Jesuit to do anything of the kind, and furthermore, he was an old and fast friend of the Archbishop. Suspicion rested on Cummings and Manahan. It may have been Roddan of Boston, who belonged to the party: his name was also mentioned."

When Hughes spoke so severely against Brownson and the americanizing Catholic Club, of which he insisted on making Brownson out a member, the latter rose to speak in his own defence, but the Archbishop commanded him to sit down, and Brownson obeyed. The Jesuits then conducted the Archbishop and the other invited guests, except the Orator of the day, to the banquet. Not one of them came near Brownson again, but he was left the solitary occupant of the hall till the departure of the train for New York.

Brownson never complained of the conduct of the Jesuits on this occasion; but maintained that it was perfectly proper for them, even at great cost to others, to keep on the best terms they could with the Bishop of the diocese in which they lived; that they were under great obligations to him for having given them their college and grounds; and that any attention towards himself after the Archbishop's address would have been very ill taken on that prelate's part. Brownson might further have said, if he had foreseen what occurred soon after, that when Hughes gave the College to the Jesuits he kept back one of the buildings with the ground on which it stood, and used it as his seminary. This property was wanted to round out the College possessions, and not very long after this event, was given to them.

The scene at the commencement at Fordham occurred between the date of Father Gresselin's letter, in which he gave unqualified praise to what Brownson had written, and the date of the letter in which he accuses Brownson of having changed, and says, "since then I have taken a wholly different view of the case." * It occurred also between that Jesuit Father's transmission of Father Bapst's "orders" that when Brownson came to Boston he must make his abode at the Jesuit College, and Brownson's rejection from the College when he only called to see his confessor. The Boston College belonged to a mission the Superior of which resided at Fordham. There may have been no connection between the Fordham episode and the changed demeanor of the Jesuits in Brownson's regard, and certainly he never thought there was. A Philadelphia journal, however, made it the cause of their changed relations, and to this Brownson replied:

"That, as the same journal alleges, we were forbidden one of their [the Jesuits'] houses, which we had entered to seek our confessor [Gresselin], is true; but he who did it was one of the warmest and truest of our personal friends, and whom, ever since we have known him, we have loved and venerated. We never blamed him; he only did what he felt was expected of him by his superiors. We had just given a lecture before the Emancipation League in Boston, and as the Jesuits hold property in the seceded states, it was feared, if they entertained us at one of their houses, the rebel government might take offence and confiscate it. They wished to give Mr. Davis of the confederacy no occasion to charge

* *Ante*, pp. 249, 261.

them with misprision of treason or hostility to his government. The Rector [Bapst] who excluded us, though personally sympathizing with us, felt that, under the circumstances, he was officially bound to exclude us, and he did so with tears in his eyes. That the incident affected us unpleasantly, we do not deny, but not in the way assumed, nor because we were the party excluded. As a personal matter we could never have given it a second thought, and the unpleasantness it occasioned was the regret that simple, worldly prudence or property considerations had more influence with the Jesuit body than we expected from a mendicant order, and that the education of the Catholic youth of the nation should be intrusted to a society so destitute of loyalty that it could look on with indifference and see the nation rent asunder and destroyed by a rebellion which every principle of our religion, as we have learned it, condemns. It was important only as one proof, among many others, that the Society is, if not disloyal, at least unloyal. The Society boasts that it has no country, no nationality, is at home nowhere and everywhere, and under no civil obligations anywhere. Now we believe patriotism is a Christian virtue, and loyalty a Christian duty; and men who make a boast of having neither, although made in the form of being superior to both, do not seem to us the proper men to have the forming of the youth of a nation, however excellent they may be as individuals. We know well that the mission of the priest is spiritual, and one of peace, and we would not have him untrue to it; but the clergy, both regular and secular, are men, and, in this country at least, have the rights and the duties of citizens; and in a national crisis, when the integrity and

even the existence of the nation is threatened by either a foreign or domestic enemy, have, as far as we can see, no more right to remain neutral or indifferent than any other class of citizens. The Jesuits have been sheltered by our nation; they have enjoyed the protection of our laws, and have all the rights and immunities of American citizens; and wherefore, then, owe they not to the nation the love, the good-will, the duties of loyal citizens? Unquestionably, they ought not to be compelled to serve the country in any way incompatible with their clerical profession or with their state; but in every way compatible with that profession and that state, they stand on the same footing with other citizens. The entrance into a religious order does not, in this country at least, work civil death, and as the members of religious orders retain here all their civil rights, they remain under all their civil obligations as citizens. In France, a few years ago, where the civil legislation suppressed the Jesuits as a religious corporation, they, notwithstanding their vows of religion, pleaded and made available their rights as citizens. If they can plead their rights as citizens against the nation, what is to prevent the nation from pleading their duties as citizens against the society? Civil rights and duties are correlative." *

The other side of the case is given in a letter of Gresselin's dated February 19, 1862. He says: "I pass now to the concluding paragraph of your letter. It is truly affecting, full of manliness and simplicity.† But

* Works, Vol. XX. pp. 368-4.

† The letter itself I have not been able to get from the Jesuits. I suppose they are something like the Normans, whatever comes within their grasp, is never let go.

let me present the case in another light, and, I dare say, in its true light. You were announced in all the newspapers of the city as coming to give a lecture in behalf of abolitionism. For us to reject that theory is no moral or political sin. Many true friends of the Union, and F. Bapst is foremost among them, reject it. Even the government of the U. S. rejects it. Was it wrong, then, for him to reason thus: That gentleman so prominent and so widely known coming here for such a purpose cannot fail to create a great sensation. His political friends will no doubt cheer him, visit him, and may have frequent meetings and consultations with him. Can all this be done in our house? No, it cannot. But, you may say, did I express or even hint the wish to be received in your house? I paid you simply a friendly visit, nothing more. Why did you greet me with your unwelcome compliment? You had nothing to refuse, since nothing was asked. This is true, in fact, and it is a good lesson for F. Bapst, or if he does not profit by it, it will be at least for me. F. Bapst has been too open-hearted. Instead of receiving your kind visit, and thanking you for it, and letting you go simply, he felt that more was to be done, and his heart prompted him to do more. But not being able to comply with his wish, he chose to explain to you the whole matter. With another man he would have acted quite differently; with you he laid aside all policy. To use with Brownson, said he, a cold and calculated reserve will not do. Besides, it would be to no purpose, since he is not to be beguiled into a false apprehension of the case; he will see through all my motives. Moreover, it agrees with that lofty mind and large heart to be spoken to openly. True, my speech in itself is

rather of a delicate nature, and might somewhat hurt his feelings; yet its reasonableness and propriety, coupled together with the regret I feel not to receive him more warmly, will all at once appear to his mind, and meet his full approbation, which will immediately reconcile his feelings to the matter on the whole. Such plan is nobler. I choose it. Accordingly he spoke. You know the rest."

Brownson's own feelings towards the Jesuits individually were always most friendly, and such objections as he expressed to them as a society were based on public, not at all on private grounds. He believed them to be the leaders of the obscurantists, the enemies of all reform, and that to the centralizing influence of their society was in great part due the centralism which obtained in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and which deprived the episcopacy of much of its former independence. He attributed the weakness, the lack of self-reliance, of robust faith and manly piety, of strong and elevated character, to the marvellous machinery invented or perfected by the Jesuits which so emasculates the soul, destroys or drives into hiding all mental activity, and causes strong and robust men to turn in wrath or disgust from the faith and piety confounded with the human machinery in vogue for sustaining them, and seek refuge in infidelity and indifference. And after the order of the General of the Society requiring them to teach the philosophy of Aristotle as interpreted by Fonseca, he opposed that philosophy because, in his judgment, its principles are not the principles of things or reality, but are mental conceptions, abstractions, taken from reflective thought, which is secondary, psychologi-

cal, without necessarily asserting any objective reality, and therefore inadequate to correct the false principles from which pantheism or atheism is logically deducible. To bring back the modern world to the unity that has been lost, no narrow or jejune system of philosophy or theology could suffice, nor any extraordinary assertion of external authority. To do it, it is necessary to reform philosophy so as to conform to the system of the Universe as it lies in the mind and decree of the Creator, made known to us by reason and revelation, not to an artificial and unreal system spun from our own brains. Only in this way can the whole world of intellect be brought into harmony with itself and with God, prejudices against religion be removed, all *a priori* objections to supernatural revelation be precluded, and the positive evidences for it be allowed to have their full weight. Faith will then revive, and with it piety and holiness, science and virtue; and civilization and religion will embrace each other and advance together. Brownson never said a word against the Jesuits as men or as priests, and was influenced in what he said of the society by no personal reasons, and his motives were such as cannot be justly censured; but it was a mistake, a grave blunder, to butt his head against the Society of Jesus. For whether his judgment was true or false in his sense, its publication could do no good, and could hardly fail to do harm by encouraging their enemies who are for the most part the enemies also of religion. In a letter to Montalembert who disapproved of his remarks, he said: "I am sorry I published them, for they can do no good, and may do harm."

It was while lecturing in Chicago, in the winter of 1862-3, that Brownson met Healy, the painter, at whose request he sat for his portrait. Healy made two pictures, one for Brownson, and another which he kept for himself. Healy tried to do his best, and said he had painted many portraits, but his ambition was to go down to posterity tacked on Brownson's skirts. He seems to have succeeded according to his own judgment; for he wrote:

CHICAGO, February 11, 1863.

My dear Friend:—After you left us I discovered I had the head too large for your body in my picture. I kept yours and have repainted mine, which I now like, and I hope you will also, when you see it in the N. Y. exhibition.

Your portrait left here last night by express. I hope it may reach you in safety, and please your family. I enclose you the receipt from the express office.

Your words linger in my mind like a strain of music, and your acquaintance has been one of the greatest pleasures of my life. The Bishop has been to see your portrait, and is pleased. I hope to soon hear from you saying you have reached home in safety and found your family well. Present to them my kindest regards with the wish that before long I may see them in person, as I feel that I know them.

My family join me in affectionate regards to you.

Sincerely your friend,

GEO. P. HEALY.

The next December, he wrote: "I enclose you a few lines from some of your admirers here with a list of

subscribers to your most valuable Review, and a draft for the amount. . . I am glad to inform you that I have been kept busy this year, and your portrait is considered my best."

Mrs. Brownson was not pleased with Healy's portrait, and never became satisfied with the expression the artist had given her husband. In both portraits painted by Healy this fault is conspicuous: to those who knew Brownson only very slightly, they seem good likenesses; but to those who knew him intimately, the failure to give his proper expression is striking.

Brownson's letters to his children, during the war of the Rebellion, show that he was both physically, and especially mentally, suffering much more than would be supposed from his public activity and expressions. In June, 1862, he writes to one of his sons: "I am perplexed and half-distracted with troubles of all sorts. My eyes are about as they were. . . . I have had a severe attack of rheumatic gout, confining me for about two months. My Review for July was out on the 17th inst.—a good number, I think, but too earnestly opposed to slavery to be popular.

"There is a great lack of wisdom and energy in the Administration, and my patience is at times nearly exhausted. I am afraid of foreign intervention unless you win a decisive victory at Richmond, and not make a *fiasco* of it, as Halleck has done at Corinth. You probably have Beauregard and the flower of his army at Richmond. It is hard our poor soldiers should have to suffer so much, work so hard, and gain only deserted camps or evacuated towns. But we need yet many political and military lessons. If there is no foreign inter-

vention, the war is only begun. We have not yet whipped the Rebels.

“ My Catholic position, I have lately heard, is good at the Propaganda, but not very good here. What will be the upshot, I cannot say. My faith, I need not tell you, is firm, and let come what may, I shall live and die in the Communion of the Church. There is no salvation out of her Communion.

“ Your mother says she is well, but she worries in her sleep at nights about you and Edward. I do all I can to calm her, and yet I am not without anxiety myself. I have four masses said this week for you and him. . . . I need not tell you to avoid danger, for you are a soldier, and I trust, every inch a soldier. But I may tell you that prudence is not inconsistent with bravery, and that you may be careful of your health that you may the better serve your country, who never had more need of the service of every one who loves her. I wish I was young enough and well enough to be with you. Remember your country and your God. I commend you to the keeping of the God of battles.”

Writing to the same son, July 9th, he says: “ Your letter of the 4th inst. which we received yesterday, you may be sure, gave us great relief. That you must have been in the hottest of the fight I know, and could hardly persuade myself that you could escape uninjured. You say your wounds are not serious, I fear they are more serious than you pretend, and I wish you to write ME at your earliest opportunity and let me know the precise facts. That you have escaped with life is to me a source of gratitude to Almighty God, to whom I had several Masses offered for your protection. I am hardly less

thankful that you did your duty as an American officer. . . The Administration, I mean the President, not Secretary Stanton, has failed utterly and shamefully in its duty, and if it was not so late in the session, he would be impeached. He is totally incompetent, and there is great danger that his vulpecular policy will ruin the nation. He appears to sympathize only with traitors, and to think that if he can only satisfy the border states, I would say, 'Old Kentuck,' and place traitors in the Federal Army, that he is wondrous wise. He is responsible for all our disasters, and the press wish to make Stanton the scape-goat. But I cannot trust myself to speak on this subject. The President is your Commander-in-chief, and it is not fitting that you should hear anything against him. My anxiety for my country keeps me ill, and is so great that I can hardly be civil. . . It is hard and you need not wonder if sometimes the gout gets into my temper."

October 3rd he wrote to the same: "This will be handed to you by Mr. Swinton of the *New York Times*, I pray you to treat him with distinguished consideration, as your father's highly esteemed friend. We all like him much, and your mother makes a special request that you should treat him civilly. He visits the army to arrange the *Times* correspondents. Be so kind as to introduce him to your brother officers as you have occasion. Ned writes me a glowing account of your extraordinary merits as an officer. I wish you were a better correspondent . . . I regard the battle of Antietam as indecisive. Gen. Mc. has no great faculty of converting his fights into real victories . . . I do not like the proclamation: it is a menace, not an act, and goes not far

enough, but will upon the whole commit the administration to a policy. Gen. Halleck is slow, but I think he will satisfy you in the long run. The dictatorship must not be thought of. Seward, whose malign influence has been so disastrous to the national cause, will probably go out of the Cabinet, and Edward Everett go in. It will be a gain. If things do not go better then, there must be a resignation or impeachment . . . The Republicans here will most likely nominate me for congress. I do not like it, but, if elected, shall serve. Ned is answerable for starting it, and ought to be scolded for doing it . . . When in Washington I heard much of your gallant conduct in the battles before Richmond. General Sykes did not overlook you, and Gen. Mc. recommended you for two brevets." Of Fremont he writes: "I like him personally, but I fear he is not a great General after all."

After the battle of Fredericksburg, Brownson writes to the same son, December 23rd, 1862: "I have been inexpressibly grieved and chagrined at General Burnside's failure, but I retain my confidence—to a certain extent—in him, and fully in the army. We have had all manner of reports, but Gen. B.'s letter to Gen. Halleck, published this morning, puts a better face on the matter, and frankly assumes the whole responsibility. He has shown himself straight-forward and manly in this. I am assured the President refuses to accept his resignation, and I can fix my mind on no better man, unless it be Franklin, to take his place. Sigel's fictitious reputation is vanishing, and McDowell is clearing away the clouds that obscured his merits. It seems that it was the President that prevented his coöperation with McClellan on

the Peninsula. As for Stanton, I give him up. He is nobody, and he ought to be removed, and Banks put in his place.

“My Review will be out this week. It is severe on the administration, especially the President, whose nigger policy I utterly condemn. I am not, and never have been, as you know, an abolitionist, though strongly opposed to slavery, and I have urged and urge abolition only as a means of prosecuting the war. There are no military reasons for the President's policy, His proclamation was a blunder, and a usurpation, for no man can pretend it was justified by military necessity ; for a military necessity that can wait a hundred days is, at least, not urgent. His ‘compensated emancipation’ is a swindle and, if adopted, would free no slave, and put millions and millions of money into the hands of his creatures. I retain no confidence in the President, and I hold him responsible for all miscarriages. Seward is bad enough, but I am not certain that it is not Seward who follows the President, and not the President who follows Seward. The effort to remove Seward has failed, and I do not believe a change in the Cabinet will amount to anything without a change in the chief . . . Of myself I have not much to say. To please Sarah and Edward I consented to run for congress, and was defeated, which has done me great harm. How my Review will go this year I am unable to say. I, however, forget my private griefs in grief for my country. I am prepared to hear any day of a terrible disaster to the Army of the Cumberland, under Gen. Rosecrans. If the rivers have not yet risen, his army is without supplies, and we must trust in God. He alone can help us.”

That Lincoln knew how unsatisfactory his proclamation was to very many patriotic statesmen, is certain, and it is very likely he seriously contemplated the necessity of a second proclamation correcting its defects. Brownson suggested this to Jas. A. Hamilton, of Nevis, near Dobbs Ferry, who was about to visit Washington, and who on his return, writing to Brownson, September 27th, 1862, says of that letter: "I delivered it to the President, accompanying the act with such remarks as were called for. He said he would keep it under his eye. I intimated that when he was to issue the other proclamation he would find something worthy of his consideration.—He said, Shall I have to issue another?—I replied, Most certainly." Hamilton was as severe on Seward as was Brownson. In one of his letters, quoting from Seward to Adams, June 5th, 1861, "The acceptance [of civil war] was attended with a strong desire and fixed purpose that the war shall be as short, and accompanied with as little suffering as possible," he adds, "of course to the enemy." He continues: "The fixed purpose is that the war shall be as short as possible. To achieve a short war, according to the understanding of all mankind except the Secretary, it should be a most vigorous one, attended by overwhelming blows at all the parts, and particularly the weak points of the enemy; and, of course, attended by as much suffering to him as possible. In this view, the two results desired and to be aimed at are wholly incompatible. This is simply an absurdity; wholly unworthy of a man who could be supposed to be capable of performing the duties of Secretary of State of this nation at this great crisis of its affairs . . . I am confident this paragraph affords the key to the whole course of the

war as conducted by McClellan on the Potomac and Halleck before Corinth, of not attacking the enemy, of guarding his property, of refusing the ardent desires of his slaves to escape ; and thus of so conducting the war as to accompany it with as little suffering as possible. This is the Seward policy." And in another letter, he said, "Gen. Scott's letter of the 5th April, 1861, is very significant when taken in connection with the Seward policy. You may depend upon it, Seward, Scott, Lincoln, Blair, and others intended to say to the seceded states, *wayward sisters, depart in peace* (Scott's letter), or to patch up a compromise. They did not mean to *wage war* in earnest."

There is no intention of tiring the reader with extracts from his sons' letters ; but one written at this time, about six weeks after the battle of Antietam, shows something of the character of their letters, and of the opinion of some of the officers of the regular army. It is written October 24th, from the Army of the Potomac. "Our corps moves across the river to-day, to begin the advance. The [Artillery] Reserve have orders to prepare for the impending battle by having light knapsacks. I believe the Reserve are to march to-morrow. To-morrow the headquarters will probably get off. It is no sham now. The rebels have probably fortified themselves along Winchester and the line thence to the Shenandoah. They have had plenty of positions to choose from, and sufficient time to fortify the poorest. They have recovered from all the disorganization that followed Antietam, and are enthusiastic over Stuart's success. Our army should have moved on the 18th ult.; it moves against great odds, I fear, now. Burnside says

we number 126,000 (on the 20th). On the 10th, we numbered 107,000 present, and 196,000 absent. These figures are correct. Burnside and Hunt—I know not what others—wished to advance on the 18th ult. From Gen. Hunt I learn that McClellan said to the President, before leaving for the Peninsula, ‘I leave you 60,000 men for the defence of Washington, so many across the river, so many at Baltimore, so many with Banks, &c.; if you want more, tell me now.’ ‘No more,’ said he. But Abe takes Blenker’s division away. McClellan remonstrates. The President urges his necessity, and promises not to repeat it,—to take no more. April 1st, McClellan sails, ordering McDowell to go to Fredericksburg. McClellan gets before Yorktown, and pulls out his guns. ‘Now,’ he says, ‘Hunt, you see; I am going to make a show here before Yorktown, until the whole rebel army runs down here to defend it. Then McDowell will move across from Gloucester, stretch across to the James, and we have all Secesh penned.’ On the evening of the 4th April, the President’s order of that day arrived, detaching McDowell and Banks. Can you tell if on the 1st April, there were any rebels in force at Yorktown, and if the probabilities were that they would run down into the trap? I hope you will not fail to give me your opinion on this piece of McClellan’s strategy.”

In addressing his readers on the 1st of January, 1863, Brownson said: “We have been in this and other Reviews before the public for nearly a third of a century, and we can well believe that we have, with many, become an old story, and that not a few, who hear much of us and read little, wonder why we still persist in repeating ourselves. A wise and amiable critic says we

have written ourselves out, though, he adds, he has not read us for the last five years ; and we hear from various quarters hints that we are growing old and prosy. Perhaps we have exhausted ourselves and have become a bore ; but it is hard to make a bore feel that he is not agreeable and entertaining, or an old man believe that he is not still young, or at least just entering the prime of life. It is true, we must confess to bad eyes and a little stiffening of the joints, but these things happen sometimes to young men, and we by no means admit that we are old. We have had serious thoughts of applying for a commission of Major-General in the army, and would do so, only we have some distrust of our horsemanship, having been out of practice of late, and grown somewhat stout. We think we could make a better major-general than some in the army, for there is, after all, a good deal of fight in us . . . We find rarely a critic that remembers that we are an old writer, of some reputation, not unlikely, before he was born, and that what we write to-day must be qualified by what we wrote yesterday, as well as what we wrote yesterday by what we write to-day. We are, therefore, inclined to believe that our fault is that we retain our youth too well, and give to our writings a character of youth and freshness which detracts from their merits. As to repeating ourselves, why, it is possible we do ; but what harm in that, when nobody remembers what we have previously said, or is aware that what we publish to-day is not now published for the first time ? Then, if we were to retire from the stage, what would become of us ? Here, for the best part of a life-time, we have been writing reviews daily ; to ask us to desist, is to kill us, or

to ask us to kill ourselves. Moreover, we do not think we can be spared just now. We do not feel that our work is yet done, or that we have no further word to utter; so we resolve, if Providence gives us life and strength, and the public will endure us, to continue to jog on in our vocation.

“The times have injured the Review a good deal, and the course it has taken for the last two or three years, while it has gained it, has lost it some friends. The friends we have lost, we of course regret, for not a few of them we love and reverence; but they have turned their backs on us, mainly, through misunderstanding and the apprehension of what they feared we might do, rather than for anything we have actually done. We have lost them only for a time, for their hearts are in the right place, and their fears were always unfounded. We have reason and a conscience, neither of which pride or passion is likely to blind. We are what we have been, what we always shall be,—a bold, rough, independent man, but a sincere, earnest, and devoted Catholic, who believes that he can save his soul only in the Church, and has no wish to lose it. The Church is our mother, and never knowingly will we grieve her maternal heart, or, knowingly, have we done so. We have not sought our personal glory. We have remained poor when we could easily have made ourselves rich, and received censure when we could with more ease have gained applause. We have labored, in thought, word, and deed, for what we regarded as the true interests of Catholicity in our age and country. We may have erred in judgment: when we are shown or are convinced that we have, we shall confess, and make reparation. The best thing is never to

err, and the next best thing is to own and correct the error. We claim not the former, but we shall never shrink from the latter. With this assurance to our friends and un-friends, and at peace in our own heart with both, we wish them both a Happy New Year."

On reading this address, Montalembert wrote:

LA ROCHE EN BRENY, COTE D'OR,
February 5th, 1862.

My dear Dr. Brownson:—I cannot read the concluding words of your January number, without holding out my hand to grasp yours, and requesting you to look upon me as one of those friends you have *not* lost. On the contrary, I feel more and more attached to you, not only because you have always stood by me and held me up, against undeserved obloquy, but also and still more so because I deeply sympathize with your character. I love *bold, rough, independent men*, as you say you are, and I bitterly regret to find so few men of that stamp amongst Catholics. You may be right or wrong in your private views on different subjects, temporal and spiritual, but of one thing I feel assured, that you are an excellent Catholic and an *honest* man, besides being a writer of superior talent. Now being turned of fifty and having began public life in the Catholic camp when hardly twenty, my *sad* experience has convinced me that *good* Catholics or so-called people are not always *honest*, and care very little for honesty, still less for *honor*, which is the flower and fragrance of honesty. Finding therefore all I most esteem and desire united in your own self, I beg once more to take your hand in mine and to claim my place amongst your true and faithful friends.

Your excellent article *Faith and Theology* shows me that we have come round to be perfectly agreed even on the Italian or rather Roman question as you resume it page 16. * With all the other definitions and distinctions you lay down in that same article I feel perfectly satisfied. We may perhaps be both heretics, but at all events we don't intend to be so, and we only stand to our opinions against other *human* opinions, and not against God's authority when duly revealed to us. We believe, as you so nobly say, that we can save our soul only in the Church, and we have no wish to lose it.

Things are going on sadly in both hemispheres: at least, so it seems to me. But having been turned adrift in the prime of life, and living for the last ten years in downright contradiction with men and things which are uppermost in public opinion, both Catholic and un-Catholic, I may be led astray by a not un-natural discontent. I see however that you do not judge much more favorably of the course of events. Your honest patriotism does not prevent you from telling most severe truths to your country-men and women. I am afraid the Union will never be re-established, although all my sympathies are with the North, as I took care to state on the only public occasion I have had lately, or most likely shall have, in my speech at the Academy on the *prix de vertu*. I cannot say how much I lament the yells of brutal satisfaction with which *all* the servile egoists of Europe greet the distress of your great republic. Strange to say, except the small group of *liberal* Catholics whose mouthpiece is the *Correspondant*, the immense bulk of

* Works, Vol. VIII. p. 15.

the clergy and Catholics agree with England (whom they have been taught by the *Univers* to hate), in wishing well to the slave-holders!

A l'intérieur, imperial democracy is more flourishing than ever, and you may judge of the happy influence of the Napoleonic régime on the moral and intellectual state of the nation by such works as the *Misérables*, *le fils de Giboyer*, and *Salambô*. The Emperor having given up the plan of handing over Rome to Victor Emmanuel, has speedily regained the confidence of the poor credulous Catholics who are daily taught by their organ the *Monde* to prefer any sort of despotism rather than civil and religious liberty. Having foolishly concentrated all their energy and all their attention on the Roman question, they take no heed of the system by which this once great and Christian nation has been delivered up to the strange crew of bastards, fillibusters, and renegades who are the worthy and exclusive ministers of modern Cæsarism. The Emperor, as you will see by his last speech, goes on holding up *English liberty* at the very moment when by gagging the press by repeated *avertissemens* and *packing* universal suffrage in a new set of *circonscriptions* he has extinguished the last spark of our past or future freedom.

Ever yours,

MONTALEMBERT.

At Chancellorsville, in May, 1863, two of Brownson's sons were in the battles; one was wounded and captured, but the other, who was in a different staff of the army, wrote his father that it was reported that he with other wounded soldiers had been cremated in the fire which consumed the woods. It was several days be-

fore the truth was known; but as soon as Brownson learned that his son was in the hands of the enemy, he set to work to secure his freedom. He went at once to the Commissary General of Prisoners at Washington, who promised to have him exchanged as speedily as possible, and May 21, sent him a note saying: "I have this moment learned that your son, Capt. Brownson has not yet been delivered, but he will be in a day or two. A flag of truce boat will leave Fort Monroe for City Point to-morrow." Brownson proceeded to Fort Monroe, where his friend, General Dix, was in command, who detained the boat coming down from City Point with Brownson's son till he had put the father aboard. Arriving at Annapolis, where there was a "Parole Camp," his son was detained with all others that had been released, and on telegraphing to Colonel Hoffman, the Commissary General of Prisoners, was told that he must apply in the usual form for leave of absence, enclosing a surgeon's certificate of disability. Brownson thought that so much red-tape was out of place where his son was in need of careful treatment to save him from the necessity of suffering amputation, and having telegraphed the Secretary of War without receiving an answer, he took his son home with him. About an hour after he left Annapolis, the secretary's dispatch, giving his son leave, arrived at the camp. Brownson wrote Stanton from his home in Elizabeth, explaining what he had done and why. This is Stanton's answer:

WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON CITY, D. C.

May 28th, 1863.

Dear Sir:—On receipt of the intelligence that your son was at Annapolis immediate orders were given that

he should be furloughed to return home. No condition of any kind was directed, and no one had any right to impose a condition upon my order. There is no impropriety in your having taken him home, that being in conformity with my own wishes. The order giving him a leave of absence will be repeated and a copy of it forwarded to him. His leave is for thirty days, at the expiration of which he ought to report the condition of his health, and it will be continued from time to time as his health may require.

Yours truly,

EDWIN M. STANTON.

Secretary of War.

REVEREND O. A. BROWNSON.

ELIZABETH, N. J.

The Review for 1864, which the Editor named the "National Series," was political, philosophical, and literary. The theological part was discontinued. For four or five years Brownson had been laboring for a reform in Philosophy and Theology, and in some respects even in the discipline of the Church. This fact had led to much hostile criticism, which, however, neither surprised nor angered him, though he thought it not just or candid. The reforms he sought did not touch dogma, the constitution of the church, or her authority to teach and govern. They affected only what is human, practical discipline or canon law, which is always reformable, and theological and philosophical systems, which are creations of the human understanding. As even men well disposed at first, are apt, when they meet on the part of the authorities what appears to them a blind and unjust

opposition, and unwise persistence, to go further than they had thought of going, so far as to resist the authority itself, and break away from the unity of the church; Brownson was opposed from fear that he would do the same, in case he failed to obtain his reforms in a legal way. In his case, the fear was groundless; for he knew, before coming into the church, the best that could be offered outside, and his philosophy and theology harmonized perfectly with his Catholic faith and duty. He had no doubt that the neglect or refusal of the authorities to favor the reforms he sought was driving large numbers out of the church, and keeping out millions who otherwise might be drawn within her fold. But so long as she insists on retaining her policy, he must submit and obey her commands. It was not impossible that she was right, and at all events, changes effected without her authority could have no value. It is better, he said, to wait, to wait patiently and submissively, till the church gets ready to effect such reforms as are needed. In the mean time, he turned his attention more exclusively to other matters. The immediate effect of this change was the loss of many Catholic subscribers to the Review; but Sumner, Kelly, M. J. Conway, and other political friends exerted themselves to send new lists; Fremont subscribed for a thousand copies; and it was not for want of subscribers that he determined to discontinue his Review with the volume for 1864. Taking leave of his readers in the October number, * he mentions the death of two sons, almost simultaneously, and that the body of one, as he wrote, lay in an adjoining room, awaiting deposition; and this double affliction, and the family's deso-

* Explanations to Catholics, Vol. XX. p. 361.

lation thereupon, had more than anything else to do with the suspension of the Review. He was certainly disheartened; and it seemed as though he never again could have the strength to combat opponents as before. He was only sixty-one years of age; but he looked and felt half a-score years older, and believed it was time for him to rest, and as he said, in the Irish expression, to "make his soul."

In his "Explanations to Catholics," the writer discusses the various accusations urged against him during the last few years, and without attempting to soften or explain away anything he had really ever meant, or supposed he was maintaining, presents his views such as they honestly were. "Wrong," he says, "they may be, uncatholic in intention we know they were not. We have never, since we became a Catholic, written a line that we regarded as unorthodox, and not intended to serve the cause of Catholic faith and civilization. From our youth up, we have loved Truth, and wooed her as a bride, and we wish to die in her embrace. We have never adhered from pride or obstinacy to any opinion we had once entertained, and have always been ready—some would say too ready—to abandon any opinion once held the moment we were satisfied of its unsoundness. We repeat, in conclusion, what we have said over and over again in our pages, and to the supreme authority at Rome, that we submit all our writings to the judgment of the Church; and any doctrine or proposition in them that the Holy See will point out as contrary to faith, to sound doctrine, or to the spirit of obedience which should animate every Catholic, we will modify, alter, or retract, in such way and manner as she shall

prescribe. More we cannot say, and less no Catholic ought to say. We abide the judgment of the Church, as pronounced by the Holy See. We never have been disobedient to authority, and we never shall be."

Many friends wrote to express their regret at the death of the *Review*, and their sympathy with its editor. Of these only one will be inserted here.

LA ROCHE EN BRENY, CÔTE D'OR,
December 17th, 1864.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—I cannot tell you how grieved I have been to read in the October number of your admirable *Review* that *that* number was to be the *last*, and also to hear of the terrible domestic calamity which has been inflicted on you by the loss of your two noble sons. Although I have been spared till now the pain of surviving a grown up child, I feel most deeply for you ; and the more so as my paternal affection (cette passion à cheveux blancs, as Lacordaire so beautifully says,) has been of late severely smitten by the sharp and enduring pang which the religious vocation of a most beloved daughter has made me endure. The only *human* consolation I can offer you is to congratulate you on the cause for which your sons have fought and given up their young life, a cause than which none can be more just and more honorable, although on that point, as on so many others, our contemporary Catholics are led astray by their fanatical and SLAVISH mouthpiece.

I conclude that the ever to be lamented suppression of your *Review* can be attributed to no other cause than to the fatal influences, even in your own hemisphere, of the men who are now omnipotent throughout almost all

Catholic Europe, and whose only task or aim is to denounce, and to smother every honest and straightforward Catholic that will not consent to bow down and worship their idols and themselves. A day will certainly come when the Church will deeply rue the pestilential ascendancy which these men are allowed to wield. But in the meantime, you and many other devoted children and soldiers of truth are struck down, wounded to the heart by the poisoned shafts of that new Inquisition. They have spared no one: great and small, young and old, priests and laymen, have been consigned to the same doom. M. de Falloux and Prince de Broglie, the Bishop of Orleans and Abbé Perreyre, Father Lacordaire and his most worthy successor at Notre Dame, Father Hyacinthe, the Belgian Dechamps and the German Döllinger, in short all the most glorious or hopeful names of the present day have been more or less *excommunicated* just like you and me. *Sed et gloriamur in tribulationibus, scientes quod tribulatio patientiam operatur; patientia autem probationem; probatio vero spem; spes autem non confundit.*

Except on the Jesuits, about whom I think you *generalize* too much (See Father Matignon's and others' excellent contributions to the *Etudes religieuses*), except on this one point, I agree with EVERY THING you say in your *Explanations to Catholics*, and above all on the extreme danger of that centralism (P. 473) which is now exposing the Church to the same dangers and the same corruptions which have destroyed monarchy throughout the world. But my sympathy for your opinions and doctrines, though so deep and so full, is still beneath my admiration for your manly truthfulness.

You are *a man*, and thanks to the prevailing spirit, Catholics in these days are *not men*.

I hope you will let me hear from you, and never look upon me as a person indifferent to your spiritual or temporal welfare. I hope also you received my letter from Maiche thanking you for your generous and friendly article on my speech at Malines [*Civil and Religious Freedom*, July, 1864.—Works, Vol. XX. p. 308]. But I am not quite sure of your address, which I request you to give me with great precision. The *Correspondant* shall continue to be sent to you as long as you may wish for it. Believe me ever your most obliged and devoted servant,

LE CTE. DE MONTALEMBERT.

It should be borne in mind that at the date of this letter, Hyacinthe was held in fair esteem by Catholics generally, and the uncatholic tendency of Döllinger was not much more alarming to those well acquainted with his doctrines than it had been at any time for a dozen years past. Montalembert avowed himself a *liberal Catholic*, and all Brownson's tendencies and sympathies were in the same direction. But from this time on, they took different directions. The quarrel between the Count and Louis Veuillot, which caused the rupture of the Catholic party, was a severe blow, and he could never be reconciled to the fact that his competitor of the *Univers* in the division carried off the lion's share and secured the approval of Rome, the Jesuits, and the great body of the bishops and clergy of France. He was left with a few friends, and as the party opposed to him were imperialists, he ran further and further into the extreme of Liberalism. Centralism in Church and State became

his *bête-noire*: he saw it everywhere ; and hence he found himself at length in opposition to the papal supremacy. Brownson saw and deplored the last fatal tendency, but had no suspicion it would carry him so far ; and in what must be regarded as his fall, could not forget that he had a richly gifted nature, and that he had made large and precious contributions to Catholic literature ; and also remembered how high had been the ambition which was ignobly thwarted. He saw in him another proof of the impossibility of allying the Church and modern Liberalism. Gioberti, one of the most powerful and brilliant minds of the epoch, tried it, and was wrecked ; Ventura tried it, and fared little better ; Balmes died before the virus of liberalism had time to take effect ; and he himself was saved from the fate of his friends Gioberti and Montalembert only by the Syllabus and retirement for several years from the publication of his Review, till he returned to his former doctrine that while loyal to the government, he must never suffer his politics to get the better of his religion, or think to promote the interests of religion by allying them to anything of the earth.

CHAPTER XV.

AN ANNUITY.—A REPLY TO FROTHINGHAM.—“THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC.”—BANCROFT.—RECONSTRUCTION.

WHEN Brownson made up his mind to discontinue the publication of his Review, some of the Catholics of New York and its neighborhood proposed to publish a

Review with the same name, and to secure the services of the former editor as a contributor to the new series. He offered them his subscription list and the right to continue the Review on condition of their settling the outstanding accounts for the last number or two, which, he calculated, amounted to about twelve hundred dollars.

This plan fell through, as explained in a letter here given:

NEW YORK, November 5th, 1864.

Dear Doctor:—We have been holding some anxious réunions first as Conductors of a Quarterly without any further consideration, and secondly as your friends. We have asked the question, Can we in these uncertain times, without any sinking fund, without pay for contributors, with a debt of \$1200, carry on a Quarterly with any chance of success? We have been obliged reluctantly to decide that ~~for~~ for the present the load is more than we can carry; more particularly since Appleton & Bro's decline being our publishers. For the present then we have determined to give up the publication of a Quarterly. We are now engaged as your friends in maturing an offer which we hope to make to you in a few days. It would, if successful, leave you free and untrammled, be consistent with your dignity, and yet make us feel that you are as safely provided for as you would have been had our project of a Quarterly been carried on to completion at once.

As we are yet not perfectly certain of succeeding I must beg you to wait a few days for fuller explanations.

The Archbishop* has spent several hours with us in discussing the Quarterly, and has come pretty much

* John McCloskey, successor to John Hughes, who died in January, 1864.

to our own conclusions. He is also acting with us in our undertaking as your friends, and no one is more kind, generous, and honorable towards you and your interests than himself.

F. Hecker left town this morning for a mission.

With kindest wishes for your health and happiness, I remain, Dear Doctor, most sincerely yours,

J. W. CUMMINGS.

Chairman of Edit. Board &c.

Hecker was very active in the same undertaking. March 17th, 1865, he wrote: I keep occupied with the annuity, and am doing my best to bring matters to a definite settlement. These two days past I have made inquiries at different companies about it. I should feel an increased satisfaction in having the annuity continued to Mrs. Brownson in case she should survive you. *Please let me know her age* that I may learn what would be the additional sum to secure her in this case the annuity."

On the 15th of August following, the matter was concluded by the purchase from the Manhattan Life Insurance Co. of New York for the sum of \$8050.78, of an annuity payable to Brownson semi-annually, of \$1000 per annum for life. In September Brownson met his friends of the Testimonial Committee at Cummings's residence (80 east 29th St.) about noon, when the annuity assurance was presented to him by Cummings, who in his address, said on behalf of several Bishops, many Priests and distinguished Laymen, and even some Protestants who had joined in the purchase, that they did not intend by this testimonial to approve all that Brownson had

spoken or written; that his best friends were compelled to condemn some of his utterances. But what they wished to honor was the perfect honesty which they had observed in him for so many years, the fearless and open defence of what he held to be for the true interests of religion, the unselfishness that would sacrifice everything rather than truth, the free and manly use of his tongue and pen which should never be denied to any honorable Catholic if they could prevent it. Whilst they expressed by this Testimonial their acknowledgment of the extraordinary services he had rendered to the cause of religion, of science, and of literature, they would by no means have any present which they tendered him, restrain him in the free and candid expression of his honest convictions. They hoped that he might enjoy their gift for many years, and continue with all the fire and strength of former days to give to the public the thoughts and feelings of his manly nature.

Brownson, in answering, said, amongst other things, that dispassionately reviewing his course as a Catholic publicist in the past years, he was satisfied that he might have effected his purpose just as well without giving any offence: the opposition he struck against and the difficulties that he encountered were in a great measure created by him; and might have been avoided without any sacrifice of principle or neglect of duty, and without giving up any of that freedom of speech and independence of character so greatly prized by all who love Catholic truth and respect themselves. More prudence, mildness, and dexterity would have been better; and often after mature reflection he thought some views he had expressed should be so modified as to sever his con-

nection with a tendency to which he was wrong in yielding.

At the time of this presentation of the annuity, nearly a year had elapsed since Brownson had written his Review for October 1864, and he had begun to regret the liberal tendency of its later volumes. But it will not do to suppose that he had become more illiberal than he really was. If he accepted Pius IX's teaching of the conflict between the church and modern civilization, it did not necessarily follow, and Leo XIII so assures us, that religion and civilization are in themselves antagonistic and irreconcilable. There may be things in modern civilization which no good Catholic ought to accept; but that, on the whole, the progress of civilization is to be denounced and excommunicated, seems to me impious to assert, as it also is, to be personally opposed or indifferent to well-directed efforts to ameliorate men's earthly condition. This world, as Brownson repeatedly said, has its place and office even in the Creator's plan of the Universe, and there is no necessary antagonism between earth and heaven; and this he maintained in his "New Views," in 1836, and made the basis of his "Society of Christian Union," to which he preached in the Masonic Temple in Boston before he was a Catholic. And as all the Creator's works proceed from the same divine Reason, which is immutable and eternal, and are necessarily dialectical and harmonious, as will be seen when all things are consummated, he regarded that asceticism as one-sided and hardly to be preferred to liberalism, that proceeds on the assumption of a necessary antagonism between this life and the life to come. It is a Platonic, not a Christian asceticism; is of pagan origin, and

no doubt, has had much to do in producing, by way of reaction, the secularism which now abases individual character everywhere and hinders all moral and social progress.

Brownson's first publication after the suspension of his Review was an anonymous pamphlet, "Catholicity and Naturalism," * written at Hecker's request. The first article in the Christian Examiner for January 1865, was entitled *The Order of St. Paul the Apostle and the new Catholicity*, referring to Hecker and his companions, who called their community the congregation of St. Paul the Apostle. Hecker writes January 25th, "I send you two pamphlets by Frothingham. Both useful in the intended Review. I am told that in the Unitarian paper of last week, Frothingham was said to be the author of the 1st article in the Examiner. This may be well for you to know in connection with his authorship of *The New Religion of Nature*. You will see on p. 3, first column that he has trotted me out again. What a satanic imagination must have suggested the last sentence of the paragraph!

In the Review of Hedge you will find the defence of this "New Religion," and I think there can be no doubt that Hedge is that leader spoken of as having returned † to supernaturalism.

"The Armitages are furious against F. for his attack in the Examiner. I have written to Boston, and will know in a day or two whether Fields will publish the pamphlet. The title might be—"A Review of the Christian Examiner on Catholicity and the New Religion of

* Works, Vol. VIII p. 339.

† See Vol. VIII. p. 354.

Nature." I shall get the Unitarian paper and make sure of the authorship of the article. In the meantime, if necessary, you can assume it. The earlier you can give the review, the more satisfactory."

This article in the *Christian Examiner* for January, 1865, contained a remarkable admission of the failure of Protestantism as a religion. It said very truly, "The process of disintegration is going forward with immense rapidity throughout Protestant Christendom. Organizations are splitting asunder, institutions are falling into decay, customs are becoming uncustomary, usages are perishing from neglect, sacraments are deserted by the multitude, creeds are decomposing under the action of liberal studies and independent thought." The refuge from these falling ruins, Frothingham thought, was in naturalism, not in the Catholic Church,—at least in the new Catholic Church which Hecker and his associates were attempting to build up.

Brownson's reply discussed the general question, and also contained a defence of Hecker's community.

The *Examiner* asserted that Hecker went "to Rome in 1857 for the purpose of obtaining the Papal release from his order whose austere regulations were somewhat more than distasteful to him, and whose mediæval type of Catholicism seemed to him out of date in this generation, and ill-suited to the genius and needs of the American people." Brownson, on Hecker's authority, says: "This is untrue in all its parts . . . He never solicited, he never wished a release from his order, but accepted it at the request of the Holy Father himself." Besides his defence of Hecker, Brownson shows that the *Examiner's* is a Christianity without Christ, a religion.

without God, a belief in nothing above the material order, with nothing to awaken and exercise man's higher and nobler faculties; and although Protestantism served the material growth of this nation in its infancy, only Catholicity can satisfy it as the religion of its manhood.

Of the pamphlet Hecker wrote after its publication by Donahoe, of Boston: "The reply gave entire satisfaction. The Archbishop expressed himself the other day to me, as being highly delighted with both the spirit and substance of the reply."

This same year, 1865, Brownson wrote his *American Republic*, a work of about the same size as *The Convert* and *The Spirit-Rapper*, but costing much more labor and hard thinking. The first part is, indeed, little else than his articles on the Origin and Constitution of Government, published in the *Democratic Review* in 1843; but the part on the special constitution of the United States contained his mature views on the relations of the state and general governments as they had been modified by the discussion of the asserted right of a state to secede, on the one side, and of the right to suppress secession on the other. The originality of the book, and its most striking features in the author's judgment, were in the assertion of the American Democracy as territorial, and distinguishing it from pure individualism on the one hand, and from pure socialism on the other, and in placing the sovereignty in the states, against the consolidationists, and in the states united, not severally, against the secessionists. The states are collectively, not individually, sovereign. The people, he maintained after Suarez, are, under God, collectively sovereign. These two points are new, and had been made, so far as his

knowledge extended, by no writer before him. Barbarism is when power is founded on private property or attached to private domain : civilization attaches power to the public domain, or the state, which is population fixed to the soil. Hence all civilized governments are territorial and republican, founded on *res publica*.

On these three points, the author considered he had contributed something to political science, and made an addition to the usually recognized principles of government. The first and the third were discovered or brought distinctly to his mind while writing the book. It had more in it than every one will discover ; it is honest and patriotic, and profoundly Catholic, and really one of the strongest arguments he ever published for Catholicity.

Soon after Brownson began writing this book, he discloses the plan of this and several other works which he then contemplated writing in a letter to Sumner:

HON. C. SUMNER, U. S. S.

My dear Sir:—having suspended my Review, I know not as I have any right to assume to be of importance enough to trouble you with any scribbling of mine. My Review died of Fremont. Had I not supported the Pathfinder, or had he not withdrawn and left me in the lurch, I should have continued it, and I hope to be able yet to resume it. I stopped it because I had sacrificed my position, and had no party to fall back upon. I voted in the election, as I suppose you did, for Lincoln electors, for after the disloyal resolutions of Chicago I had no alternative.

I am busy writing a book which I entitle The Republic of the United States, its Constitution, Tendencies, and Destiny. I treat 1, Government in general; 2, the

origin of Government, or the principle and ground of the right to govern—sovereignty; 3, The Constitution of Government; 4, The nationality of the United States; 5, The Constitution of the United States written and un-written; 6, The Tendencies of the Republic; 7, Its Destiny. Or, in other words, what is a Republican Government? What the Republic of the United States has in common with all governments, and what it has peculiar to itself. And under the head of Tendencies and Destiny of the Republic, I expose the dangerous tendencies among us, and end with a vindication of our system and our national character. In it you will find my latest and best thoughts on the subject, and all that I have heretofore written on it that I wish to be judged by. It will be my political testament, or my legacy as a citizen to my country, and all to be compressed into a moderate sized 8vo. volume. What think you of the plan?

If my friends succeed in what they are attempting to raise, an annuity, this work if Providence spares my life and health and reason, will be followed by a work on Philosophy, another on Theology, another on the Church, and another on the Catholic and Protestant controversy. Under the head of philosophy I propose to treat Metaphysics, Ethics, and Æsthetics, and under that of theology, the Christian Revelation, and the Greek and Roman, Hindo and Egyptian Mythologies.

Is not this pretty well for a man to propose to himself in the 62nd year of his age? But the materials are all collected, the greater part already written, and nothing remains to be done but to throw the whole into shape, and give it the finishing hand. So you see, I do not

mean, old man as I am, to be idle, and that I have lost neither heart nor hope.

Pardon this egotism. To our national affairs. I am rejoiced that Butler is relieved. In my judgment that is worth more to us than would have been even the taking of Fort Fisher. *

* How severely Brownson censured Butler and other Generals appointed from civil, i. e. political, life, is apparent from another letter of the same date as this one to Sumner, and addressed to Elihu B. Washburne, in which he says: "I know Butler well; he has ability of a certain order; is what in New England is called smart; touchy, astute, fussy; but incapable of anything noble or manly. His course from Big Bethel to the late *fiasco* at Fort Fisher is marked by utter military imbecility or treachery. But for him Grant would have been in Richmond before Sherman reached Atlanta, and our civil war have before this been virtually closed. Perhaps no man, not even the Rebel Lee has been so great an obstacle to General Grant's success, or to the success of the Union cause, as this same Benj. F. Butler;—not so much by what he has done as by what he has failed to do, or hindered from being done. He ought to be court-martialed for his insult to General Grant in his farewell address to his army, condemned, and if not sentenced to death, at least to dishonorable dismissal from the service of the United States

"I hope you and others who have influence and hold the reputation of the Army for something will insist on his having justice done him. At any rate, that you will take care to block the movement already begun to make him a candidate for the presidency in 1868. Better than he were that 'Commissary of the Rebel Army,' N. P. Banks. I was opposed to the nomination and reelection of Mr. Lincoln, and sacrificed myself for Fremont, though I actually voted for Mr. Lincoln; but I would far rather have Mr. Lincoln run a third time, than have any of the civilians who at the beginning of the war were appointed to high military rank.

"Permit me to express to you the wish that Congress would create the grade of full general, and raise to that grade, if but one, General Grant: if, as I should prefer, two, General Grant and General Sherman; and authorize as many Lieut. Generals, as it is intended to have permanent army corps. We have got to be in many respects a military nation, and we should give our army a complete organization. We must be a great naval power, and we should have all the grades in our navy. A vice-admiral, without the grade of admiral, is a solecism.

"I have full confidence in Grant as General-in-Chief, if he can only be permitted to have his own way, and an effective voice in selecting the officers to command armies under him. But do not hamper him by imposing on him the Butlers, the Bankses, the Sigels and Sickleses. Let military appointments be made on military, not political principles.

Let me thank you for your speech on the Reciprocity Treaty—a treaty I never liked. I had long conversations with members of the Canadian ministry on it before it was adopted. Their views of it set me against it.

I think our national affairs look brighter. Sherman is a general, and Thomas is not bad. Appearances now indicate that the next campaign will nearly finish up the war. The great thing with me now is the amendment of the constitution prohibiting slavery. That, if congress will do its duty, will in a short time be adopted by three-fourths of the states. I hope a good and competent man will succeed the present Secretary of the Treasury. We have no reason for despondency. All will come right.

Very truly yours,

O. A. BROWNSON.

ELIZABETH, January 17th, 1865.

Many of Brownson's letters tend to make clear many views maintained in his *American Republic*, and form a sort of commentary on that book. The *New York Times*, reviewing Bancroft's ninth volume of the *History of the United States*, pretended that he was at variance with Brownson's view of our nationality. He says in a letter to Brownson that he thought they substantially agreed on that point. To this Brownson replied :

"I hope the administration will look to it, and take measures hereafter not to be cheated as it has heretofore been as to the actual number of men returned. The last call, it is reported, gave 180,000 recruits: did it add 75,000? One division in New York has been named to me where for 6,000 actually mustered into the service of the United States, the government actually got only 80 men all told, while the A. A. P. Marshal General got credit for 13,000. Is there no way of preventing this?"

My dear Mr. Bancroft:—I received yesterday Vol. IX of your History, and have read nearly all of it with a pleasure which I find it difficult to express. It throws to me new and unexpected light on passages in our history with which I thought I was familiar, and corrects my previous views on various points of great importance. I think also that even in point of style, as well as in depth and maturity of thought it is a great advance on your earlier volumes. The tone is deeper and the style and expression are simpler and more natural, as well as more subdued, without being a whit less poetical and brilliant.

I have not seen the notice in the *Times* to which you refer, but I am at a loss to imagine what view on nationality of mine the writer can have set over against any view of yours. You and I write from different points of view, and adopt not always the same terminology, but I think with you that on the question of nationality "we substantially agree."

We both derive, with the greater part of Catholic theologians, political sovereignty from God through the people, for you as well as I admit right or justice antecedent to the state, and you hold as well as I that God is the source of all existence, right, and power. I infer so at least from p. 258.

I hold that nationality, in the civilized as distinguished from the barbaric order, is territorial, and that every people fixed to a given territory, not subject to any other, is a sovereign nation, and has, under God, the plenary right to determine its own political constitution and to govern itself according to its own judgment

and will. I have found nothing in your volume that contradicts this view, or is not in harmony with it.

I reject Hobbes's theory of the state of nature, and Rousseau's theory of the origin of civil society in a social compact, and believe you do the same. I maintain in opposition that nations are founded, not by compact, are not self-created, but are providentially created and constituted, that is, by historical causes and events, and you maintain the same, for you say, p 271, "a nationality is not an artificial product."

Holding the new nation to have a providential or historical origin, I hold it to be not a self-creation, nor a new creation, but a providential or historical development, and therefore that it grows out of the past in which already existed its germ. I gather from declarations in your Chapter XV. that you hold the same. I cannot imagine then what the critic finds in either to set over against the views of the other.

The question whether the United States were always one sovereign people existing as states united or several distinct sovereign peoples or nations and united now only by a league, is a question that comes up for you when you come to treat of the Federal Constitution, but from remarks scattered all through your volume, to the purport that the colonies were in fighting for independence, fighting for a national cause, and from your frequent assertion of American nationality as against state nationality, I conclude that on the capital point of American nationality, especially as you deny nationality to be an artificial product, we also "substantially agree."

You make it evident that the men who drew up the old Articles of Confederation held the state sovereignty

theory, and while for the most part holding the existence of an American people, they were far from the principles and conditions of their existence as such people, or as I would say, this providential constitution, or organic life. It seems to me, then, whether we speak of a nationality in general, or American nationality in particular, we substantially agree, and the critic in the Times must have misunderstood one or the other, or perhaps both of us.

There is an expression of yours which, it seems to me, is liable to misapprehension, "Nationality . . . can neither be imparted nor taken away." By the nation itself, agreed; but do you mean to assert that nationality is inamissible, that a nation may not be conquered and its nationality lost in the nationality of the conqueror? I do not suppose this is precisely your meaning, but do you sufficiently guard against it?

I should very much regret to be found differing on fundamental political questions with one who has devoted so much more time and study to them than it has been in my power to do, to say nothing of his superior learning and ability. Formerly I thought you inclined too much to what I call Humanitarianism, and being at that time engaged in a bloody war against it, I criticised you with undue severity, which I have long since regretted, and I dedicated my book to you as a sort of public atonement, inadequate of course, but the best I could make. I do not believe my suspicion was well-founded. I find in this volume expressions I should not as a Catholic use, but nothing which seriously conflicts with my Catholic faith, and far more that accords with it than in any other non-Catholic, and even most professedly Catholic historians I am acquainted with.

If I can persuade Father Hecker to allow me, I shall write a review of it for *The Catholic World*. Excuse the egotism of this long letter, and believe me with sincerity yours affectionately,

O. A. BROWNSON.

HON. GEORGE BANCROFT.

ELIZABETH, October 21, 1866.

In another letter to Bancroft, Brownson said some things which tend to make plain what is most important in his same book: "Since I had the pleasure of seeing you. . . I have read . . . the last third of vol. IX . . . to see how far our views of the constitution of government in general and of the United States in particular agree, and after reading them, I have for the sake of comparison read over Chapters VIII and IX of my own book, the *American Republic*. I wish you would do me the honor, if you can find time, to read these two chapters, and if you will do so, I think you will be struck as I have been at our substantial agreement.

"Whatever doubts I might have had are dispelled by your XXVI Chapter, Vol. IX, on the confederation. You have there asserted the territorial doctrine which I was afraid you might not hold, and shown that you understand as well as I by the people, whose sovereignty under God we both assert, the territorial people, or the people attached to or occupying a given territory, within which they are sovereign, and out of which they have no jurisdiction. This you will see, if you will read pp. 296-302 [152-155], of my book, is with me very significant, and is overlooked by most democratic writers.

“In regard to the political people of the United States, we certainly both maintain that, though the statesmen of the time did not know it, or were unwilling to recognize it, they were really but one people before the declaration of independence, and you no more than I hold their unity, as did Mr. Madison and Mr. Webster, was of constitutional origin; but I am not certain whether you hold them to be a unitary or a federative people. I hold that the people of the United States exist only as people of States united, that is, that there are no people of the United States distinguishable from the people of the several states, and no people of the states except as states united. The people of a given territory must with the territory be in the Union as a state, or they are no part of the people of the United States, and the people of the United States consist alone of the peoples of the several states united. Hence the convention, in which I place the sovereign, is a convention of the people of the several states united, not one unitary or consolidated state. As you see, I am a trinitarian, not a unitarian, and hold multiplicity in unity and unity in multiplicity. On this point I am unable to satisfy myself whether we agree or not. The point is not without practical importance in settling the question whether the states that seceded are still states *in* the Union or only territories *under* the Union.

“You show how the unity of the American people was developed and constituted, or formed: that was your duty as a historian, and I agree with you entirely; but my business was to establish the fact that the unity exists, and to explain in what it consisted. You give the facts; I give the law derived from the facts: but I am not

aware that on any important point we conflict, and these coincidences between us are often very remarkable, considering we wrote without concert and from different points of view."

And in another letter to Bancroft, Brownson says:

"The hint for my distinction between civilization and barbarism was given me by Guizot, when marking the difference between the Roman monarchy and the feudal. The Roman empire, he says, represents the majesty of the State, while the authority of the feudal monarch is personal, a personal right."

And again, "I have read you as an ex-reviewer, who looks for faults, perhaps still more than for merits. Your remarks on the Gallican Church, Vol. VII. p. 28, are just, and recognize a profound Catholic principle, but you give an undue praise to the Society of Jesus. The principle you say the Jesuits asserted was asserted with scarcely an exception, by the whole body of Catholic theologians, before their founder was born, and at the very time to which you refer, while Pope Clement XIII was asserting that principle against the Court of France, the five provincials of France formally abandoned it and offered to accept not only the Four Articles of the Assembly of the Gallican clergy in 1682, but the organic laws of Louis XIV which absolutely subjected the Church to the state. The Jesuits are generally admirable as men, but as a society, I think, since it was remodelled by Aquaviva their fifth general, they have been equally hurtful to the church and to society. They are in our day, the real *obscurantists*."

"I think you, in the same volume, p. 153, ascribe to Protestantism a merit in regard to liberty which it has

not, and deny to Catholicity the merit it really has. The great principles of liberty asserted by our Protestant ancestors were those common to all the great fathers and doctors of the Church. The Puritans against the English government and its subject church fell back on Catholic principles. James I of England wrote his *Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings* against the speech of Cardinal Duperron in the French Etats généraux in 1614, and Suarez the Jesuit replied to and refuted James. The Catholic writers in the time of the Ligue, assert not only the sovereignty of the nation as against the King, but almost assert pure democracy. The great argument in the 16th and 17th centuries against the Church was that she denied the independence of kings, and absolute monarchy was developed in Protestant states before it was in any Catholic state. I have found no Catholic defending absolute monarchy prior to Bossuet in his *Politics of the Bible*, written for the Dauphin. A Spanish monk in the time of Philip II of Spain had the audacity to defend it in a sermon, and the Inquisition condemned him to retract publicly his doctrine in the same place in which he had proclaimed it. St. Thomas of Aquino derives the natural law from the eternal law, and the human law from the natural law, and declares all laws contrary to the common or public good unjust and without force. St. Augustine had said, *Lib. I de Lib. Arbitr.: Lex non esse videtur quæ justa non fuerit*, and St. Thomas adds, *unde tales leges non obligant in foro conscientiæ, nisi forte propter vitandum scandalum et turbationem*; and he says of such acts, *magis sunt violentiæ quam leges*. St. Augustine says that God gave to man the lordship over the lower creatures, to

the rational over the irrational, but not to the rational over the rational; and hence the first rulers, rectores, of mankind were called pastors, not lords, *pastores, non domini*. Pope Gregory the Great cites and approves this language. Gregory VII, Hildebrand, does the same, and goes further, and says that princes derive their power from Satan, and hold it only by violence. They are not, he says, the shepherds or protectors of the people, but their spoilers. I have embodied in my book the common teaching on the subject of my Church, and I will not yield to any man in my devotion to popular liberty.

“The contrary impression I think has grown out of confounding the liberty of the federal nobility with the freedom of the people. The Church never had any sympathy with feudalism, and I think it very true in the war of monarchy against feudalism, the popes in general sympathized with the monarch, though not always, as we see in the case of the Hohenstaufen. The general attachment of Catholics in our own day to monarchy is mainly due to the fright they got in the old French Revolution, and the fact that the movement in behalf of popular liberty has been associated with an anti-christian philosophy,”

To Joseph K. C. Forrest, who sent an article he had published in the *Chicago Times*, and asked Brownson's opinion of it, the latter wrote :

ELIZABETH, N. J., November 28, 1866.

My dear Sir:—I have read your Essay in the *Chicago Times*, which you were so kind as to send me, and which you ask my opinion of. You can find my opinion in my book, *The American Republic*, in the chapters

devoted to the constitution of the United States, and to political tendencies.

Your Essay is able, and will, no doubt, have great influence, as it falls in with the strong tendency to centralization, which I consider at present our greatest political danger. I am and all my life have been a states rights man, that is, I hold the sovereignty vests in the states, not in the people outside of state organization ; but in the states united, not, as Mr. Calhoun maintained, in the states severally. There is a natural distinction of general and particular, and I am in favor of confiding, as the constitution does, all matters of a general nature to the general government, and all that are particular to the several state governments. Your views, if I understand them, would efface this distinction, and destroy what I regard as the peculiar, the distinctive excellence of the American system of government.

1. I object to the first law you demand of congress declaring suffrage the birth-right of every citizen of the United States. I do not recognize suffrage as any man's birth-right. Suffrage is political power, and political power is the natural right of no one. You are right in saying it is not a privilege ; but it, like all political power, is neither a birth-right nor a privilege, but a trust from the civil community, to be used for the common weal or public good. I also object to it, because it supposes in congress the right to declare who are and who are not citizens and therefore to bestow the elective franchise on persons not citizens of any particular state, on the inhabitants of territories, for instance, which would revolutionize our whole system of government. Now no one can be politically a citizen of the United States

unless a political citizen of some state, and I wish this to continue. Congress can make uniform "rules" of naturalization, but only the state can naturalize.

2. I see the evil you would guard against by the second law you demand, but I fear the remedy would be worse than the disease. Congress has jobs enough on hand now, and I do not believe it would be strong enough to control the mammoth railroad corporations, creating an interest more subtle, powerful, and dangerous than ever was slavery, or more accurately, the slave interest, or than would be a landed aristocracy. It is one of the legacies bequeathed the country by the old Whig party, of which, thank God, I never was a member. [Forrest had been a Whig.]

3. Congress has and should have nothing to do with the subject. 4th, I place with 2 and 3;—5, I object, because it deals with private rights and interests. To the 6th, I make the same objections. The 7th I approve, and it is the right and duty of Congress to do it, under the power to regulate commerce.

8. I oppose it, as paving the way for Congress to legislate on ecclesiastical matters.

9. Congress has the right to pass uniform bankrupt laws, and should exercise it. In giving the right to Congress, the Constitution prohibited it to the states severally.

10. Let not Congress meddle with the subject.

11. I say the same.

12. Fills me with horror. I am a hard money man and condemn in the strongest terms I am master of, the National Bank system.

You will perceive sir, from these remarks, that I am not likely to agree with you, and I am as ready to fight against consolidation as I was to fight against secession. My reasons you will find at length, if you wish them, in my book; and when I find the Republican party committed to consolidation, I shall quit it as I did the States-rights party when it became secessionist. I neither advocate nor oppose universal suffrage. I wish to leave the whole question of suffrage to the several states. If the states exclude or admit negro suffrage it is their affair, not mine. Practically the negro vote either north or south will amount to nothing. Politics will be, in my judgment, about the same whether the negroes and colored men vote or not.

I have no doubt of the purity of your motives, and I recognize your ability, but I am in most respects deeply and earnestly opposed to your scheme, which, in my judgment, would prove, if adopted, destructive to our political institutions and to the civil and religious liberty on this continent. In my view, you lay a sacrilegious hand on the work of Providence. May God forgive you your matricidal attempt, and defeat your purpose.

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

Brownson always regretted that the Administration repudiated the agreement provisionally entered into between General Sherman and General Johnston. Had it been adopted the work of reconstruction of the states lately in rebellion would have been quickly completed. He liked neither the action of the Executive nor that of Congress, but he had confidence in the people and in the destiny of his country. In a letter to John Sherman,

of Ohio, he says: "I am not one of the admirers of President Johnson, nor of what is called the President's policy, and I do not believe that the states that seceded should be represented in either House till Congress declares their reconstructed governments loyal and legal state governments. I do not believe that recognition of them as such by the Executive alone, or either House of Congress alone, entitles them to a representation in Congress. I think also that the executive has from the first intended so to carry on the work of reconstruction as to compel Congress to adopt his plan as the less of two evils." And in another letter in which he contends that suffrage is a question for each state to settle for itself, he says: "It would destroy utterly the balance of power between the Union and the states to subject it to the control of the general government. Besides it were bad policy for the general government to attempt to force negro suffrage on a state against its will. I think the President's views of reconstruction practically right in the main, but I think he has in several respects usurped the functions of Congress, and I owe him no good will for attempting to forestall Congress; but I am very little better pleased with the action of Congress. If you reconstruct the Southern States at all, you must do it with the people who have been in rebellion, for there are no other people in them. Besides, we need the Southern individualism to temper New England socialism. You and I are both New England men, but I do not want the South completely new-englandized." And again: "Let Congress pass for each of the late states an enabling act, providing for their reorganization as states, in which the whole electoral people are free to

take part. Let the president know that he is the executive chief, not the monarch, of the country. You must reorganize those states with the rebel population, for they are the real people of those states. You must condone the past, and look only to the future."

In a letter to Kelly this view is somewhat fuller explained, and the letter like those already inserted, helps as a sort of commentary on the *American Republic*.

ELIZABETH, N. J., December 24, 1865.

Dear Judge:—I have read with much interest a brief report of your colloquy with Raymond. I wish you had asked him, What is it that constitutes a state under our system of government *a state in the Union?* instead of What constitutes a state? Had you done so, you would have nailed him. His answer to you is true, if the state is a sovereign state. The government, the whole exterior organization may be subverted in an independent state or nation, as in France in February, 1848, and the state still subsist with the plenitude of its political rights. In asserting this, Mr. Raymond was right, or rather, he asserted a truth; but his answer assumes that the states in the Union are states in the full sense of the term, and really concedes the whole secession doctrine. He concedes state sovereignty to begin with, and then has the impudence to ask the several states lately in rebellion to disavow it. You should grant him that the constitution and government of a state may be subverted, and yet the state subsist, but not a state in the Union, because such state is a state only by virtue of its constitution and organization. These subverted, the state ceases to exist as a state.

Mr. Raymond adopts the theory, long since exploded, that the powers of government are made up of the rights of individuals surrendered to society, and the powers of the general government are made up of the rights surrendered by the several states, and he now insists that the several lately confederated states shall *surrender* their state sovereignty. In other words, he holds, if he knows what he holds, that government is founded in compact, and that the general government is formed by a mutual compact between the several states. A government formed on compact is only a compact, federation, league, or alliance, and therefore dissolvable, as the secessionists maintain. In striving to avoid the doctrine of the Radicals, he simply falls into that of the secessionists, as does the President himself, Billy Seward also as a matter of course, and hence their popularity with Secessionists and Copperheads.

The confederate states were and are out of the Union as states, because by secession they ceased to exist as states at all, but have never as population and territory been alienated from the domain of the United States. The government has not and never has had the right to force them back as states into the Union; but it had and has the right to reduce the rebel population and territory to obedience to the authority of the Union. This is the simple fact. When so reduced, congress has the right, if it sees proper, to grant them permission to reorganize and apply for admission as states, for the reorganization and application for admission must be the free voluntary act of the territorial people. This is all simple, and it has been the absurd theory of the administration that has complicated the question.

I have no sympathy with the *conservative* Republicans. They are only a shade better than Copperheads, and have been more embarrassing.

Yet I am not quite satisfied with our Radical friends. Mr. Stevens is right in regarding the rebels as a subjugated people and at the disposal of the Union, but wrong, I think, in claiming for congress all the rights of the conqueror over the conquered. It is limited by its own constitution and the territorial law which in each of the lapsed states remains in force till abrogated by competent authority, which can be done only by the convention, or what is the same thing, by constitutional amendments. Congress has, no doubt, under the amendment the right to pass a bill like that introduced by Senator Wilson in the senate, but no right to enact a law in favor of negro suffrage; because suffrage belongs to the states severally, and there is a territorial law regulating it still in force, and which only the state or the United States can abrogate.

I am in favor of negro suffrage, but I want it constitutionally introduced. I think the American idea excludes all political distinctions based on birth, property, or complexion. But, between ourselves, I may say that I have very little belief in the perfectibility of the negro race, and have all along regarded emancipation as the first step towards the extinction of that race in the United States. I have advocated emancipation for the sake of the whites, rather than for the sake of the blacks. But we must be just and do what we can to protect the black

man, and to enable him to prove his manhood, if he has any . . .

Very truly your old friend,

O. A. BROWNSON.

HON. WM. D. KELLY, M. C.

This question is further discussed in a letter to General W. T. Sherman, of May 31, 1865. Brownson heartily approved of that General's plan of pacification for which he was liberally censured by the journals, if not by the President and Secretary of War, just as he had been in the beginning of the civil war for what Secretary Cameron called his "insane" request for 200,000 men.

Brownson writes: "I have just read in the *New York Tribune* your testimony before the Committee on the Conduct of the War, your report of your proceedings, and the correspondence subjoined . . . I deeply regret that the plan of pacification contained in your memoranda was not adopted by the government. It would have been effectual, allayed irritation, and secured us union and peace. It is the only sensible and practical way of dealing with the population in rebellion against the Union, and you rightly say, it *must* ultimately be adopted, but never can it be adopted with the advantage it could have been at the time when you proposed it. That was the opportune moment, which is now past forever.

"The plan of reorganizing the states late in rebellion with the pitiful minority that has never engaged in or aided the rebellion, even reinforced by all the rebels whose taxable property is under \$20,000, and of hanging,

exiling, or disfranchising all the rest, will prove a miserable failure. There cannot be found in them the necessary materials for constituting and administering a self-governing state. A state reconstructed with them will be utterly unable to stand alone, or to stand at all, save as upheld by the military power of the general government.

“You, my dear General, and I both know that the real substantial people of the South have been in rebellion, and that, if the states are to be reconstructed at all, it is to be with this very population that has made war on the Union, and which has been whipped into submission. I am one of those who hold that the states that seceded have lost all their rights as states in the Union; but I believe the only practicable way of restoring them to their former status is through their existing state governments. I was delighted with the invitation extended to the members of the Virginia legislature by General Weitzel to meet at Richmond, and chagrined when I learned that the President had rescinded it.

“I am aware that there are two questions at the bottom of the government policy, the one the slavery question, and the other that of the Union men at the South. There is a determination on the part of the government, not to convert the late Rebels into Union men and friends, but to transfer the power to the men who have opposed the Rebellion. These men are not and cannot be the state. The slavery question has lost all real importance. Slavery is dead, and cannot be revived. The constitutional amendment, if not the President's proclamation, has for ever disposed of it, and our statesmen are now only wrangling, over its dead body,

as to the manner in which its funeral obsequies shall be celebrated.

“ The question of negro suffrage is not within the jurisdiction either of the President or of Congress. It, as the whole question of suffrage, belongs exclusively to the states. If the disorganized states are and all along have been, as the Executive assumes, states in the Union, their existing constitutions settle the question who may or may not vote; if they are not; if, as I hold, they have ceased to be states in the Union and become population and territory under the Union, the electoral law in force as the territorial law, is still in force, on the principle that the laws governing private rights under the former sovereign of a territory remain in force under the new sovereign until abrogated or new ones are enacted in their place. The old electoral law has not been repealed, for the military can only suspend its operation during war, not abrogate it, and the general government has not abrogated it, for it has, under the Constitution no power to legislate on the subject. The question can be definitively settled only by the reconstructed state, or by the convention called to reconstruct it.

“ The insisting that the state shall adopt a constitution prohibiting slavery before being allowed its representation in Congress, is repugnant to the first principles of the Constitution of the United States, and can be justified only on the assumption that the general government is a supreme national government in which are concentrated all the powers of government, which is not the case, for though the nation is one, the powers of government are divided between a general government and particular state governments, both holding from the

same national sovereignty and each equally supreme in its own sphere, or in regard to the matters entrusted to it. . . .

"I think I know the Southern people, and when they acknowledged themselves whipt, we had only to place a generous confidence in them to make them the most ardent and faithful friends of the Union to be found in any section. Unhappily, the government has not seen proper to place that confidence in them, and is doing its best, after having humbled, to humiliate them, to disgrace them, and to hold them out to the world as a set of cowardly assassins and cut-throats, forgetting that they are their countrymen, and that we cannot disgrace them without disgracing ourselves. The Parson Brownlows never forgive, and yet the Rebellion has made this Parson Governor of Tennessee, and Andrew Johnson President of the United States.

"We cannot help it. The present policy, after having done infinite mischief, will have to be abandoned. Men like yourself must not forget that if you are soldiers you are none the less citizens, and must be ready to support the true policy wherever it is possible to adopt it. The Rebels are too many to hang, to exile, or disfranchise and govern by means of rotten boroughs held by the Executive."

Writing to Kelly, January 17, 1865, Brownson says: "we seem to be in a financial fix. To continue both systems is to continue the present state of things in an aggravated form, and to run the national debt up to \$800,000,000 or \$900,000,000. I see nothing better to be done than to return to specie payment as rapidly as possible, but I know not how it is to be done, for

heavier loans are still needed. You will have to modify the Tariff by striking off its protective features, and make it purely a Revenue Tariff. It has been our misfortune that old Whigs have been in the main our Republican leaders."

Brownson also wrote many letters to the *New York Times* and the *New York Tribune* on the reconstruction of the rebel states; but as his views have been sufficiently set forth in what precedes, it is not necessary to go over the matter again. Greeley advocated "impartial suffrage and universal amnesty." Brownson wanted no distinction made in the elective franchise on account of caste or complexion, and would grant amnesty to all rebels for the simple crime of rebellion; but whether negro suffrage would be for the interest of the ex-slave states, it was not for him to say. It was a question which they probably understood far better than he did, and he proposed to leave it entire to their own wisdom and discretion, without offering them any advice one way or the other. It would be time enough, he said, to tell them what he thought when his own state had placed the negroes and colored people on a footing of political equality with white people. He inquired whether the *Tribune* proposed to establish impartial suffrage by an act of congress, by a constitutional amendment, or by the several state legislatures or conventions. Greeley replied, "By them all." Brownson thought this reply unsatisfactory, and too comprehensive. Congress certainly had no constitutional power, as the constitution stood, to legislate on the question of suffrage within the states. "Do you propose," he asked, "it shall legislate without constitutional power, or establish impartial suf-

frage prior to amending the Constitution? If you propose to establish it by a constitutional amendment, what need is there for an act of congress on the subject?"

To amending the Constitution so as to enable congress to legislate constitutionally on the subject of the elective franchise within the several states, Brownson suggested the objection that it would mar the beauty and symmetry of the Federal Constitution, destroy the equilibrium between the general government and state governments, and tend to consolidation. Greeley said he proposed to procure a constitutional amendment, and that the objection came too late. Brownson, in explaining, what was clear enough, shows that what he objected to was the conferring on congress or the general government any authority over the question of suffrage, holding that under the national constitution the question of suffrage is and ought to be left to the states severally, and asks Greeley if he held otherwise and was prepared to confer on congress authority to come into the State of New York, and say who shall or shall not have the elective franchise. That his objection came too late, because it was urged against the amendment abolishing slavery, was not, in Brownson's judgment, a sufficient answer; because there was no parity in the two cases. To take the question of suffrage from the states is to overthrow all state autonomy, and revolutionize our system of government; whereas to abolish slavery by the sovereign authority of the people, is to bring our system into full play and harmonize our institutions with it. But Greeley evasively sets all these reasons aside denominating them "abstractions." To this Brownson rejoins that it is easy to set aside as abstractions points which

are a little troublesome to us, and thus get rid of them ; but no man does it when he has a ready answer to them. "I do not deal in abstractions," he says, "for, in my philosophy, abstractions are nullities. Principles are realities, and in my judgment, very important realities. Revolutionists, Mazzinians, and the Democrats of Germany, or conventionalists, like the followers of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, may treat lightly my scruples on this point ; but I wish to preserve our national constitution in its general principles as it is, for these principles are not, as you intimate, abstractions, but realities, really existing in the nature of things. I hold that the national sovereignty under our system is not in the American people as one people outside of their distribution and organization as states, but is in the people as states ; not in the people as states severally, as the secessionists maintained, but in the states united, constituting one complex whole. I am opposed to any and every constitutional change that would either assert the sovereignty of the states severally, or the sovereignty of the American people acting otherwise than according to their distribution as states, and through their respective organizations. As the amendment of the Constitution regulating or giving to the general government power to regulate the question would, in my judgment, strike at a fundamental principle of our national constitution, I am decidedly opposed to it."

In the *N. Y. Times*, Brownson wrote in defence and support of the amendment abolishing slavery. "There can be no doubt," he said, "that the President's policy of reconstruction has miscarried, and it now seems not unlikely that the constitutional amendment proposed by

congress [abolishing slavery] will fail to be adopted. The plan of your neighbor of the *Tribune*—impartial suffrage and universal amnesty—seems already to be quietly rejected, and the cry is now raised for manhood suffrage. It becomes therefore a very serious question what plan will succeed.

“For myself, I do not despair of the constitutional amendment, because I do not recognize the ten unreconstructed states as states in the Union. They belong as population and territory to the Union, are within the jurisdiction of the Union, but have none of the rights and privileges of states in the Union; and consequently three-fourths of the states represented in congress are competent to ratify the constitutional amendment and make it to all intents and purposes a part of the Constitution of the United States. It matters nothing in a constitutional point of view whether any or all of the ex-states ratify it or not. There are states enough to adopt the amendment without them, and I hope that it will not be abandoned for any other scheme.”

In the preface to the *American Republic*, Brownson acknowledged his indebtedness to Hurd's *Law of Freedom and Bondage*, for hints and suggestions without the aid of which he could not have written it as he did. In regard to this, Hurd writes:

NEW YORK, December 27, 1865.

Dear Sir:—Ever since reading in the last number of the National series of your Quarterly the very generous reference to the *Law of Freedom and Bondage in the U. S.*, I have wished an opportunity to express to you personally my gratification in having had the good fortune to receive your favorable judgment on the work,

and my gratitude for such a public expression of your opinion.

Your second and even more complimentary mention of my book in the Preface of your new work, even places me in some embarrassment in attempting to express my thanks for so flattering a distinction, one which I can hardly believe to be deserved. . . .

I have during the past few months furnished to the *Army and Navy Journal* some articles on the Reconstruction question, and intended in another in the same paper on the subject of State Suicide to refer to your views as expressed in the *Review*. I had proposed to send you a copy of the intended article and at the same time to write to you. The *Journal* not having had room for it I gave it to the *Times*, just after your new volume appeared and I had glanced over it; so that I referred to the book in place of the *Review*. The article as printed in the *Times* is enclosed. . . .

I am, dear sir, gratefully yours,

JOHN C. HURD,

Brownson's answer to this letter is candid and characteristic.

ELIZABETH, N. J., December 28, 1865.

JOHN C. HURD, ESQ.

Dear Sir:—I have just received your letter, and the article from the *Times*. I thank you most warmly for both.

When your book first came out I was unable to use my eyes but for a few moments at a time, and I could not read and study it as such a book deserves, or otherwise I should have written a review of it. I saw at once

it was not a book to be appreciated at a glance, although I was not a total stranger to its subject. It was a book to be studied, meditated, and I was not always certain of getting your precise meaning; and I may say that I have never found a book that so thoroughly tasked my intellect, or that was so compact with thought and erudition. I felt it was a book, and I did not seem to myself to have sufficiently mastered it to write a review of it till I had ceased to be reviewer.

What I said of your book in my *Review* or in the Preface to my recent work I feel as less than is your due, but I dared not say more lest I might create a suspicion that you agreed with me further than was actually the case.

I was not quite sure that the view presented of the investiture and distribution of powers asserted in your article in the *Times* was yours. I dared not ascribe it to you, and I could only say that it was suggested to me by reading your book. Judge then how delighted I am to find that you really hold it. In my judgment it is not only based on historical facts, but is the key to the whole American Constitution. It is the chief point in exposition of the Constitution of the United States, and I am most glad not only to have derived it from you, and to have your authority for it, which to me is higher in such a matter than that of any other.

I think for myself, but I do not claim to have any inventive genius, and wish to give every man his due. Every man who helps me to a truth I knew not is my friend and benefactor, and whether you like it or not, I shall always rank you among my friends and benefactors.

My old friend Ripley seems in his notice of my book to have taken occasion to pay off some old scores. He sees nothing in *The American Republic* but a psychological curiosity. . . . Most men who refer to my writings deem it necessary to do so with a *but*.

Your allusion is generous, and contains no humiliating drawback.

Your most humble and obliged servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

CHAPTER XV .

BANCROFT'S ADDRESS. — POLITICAL COMMENTS FROM BROWNSON'S LETTERS TO HIS SON.

BANCROFT gave his eloquent Address on the Life and Character of Abraham Lincoln, at the request of both houses of Congress, on the 12th of February, 1866, and on the 13th he wrote:

WASHINGTON, 13th February, 1866.

My dear Mr. Brownson:—I send you one of the first copies of my address yesterday, because I think there are things in it, of which few besides yourself will perceive the meaning. If I have impressed Leibnitz and Plato into the service of doing justice to Lincoln, you surely will approve.

But whether you like my oration or not, I feel sure you will be pleased to hear from me, as I always am from you, with the assurance that I am ever your friend.

GEO. BANCROFT.

In reply, Brownson commended highly the address, although, judging Lincoln from a patriot and statesman's point of view rather than the funeral orator's, his estimate of the life and character of the assassinated President fell far below his friend's. He added, "I wish to thank you for daring to tell the truth with regard to England and France, and the noble words you spoke with regard to Mexico.* They must have been balm to the heart of my friend Señor Romero. I may be wrong, but I have not and never had any confidence in Mr. Seward, and I think the Republic of Mexico has much reason to complain of his partiality for Louis Napoleon. I fear he early gave the Emperor of the French to understand that if he would not interfere with us in our civil war, we would not interfere with him in his Mexican policy, though a policy hostile *ab initio* to us. I shall rejoice when he retires to private life."

Brownson's interest in Mexican affairs caused him often to allude to Napoleon's attempt to impose a government by force on our neighboring state, in letters to one of his sons, to whom he wrote with entire freedom and confidence. Allusions of this character, giving his comments on political events as they occurred, taken from these letters, make up the rest of this chapter.

* Bancroft's *Address*, pp. 26 *et seq.* Note this paragraph, page 34: "It was the condition of affairs in Mexico that involved the Pope of Rome in our difficulties so far that he alone among sovereigns recognized the chief of the Confederate States as a president, and his supporters as a people; and in letters to two great prelates of the Catholic Church in the United States gave counsels for peace at a time when peace meant the victory of secession. Yet events move as they are ordered. The blessing of the Pope of Rome on the head of the Duke Maximilian could not revive in the nineteenth century the ecclesiastical policy of the sixteenth, and the result is only a new proof that there can be no prosperity in the state without religious freedom."

In a letter to his son, January 2, 1866, he says: "Schofield is sent to France with a secret mission to the Emperor. So much is certain. Seward has gone to see Max. There will be no war. Seward will pledge Max that he shall not be disturbed, in case the Emperor Napoleon will withdraw the French troops. The Monroe doctrine will be saved in appearance, and given up in reality. All Seward's diplomacy will end in—surrender, which the New York Times will swear is victory."

March 12, 1866: "I do not like the way things are going at Washington. Both parties seem to me about equally wrong. I have lost all sympathy with Sumner, who has nigger on the brain worse than ever.

"To give congress the power to determine the question of suffrage would change radically our constitution, make the government one of the people consolidated, not one of the people as states. The sovereignty with us vests in the states, not in the people outside of state organizations; only it vests in the states collectively or united, not in the states severally as Mr. Calhoun contended. The leading radicals in congress tend to consolidation, and would, if successful, destroy the distinctive excellence of the American system, entirely eliminate the federative element and make the government a centralized democracy, the worst of all possible governments.

"The President [Johnson] is violent, hot-headed, arbitrary, but as the defender of states rights against them, I think he is right, although he does not place the defence of those rights on the right ground. He committed a fatal error in repudiating the agreement between Sherman and Johnston. The governments he has

organized in the several states that seceded are not legitimate state governments, and neither his recognition nor that of congress can make them so. Yet, if acquiesced in by the people of the several states, that acquiescence will make them legitimate, and under the circumstances perhaps congress could do no better than to admit their representatives on their taking the oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

“The President has already too much power, and his victory in the present conflict with congress will increase it. This is my ground of fear; yet he will win the victory, for the socialistic democracy can no more triumph than the egoistical.”

October 14, 1866: “The elections have thus far gone for the Republicans, and there is hardly a doubt that the constitutional amendments will be ratified, ‘My Policy’ to the contrary notwithstanding. I, as you know, dislike exceedingly the financial and tariff policy of congress, do not like its dealings with the army; but I think it very important it should be sustained, unless we wish the executive power to become supreme, and the government to grow into an elective monarchy. Whether the President has done anything for which he can be impeached is doubtful, but I do not think he will be impeached, nor do I think the country would sustain congress in attempting to impeach him.

“Butler has done himself no credit by his Cincinnati speech, and it will not help him to the Presidency. He shows too plainly his spite against General Grant and the Army. He may damage Grant with a few, but not with the country at large. His own military record is not high enough for that, and neither the Regular Army

nor the 'Boys in Blue' will take him as our representative military man. His administrative and speechifying ability is considerable, but Grant's popularity is strong enough to crush him. The Army will be sustained, and it will be placed on a popular footing, as soon as the question of reconstruction is disposed of, and the Union fairly restored.

"The President's pilgrimage to the tomb of the Douglas has hurt him, and Raymond has returned to the ranks of the Republicans. Henceforth men who love their country will oppose all duties on imports except for revenue purposes, seek to demolish or essentially modify the national bank system, and to convince the people to rely on a regular army, not on a volunteer militia, which is too expensive in both blood and treasure. I want the regular army increased to a hundred and fifty thousand men, containing the *cadre* for three hundred thousand. It would be a measure of economy, and must be done.

"I still doubt the withdrawal of French troops from Mexico. The key to the recent events is the desire on the part of Napoleon to prevent the union of Germany under Austria with her non-Germanic provinces, and to prepare alliances that will enable France to guard against the further advance of Russia southward, and to settle the terrible Eastern question without an undue accession of power or territory to Russia, or sustaining the Turk to allay the fears of Great Britain for her Indian empire. Perhaps also the Emperor has wished to guard against the influence in Europe, and with the so-called Latin races on this continent, of the great and growing American Republic. Thus far his policy has

been successful, but he wants two or three years of life, health, and peace to consolidate it. Will he have them? His health, they say, is giving way, and if, as they say, he has an affection of the spine and Bright's disease of the kidneys, his life may at any day be cut short. I had written my article for the *Catholic World** and corrected the proofs before the appearance in this country of the Imperial circular signed by M. de Lavallette. I wish you would bear this fact in mind, as it proves that I had rightly seized the Imperial policy. Pay no heed to those who tell you Napoleon has been defeated or disappointed. *Le Correspondant* raves fiercely, not being able to understand that Napoleon has intentionally abandoned the old French policy of Henri IV of suffering no great power on the frontiers of France.

"The Council, † I suppose, will come out, in its pastoral, strongly for the Temporal Sovereignty now that it is hopelessly lost. I do not think the Holy Father is in any danger of being disturbed at present. I presume matters will go on pretty much as they are till the present Pope dies. When a new Pope is elected, the matter will be amicably settled, but not so advantageously as it might have been in 1860. There is nothing like seizing time by the forelock.

"The press is certain that Maximilian will soon abdicate. It may be right, but I do not yet believe it. I think he will maintain himself on the Mexican throne and will be all the better able to do it, if abandoned by France. The liberals are fighting one another, and as far

* *Independence of the Church*, published in the number for October, 1866, and to be read in his *Works*, Vol. XIII pp. 86 *et seq.*

† The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore.

as I can learn, Max has by far the strongest party, and by far the majority of the people. He holds the most densely populated part of Mexican territory, though the smallest in extent. Fenianism is, I trust, on the wane, and hope the nigger question will soon get its quietus."

November 14, 1866: "The Radicals have made a clean sweep, and will be rather stronger in the next Congress than in the present; but I do not believe Fisher Butler will carry out his programme. It is probable the constitutional amendment will be insisted on as a finality. I do not like the President, as you know, but I see no ground on which he can be legally impeached. He asks no more of Congress than Congress yielded to Mr. Lincoln. The members of Congress from Virginia were admitted because Mr. Pierrepont's establishment at Wheeling in 1861 was recognized, on the advice of Mr. Attorney General Bates, by the Executive as the *state* of Virginia. Mr. Johnson claims to do no more than was done by Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Bates, in his argument, while admitting it belonged to Congress to judge of the election and qualification of members, contended that it belongs to the Executive to determine whether a state is or is not a state in the Union, and Congress acquiesced with scarcely a dissenting voice. The Executive, in my judgment, is wrong, but Congress has heretofore waived its right, and cannot now reclaim it without condemning itself. Mr. Lincoln was not censured, and why should Mr. Johnson be impeached for following in his footsteps? For my part, I think Mr. Johnson a far less dangerous President than was Mr. Lincoln.

"If the papers are to be credited, my prediction with regard to Maximilian is already falsified, but if he

has abdicated, there is as yet no authentic proof or official statement of the fact. It would seem that our government is about to interfere, and perhaps to buy off the French by paying them their demands on Mexico, and to extend its protection over the Mexicans, which of course means annexation. What congress will say is very uncertain, as the North has still the nigger on the brain. The whole matter is a muddle, and Lieutenant-General Sherman and Mr. Minister Campbell are not unlikely to make it a greater muddle still. My prediction was based on a letter from Mexico in the *Tribune*, which seemed candid, and to be written with good sense.

“European affairs are not yet falsifying my predictions. War of Russia against Austria, or a close alliance of Prussia and Russia, which the journals assert as certain, I do not believe probable. The aim of Prussia is to consolidate Germany under the Hohenzollerns, and to become a great maritime power in the North Sea and the Baltic, which makes her a rival to Russia. Russia can fight Austria only on the Eastern Question, and which the other European powers will not yet suffer to be opened. When it is opened, it will not be opened in the interest of Russia, and hardly in the interest of the Eastern Christians themselves. France wants Syria and Egypt, Tunis and Tripoli, Spain the Empire of Morocco, which Great Britain will resist with all her power; Greece wants Candia, with all the other Greek Islands, Thessaly, Macedonia, Albania, and Constantinople, indeed the whole of the old Greek Empire in Europe, and is opposed by Great Britain, Italy, and Austria, but might be favored by France and Russia. Russia wants to drive the Turks out of Europe and Asia Minor, and

liberate the Christian populations of the Empire, in which she is opposed by all the other powers on the ground that it would make her too powerful; Great Britain wants to protect her Indian possessions against the advance of Russia from the northwest, and France from the southwest through Egypt, and to secure the monopoly of the whole Turkish Empire, and all Upper or Central Asia, as well as of all Northern and Eastern Africa, in which she has for rivals France, Austria, Italy, Greece, Spain, and Russia. This is the lay of the land. Prussia will probably exchange the Danubian Principalities for the German portion of Austria, and Austria, as the least dangerous power to her interests, be allowed by Great Britain to extend eastward and absorb all the Slavonic provinces of Turkey, and not opposed by France, and perhaps favored by Prussia, but opposed by both Russia and Italy. Will Austria be able to succeed? Or will the present Kingdom of Greece gradually expand into a great Eastern power and absorb all the Christian populations of the East?

“None of the Powers is prepared to broach these questions at present. Prussia has enough to do with her internal affairs, Great Britain has her hands full with the Reform Question, which seems to be growing serious, Austria has to repair losses, and Russia has not yet completed her railroads, and France for the moment is without effective allies. Russia is the best prepared of all the Powers, but the whole diplomatic influence of Europe is exerted to prevent her moving. Will she move? I do not believe she will at present, and in very few years it may be too late. I am unable to foresee the issue, but I think when the question does come up the whole

world, not excepting ourselves, as the great commercial rival of Great Britain, will take part in it.

"I am expecting to-day a visit from Count Chabrol from France, a friend of Montalembert, and may learn something of the Emperor."

January 1, 1867: "You get my first writing of the date 1867, and with it a hearty wish of 'a happy New Year' . . .

"Things look now as if my prediction with regard to Mexico is likely to be fulfilled. Maximilian stays in spite of the Liberals. Napoleon wishes to divert our attention from the Eastern Question, and prevent a close alliance between us and Russia. A general European war on the Eastern Question seems inevitable. I am on the side of Russia, and it is not impossible that if the war takes place our government may be drawn into it, as we have several questions to settle with Great Britain and France, and our people sympathize with the Greeks; but if so, we shall fight on our own continent.

"Napoleon is alarmed at the prospective growth of Russia and the United States, and sees that it is necessary to combine all the old states of Europe against them. This is the key to his policy. But I apprehend that he comes too late, and that they are already strong enough to resist all his possible combinations. Great unitarian states are generally too strong for allied or confederate states. We shall take possession of the whole Continent of America, and probably the great battle for the Empire of the World will ultimately be fought in Asia between us and our present good friends, the Russians. At any rate, the expansion of these two great modern Powers cannot be successfully resisted

and very soon their united diplomacy will be all powerful for the rest of the world. You may live to see it so, as well as the resuscitation of a Christian East."

March 12, 1867: "I am very glad the Tariff Bill failed, and possibly may continue to fail. The great danger to the country now is from the National Bank system. It would seem that Congress has very little financial talent, and the Administration less. However, I suppose the country will survive. But may the good Lord deliver us from the fanatics, like Sumner and Phillips, who can never let well alone."

April 12, 1867: "Things look a little squally in Europe, and I am afraid that Austria is on the eve of dissolution, and it looks now as if Napoleon will be unable to effect the alliances he counted on, and that France will become only a second-rate European Power. The population increases only at the rate of about ninety-five thousand a year, and the rate of increase is every year diminishing. The present appearance is that Prussia and Russia have a good understanding, and that if Russia wishes to advance in the East, Prussia will offer no opposition.

"The Derby Ministry I think will remain in office, and carry a Reform Bill of some sort.

"So, we have purchased Russian America. I do not believe it is of much value, though it may prove a stepping-stone to the acquisition of British Columbia.

"You will see me in the Catholic World. The Church and Monarchy, Church and State, An Old Quarrel, that is, Nominalism and Realism, and probably in June, Cousin and his Philosophy. The two Philosophical articles I think will interest you. Do you see the Tab-

let? I shall resume my contributions to the *Ave Maria*, which I have suspended in consequence of ill-health. I am still a cripple, confined to the house.

"Extreme Radicalism, I think, has received a check. Bethel-Fisher-Butler has fizzled as a member of Congress. There will be no impeachment. The South, most likely, will come back under the Reconstruction Bill, and once back, the disfranchising clauses of the Bill fall of themselves; for, when once restored, they stand on an equality with the states that did not secede. New Jersey rejects Negro suffrage, Wisconsin adopts female suffrage, and Sumner goes to Europe."

June 9, 1867: "I suppose you see the papers as well as I. Impeachment has exploded; the President has grown prudent; Seward is garrulous, but harmless; McCullough blunders as usual; our finances are in a bad state. We are just beginning to feel the real pressure of the war, and the curse of the protective policy. The capital of the country is getting into few hands, and the people at large are impoverished and controlled by the bondholders and great corporations.

August 27, 1867: "I do not regret Stanton's suspension, though it will hurt the President. I may say the same of the other changes made or expected. I, you know, favor the policy of the President rather than that of Congress, or should do so, if reconstruction constitutionally devolved on him. But between him and Congress a sad muss has been made. We have no statesmen.

"I am no Democrat, and have no sympathy with the Republicans. I am tired of the eternal negro, and dread the insane doctrines which are held by the Radi-

cals. My only hope for the country is in the good providence of God. Man fails us. I am not sorry that I am too old and too infirm to be an active politician."

November 23, 1868: "Well, we have got Grant and Colfax, though the Democrats have made large gains in the House of Representatives. I am glad of this, because while it will not impede legislation, it will hold the extreme Radicals in check, and tend to restrain Congressional extravagance. I think Grant will make a good President, but I doubt if even he will be able to check the evils you tell me of in Southern society. There are a great many people in the South who look upon killing a negro as nothing more than killing a dog, and the administration of justice in those states was never prompt or energetic. I see not much the President can do."

"March 9, 1869: "Grant has done well in attempting to give the go-by to the politicians, yet his first appointments are blunders. General Cox will do well enough for the Interior. Judge Hoar is an excellent appointment. The others cannot be commended. A. T. Stewart is out; so far so good. A man who pays 7, 8, or 10 millions a year by way of duty to the government, and an old man of 70 at that, is not a fit man to be Secretary of the Treasury, however honest he may be. Yet he is a better man than George H. Stuart, to whom it was first offered, a miserable fanatic, a leader of most of the anti-Catholic movements of the country. I do not think Grant is a judge of character. Borie is a Frenchman born in this country, but of his character I know nothing. His appointment I presume is due to Grant's nepotism.

"Who will be Secretary of the Treasury, you will probably know as soon as I. It is thought it will be Boutwell, who has the merit of having never been a Whig. If I could have my choice, it would be Cisco, formerly Assistant-Treasurer at New York.

"Grant will have great opposition, and a harder battle than any he fought during the war. Will he conquer? Perhaps, yet I fear, whether he does or does not. If he succumbs to the politicians, there is no hope; if he does not, the Executive becomes supreme, and Congress will have nothing to do but to register his edicts."

April 3, 1869: "The new Administration has made a poor beginning, and stands now at a heavy discount. The President has proved, what most of us feared, to be a poor judge of men, and has already succumbed to the politicians. He has blundered about as much as he did in his campaign in 1864, which sacrificed at a pure loss the greater part of the noble Army of the Potomac.

"General Sherman's sympathies are civilian, not military, and he hopes to succeed Grant as President. He is likely to be a poor general for the army in time of peace. He and Grant, if they had chosen, could have saved the army in spite of Butler, Schenck, and Garfield.* Had they cared for the interests of the army, the friends of the army in congress would not have remained silent. But the only consolation I find is in the severe castigation which Senator Sprague has given both Houses of Congress and the Government."

August 7, 1870: "With regard to the war between France and Prussia I suppose we think alike. I am on the side of France, without being hostile to Germany,

* This refers to the unfortunate reorganization in 1866.

Our countrymen, especially the Republican party, are on the side of Prussia, because she is the great Protestant power of the continent. I like Germany, not Prussia, and do not wish the old German Empire to be prussianized. The success of Prussia is the extinction of Germany by her absorption in Prussia, not Germanic in her nucleus, and more perfidious than *perfidie Albion*.

“Things look dark for Catholic interests. The nations are governed by Protestants, Jews, infidels, schismatics, and lukewarm Catholics, and the Church has nearly all her work to do over again. The world has to be re-converted, and she has only wooden bishops and priests to do it with. But God is mighty, and we will not despair.”

November 12, 1870: “I am not sorry to see the radicals weakened in the House. The strong Democratic minority will be a wholesome restraint on the protectionists, and hinder some evil, if they cannot effect any good, which will be some gain. Gen. Grant has gained nothing by getting into a quarrel with Gen. Cox, and removing him from office, as he has virtually done.

“For my part, I have come to old Judge Parsons’s conclusion, ‘The young man that is not a Democrat is a knave; the old man that is a Democrat is a fool.’ I have ceased to believe at all in Democracy, think with your countryman, Fisher Ames,* that it is ‘an illuminated hell,’ and say what we will of it, it is simply the logical political development of Protestantism. Popular self-government is a delusion, a humbug, an absurdity. The people need to be governed collectively as well as individually. Jacobinism is Calvinism, without its long

* The son to whom he writes was, like Ames, a Massachusetts man.

face, pious garb, and guttural tone, and Evangelicalism, the present form of Calvinism, is seeking through Calvinism to establish in our Republic the most complete and odious civil and religious despotism, and that too by the assistance of Paddy. Father Hecker's notion that Democracy is favorable to Catholicity is worse than foolish. Democracy rests on popular opinion, and never looks beyond, and no people that makes popular opinion its criterion of right and wrong is or can be Catholic. Catholicity spreads among a people only in proportion as they habitually act from the Law of God, which is above kings and peoples, alike above popular opinion and the pleasure of the prince.

"I have been disappointed in the French. I am ashamed of them. They have become a nation of braggarts, and are meeting with deserved chastisement. I do not like Prussia any better, but I like the French less. So far as Catholic interests are concerned, Alsace and Lorraine might be annexed to Prussia without damage. Catholicity in our day prospers only in non-Catholic countries. The protection of the Church by Catholic princes only enslaves her and enfeebles the faithful.

"The Holy Father is a prisoner. I think that he would have done better to have followed my advice in 1860, but still he is mightier now than he has ever been before, and his influence on both the Catholic and non-Catholic mind is greater than ever. Satan is never more signally defeated than when he has won his victory. The sovereigns of Europe will not long consent to have the spiritual head of so many millions of their subjects a prisoner, even a prisoner at large, of the King of Italy,

and Catholics who still are Catholics will pray earnestly for his freedom, and become better Catholics."

October 23, 1871: "In the first article * you will get my view of the significance, causes, and remedy of the present state of things in the old Catholic nations of Europe. The restoration of the Pope to his temporal possessions will remedy nothing. The Catholics of Europe must learn that while the Church does not need the State, the State needs her, and cannot subsist without her. They must learn that Christendom is gone, and from the Pope downwards, not to put their trust in princes. The Church is now, if Catholics could see it, a missionary church in an infidel world, and is now compelled to begin anew and reconvert the people, for the princes can do nothing without them."

December 7, 1871: "I do not like the political outlook at all. Grant will be renominated and reelected, and the protection policy will be continued, the old Whig policy, 'Take care of the rich, and the rich will take care of the poor', heavy taxation, large and extravagant expenditures, and consequent public and private corruption. No statesman seems to be aware that all taxes for the benefit of capital, are necessarily borne, not by capital, but by labor, in the shape of increased cost of living. The true policy of the country is light taxation and free trade. The great fault of our statesmen has been to make what should be a great agricultural and commercial people prematurely a great manufacturing people. This was a necessary policy for England, with a dense population and a limited territory. It was a blunder for us, with a sparse population and a

* *Recent Events in France.* Catholic World, December, 1871.

territory embracing a continent. But the great industrial corporations have got the control, and the government is simply their factor.

“The outlook in Europe is gloomy. The French Republic is a farce. Thiers is no statesman, and our old Catholic populations are afraid to say their souls are their own, and meekly suffer themselves to be governed by the enemies of God and man,—sheep who submit to be devoured by wolves. The Holy Father holds on to the civil powers for protection, when they spurn him, and seek only to enslave the Church, and secures for religion all the odium in the minds of the people attached to the governments they detest and seek to overthrow. He hopes still to see his temporal sovereignty reëstablished, apparently not seeing that the restoration of the *status quo* would settle nothing, and the events we deplore would in a brief period occur anew. Christendom will be reëstablished on a republican, not a feudal or a monarchical basis. The Church should let go the arm of flesh, and trust to her resources as the spiritual kingdom of God on earth.”

May 23, 1872: “Grant’s nomination is very proper, but a disgrace. Grant backs down. I can hardly say I am sorry.”

January 10, 1875: “I am much obliged to you for a copy of Judge Cooley’s Article on Constitutional Guaranties of Republican Government, &c. It is the only sensible document on the question I have seen, and explodes the fallacies that played so prominent a part in the acts of reconstruction. It excuses some things which I do not, but it does not pretend to justify them by the Constitution. His doctrine that it belongs to the

President, not to Congress, to decide which is the legal government of a state, I believe to be sound and just. The Rhode-Island case, in which I had some share, is in point. Congress has no jurisdiction in the case.

"In the meantime I have a thorough want of confidence in Grant, who is absolutely destitute of a moral sense, a low vulgar mind, and at ease only when surrounded by blackguards, as his friend, Dr. Hewit, always insisted. I do not believe there is a shadow of excuse for his interference in the organization of the Louisiana Legislature. The Southern States are States in the Union, and stand on a footing of equality with all the other States of the Union. Yet the Republicans in Congress will and must sustain Grant, for he is their only hope. The Democrats have no leaders, and they have not recovered from their demoralization, and have no policy."

CHAPTER XVII.

THE AVE MARIA.—THE CATHOLIC WORLD.—THE NEW YORK TABLET.

BROWNSON'S Review having stopped at the close of the year 1864, two magazines devoted to Catholic interests were started the next spring,—the *Ave Maria*, devoted to the honor of the Blessed Virgin, at Notre Dame, Indiana, and the Catholic World, a monthly Eclectic Magazine of General Literature and Science, published by Lawrence Kehoe, in New York.

When the Very Reverend Edward Sorin, C. S. C. Founder of Notre Dame University, and later Superior General of his Congregation, established the *Ave Maria* it was the only periodical of its kind in our language, that is to say, the primary object of which was professedly "to honor the Blessed Virgin and to make her better known and better loved; thus commending itself to all who venerate the Mother of God and who wish to see devotion to her extended."

He at once engaged Brownson to write for it; but although Brownson was devout to the Blessed Virgin and in fact regarded such devotion as belonging to the love and reverence all Catholics bear to the Incarnation, of which it is an essential and inseparable part, he felt a little awkward about writing on the subject for the public, as he always preferred to be silent in his writings as to sentimental devotions and private feelings and practices of an emotional nature. But the Reverend P. P. Cooney from Notre Dame, assured him, in a personal interview that he was not expected to confine himself to the mere sentiment of devotion, but rather was looked to for a philosophical explanation of the principle which underlies the devotion to the Mother of God. Thereupon Brownson began a series of articles on the worship of saints and especially the Queen of all Saints, the veneration of relics, and of images, which was continued through weekly numbers for nearly six months. * This was followed by another series of articles on the moral and social influence of devotion to Mary, † in 1866.

* *Saint-Worship*, Works, Vol. VIII. p. 117.

† *Ibid.* p. 86.

Father Sorin wrote him in January, 1867: "With regard to your course in the *Ave Maria*, of which by the bye, the Most Reverend Archbishop of St. Louis was good enough to say that he considered it the best paper in the States, I wish to say that you must consider yourself the representative of the American Catholics, speaking to his own people of the Mother of God, as you think that they should be talked to. It cannot be without a design that our New World has been dedicated to the Blessed Virgin by Columbus, and lately by our American hierarchy. Were Americans once convinced that she is the Mother of God and not only the Mother of Christ, even Protestants would acknowledge that it is right to honor her. It seems to me that no one better than yourself could tell the American people what our country has to gain by spreading such a devotion, were it only for the atmosphere of purity in which it will enable the present generation, which is bad enough, to raise the succeeding one, which I trust will be better. Shall I tell you, and why not? that the beautiful statue we erected last May, on the dome of our new college, is doing wonders among our 400 students? Would to God such a type of modesty and pure love would meet the eye of our youth everywhere! Ah, if pains were taken it might soon be effected to a great extent, and wherever it will be properly explained it will be loved by Americans as readily (and more efficiently, perhaps,) as by any other nation in the world. I never saw either in France or in Italy warmer feelings of devotion towards the Mother of God than here among our American converts. I thought at a time that I loved her; they literally shame me, and my confusion helps me in my little task. I would get

on my knees before any one who can speak to those honest-minded people whose misfortune is their ignorance of the truth, to aid me to open their eyes to the light and to reveal to them the grace, the beauties and the perfection of her who is the gate of Heaven for them as well as for ourselves. Americans, as a nation, are a sensible one, they cannot remain long blind to their interests. They will bless one day the hand that tore off, however much against their wishes, the veil that hid the light from their sight. As a nation, they cannot remain much longer estranged from a mother so lovely and so loving. My dear Doctor, I do not know either for yourself or for me, any subject more worthy of our efforts on the decline of our life, or anything that will give us as much consolation on our death-bed, as to have tried our best to make her known, to represent her as she is, and give her the place she ought to occupy among us.

“You have given us excellent articles, of which a number of persons have spoken in high terms, even the editor of the *National Quarterly Review*, Mr. Sears; I pray to our Holy Mother to watch over you tenderly and obtain for you many years yet before you rest.”

In 1867-8, Brownson published in the *Ave Maria* a series of articles * showing that all heresies, each one in detail, consist in the direct or indirect denial of the Incarnation, and that the worship of Mary, fostering faith in that mystery, cuts them all off. And a little later he wrote for it some articles on the Religious Orders † which he hoped might counteract such unfavorable criti-

* *Heresy and the Incarnation*. Works, Vol. VIII. p. 186.

† *Ibid.* p. 219.

cisms of vows and monasticism as he had been guilty of in the last few years of his Review. They tend to show the great value of monks and religious to the world in general, and especially to the country in which they live, and pray, and deny themselves; and also the value of the three religious vows in their effect on the ruling passions of our present age and country.

Nothing that Brownson ever wrote gave him more labor, and required more thought, than his articles in the *Ave Maria*, simple as they may seem to the reader; but the labor was well bestowed, since he was able to say: "If my articles have been profitable to no others, their preparation has been profitable to me, and has given me much peace and serenity of mind, quickened my love to Mary, and the saints of our Lord, and rendered dearer both the Catholic faith and the Catholic worship."

In one of his articles in the *Ave Maria*, on *Saint Worship*, (p. 124), Brownson used the phrase, "As God is, in his essence, triune," the organ of a lately-promoted archbishop, pronounced it "a formal heresy." Sorin was disturbed and wrote to Brownson to set the matter right. With a meekness hardly to have been expected, Brownson in concluding the series, says that he supposed this charge was made because it was thought he impugned the unity of the divine essence, as if he had said, God in his essence is three instead of saying, as he did, he is triune. All the notice he took of the charge was to write: "The three persons are the essence of God, and that essence is one essence, which is what I meant. The phrase may be unusual, but it is not, in my judgment, inexact; but at any rate, my meaning was exact,

* Ibid. p. 185.

and strictly orthodox, and I am not at all tenacious of the phrase, and readily surrender it to any one who will supply me with one more philosophically and theologically exact. It never occurred to me that it would be objected to by any English reader ; but as it has been, I shall avoid using it in future." (P. 185.)

The pacific character of this remark is deserving of praise in one so ready to wage war for what he considered the truth. For Brownson knew, as do all theologians, that the "formal heresy" is in denying, not in asserting it ; because, as there is no real distinction between the divine essence and the divine being (*essentia et esse*), the denial that God is in his essence, that is, essentially, triune, is the precise error of the Socinians and Unitarians.

God, in his providence, has not thought best to make archbishops infallible, and it may lawfully be questioned if the archiepiscopal organ is more orthodox than the writer criticised. The epithet, triune, means by common usage, when applied to God, that he is three distinct persons in one essence, and in that sense the word was used. Worcester's Dictionary says it means, "At once three and one," and "expresses the unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Webster says, "Three in one, an epithet applied to God, to express the unity of the Godhead in a trinity of persons." No doubt, the trinity is of persons and the unity of essence ; but the persons are not out of the essence ; they are the essence. Each person of the Blessed Trinity is the divine essence, and the divine essence is each of the Persons. Nor is each Person a part of the Essence, and another, another part ; but each is the whole, and the whole is each. The dis-

inction of persons, a real distinction, is not something added to the divine essence; but the essence itself is trinity, as says the XI Council of Toledo (in 675), *nec recte dici potest, ut in uno Deo sit trinitas, sed unus Deus trinitas*. It is not right to say the Trinity is in God, but God is the Trinity. Brownson did not say in one God is the Trinity, but that God in his essence is triune, or Trinity, which simply means, as the connection shows, that God is essentially Trinity, which is authorized by the Church. In short, God is essentially one (essence) and essentially three (persons); therefore he is essentially triune, or triune by the constitution of his nature, in essence.

The critic seems to have held the notion of Gilbert de la Porrée, condemned by the Council of Rheims in 1148, at the instance of St. Bernard and others, that there is a distinction between God (*substantia quæ est*) and the Divinity (*substantia qua est*); that God the Father was not God *eo quo* Father, but by the *forma divinitatis* common to the three Persons he was God, and Father by the special form of Paternity, thus converting the purely logical distinction of God and Divinity into an objective distinction of matter and form. Gilbert was led into this error, which he retracted when it was condemned, by the attempt to explain the Trinity on peripatetic principles. St. Thomas points out his error in the 2nd Article, XXVIII Question, Part First, of his *Summa Theologica*, and expressly contends that the distinction of Persons is the essence itself of God; or as he says the relations are identically the divine essence; for they are in God, and whatever is in God is his essence. Moreover, he says, every thing which is not

the divine essence is creature ; if, therefore the relations are not the divine essence, we could not worship the divine persons distinctly with the worship of latria.

Did the critic fancy that he detected in the phrase the error attributed to Abbot Joachim of San Giovanni in Fiore, that the relations are not really distinguished from one another, or are no real distinctions at all, which would virtually, if not formally, deny the dogma of the Trinity? Brownson's phrase does no such thing ; for by asserting that God in his essence is triune, it makes the triplicity as real as the unity, and each as real as the essence of God.

Joachim's error, as set forth in the IV Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, was the denial that there was any "summa res," which was Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or making a real distinction between the essence of God and the Persons ; whence he said that Peter Lombard made the Trinity a Quaternity,—Father, Son, Holy Ghost, and Essence,—as the critic seems to do. The Abbot rightly held, says the council, that the three Persons are the essence. The council then defines that each divine Person is truly the "summa res," or divine substance, essence, or nature. *Licet igitur alius sit Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus Sanctus, non tamen aliud ; sed id, quod est Pater, est Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus idem omnino.*

Perhaps the critic fancied the phrase contradicted the unity of the divine essence, and supposed its meaning was that there are three essences in God. But Brownson was not such a tyro in theology as to fall into such heresy, or so poor a logician as to assert such absurdity as that three essences are one ; and was not

in the habit of thinking so crudely, or of expressing himself so carelessly. A man, originally a Unitarian, who has spent a long life in the study of theology, must have mastered the Trinitarian controversy, as far as his abilities would permit, and could not be so careless in his expressions as to use the language which implied a denial of the unity of God, or the trinity of Persons, unless he meant it as an open apostasy, as the Archbishop, if he wrote the criticism, perhaps intended to insinuate.

The phrase, as far it goes expresses Catholic doctrine. Brownson was not treating the doctrine of the Trinity at length. He was considering it only in its most general aspect, as triplicity in unity, and unity in triplicity, supposing all his readers had been taught the doctrine in their catechism, and so he contented himself with simply saying, God in his essence, because he wished to imply that the trinity, or the unity and triplicity are alike intrinsic in the divine Being, not extrinsic or accidental; necessary and eternal, not contingent and temporary. The phrase did this, but it neither did nor was intended to do more. The purpose was to show that God, *mediante* his creative act, is in his works, and in them may be worshipped with supreme worship without idolatry. The Critic did not seem to understand this, and strangely saw in it pantheism, or a pantheistic tendency. He proved by this that he neither understood pantheism nor Catholic theology in English. He never understood the intimate relation of the creature to the Creator, and like Rousseau, looked upon God as a Genevan watchmaker, as do all Deists. Spinoza represented God as *Causa inmanens*, or as in all his works

the only actor; Brownson represented him as *causa immanens*, in the sense that his creative act is continuous, and that he is immanent in his works as first cause, creating or sustaining them as second causes. Spinoza is a pantheist, because he denies that God creates second causes, substantial existences, capable of acting from their own centre, and producing in a secondary way effects of their own: Brownson was no pantheist, though he maintained that God is immanent in all his works as first cause, because he maintained that he was immanent in them only to create or sustain them as second causes. The Critic's caution against pantheism was therefore unnecessary, and proves that he was talking of what he did not understand—in English.

God creates after the ideas in his own mind; and ideas, or rather idea, in the divine mind, or in God, is nothing else than the essence of God, as St. Thomas says: therefore, as God is triune in his essence, the idea after which every creature is created, is the holy and ineffable Trinity.

Sorin was disturbed by the criticism, and said he had a distraction on saying, *in essentia unitas*, in the preface of the mass. To relieve his mind he sent the article to Cardinal Barnabò, who in turn submitted it to some Roman theologians. These reported that they did not like the phrase, probably because it was not in the text-books they had studied; but they admitted that there was nothing in it not strictly orthodox.

The first number of *The Catholic World* was issued in April 1865, with Isaac Hecker as real editor-in-chief and a managing editor under him, Lawrence Kehoe as publisher, and financially backed by Isaac's brother

George, whose flour mills had for some twenty-five years been growing more and more profitable. It was not intended at first, or at least it was not given out, that it was to contain much more than a selection from the Catholic periodicals of Europe, with a few original literary and scientific notices appended to each number. Later it became mostly "original."

Kehoe, the publisher, was not very sanguine as to its success: he was sure of his pay for his services, but did not believe it would ever afford him a livelihood. In a letter to Brownson, February 15th, 1865, he asks: "What do you think about my taking a situation in the custom house? Could I get one that I could attend to, and attend to this magazine also? This affair will not take up all my time, and will not be able at present, if it ever is, to pay me enough to live upon. My expenses are great, and I have but little faith in Catholic publications. I have spent eight years—the best years of my life, at such business, and what have I got? I am poorer than when I went into it."

Brownson's connection with the *Catholic World* was at first only as translator of articles from foreign languages, and writer of some literary notices. His translations were made with great care and exactness, in accordance with two principles on which he loved to insist. The first was that a translator who alters, abridges, or adds to what an author has written is deserving of severe censure. And inasmuch as a man's reputation is more precious than money, it does seem that translators so offending, as well as critics who unfairly present an author's opinions, are much more guilty than forgers of drafts and notes payable in money. The second prin-

ciple here involved grows out of the Catholic practice of referring all one's actions to God as their end, by which means alone can they have supernatural merit: and Brownson always said that as we offer our work to God, whatever is worth doing is worth doing well. Working for God, we should exert ourselves to the utmost, mindful of those words, "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord negligently." With these views, Brownson's translations were honestly and carefully made; and he aimed always to present the thoughts of the author he translated in a language nowise inferior to the original.

In the second year of the *Catholic World*, intending at first to translate an article by P. Toulemont in the *Etudes Religieuses, Historiques et Littéraires*, but thinking it rather adapted to France than to the United States, Brownson thought it better to set forth the facts and arguments in his own way, and with reference to the wants of his own country, and accordingly wrote the first of his contributions to the magazine, which was accepted, and published in the number for July, 1866. * This article was followed by three more in the six months following; and in the twelve numbers of the third year of the magazine there were twelve of his articles. From that time on, each number generally had one or more articles from his pen until well on in 1872.

The second article, on the *Independence of the Church* † shows how Brownson was already recoiling from the dangerous views to which he had been tending

* *Use and Abuse of Reading*, Works, Vol. XIX p. 517.

† Works, Vol. XIII p. 86, *Cath. World*, October, 1866, p. 51.

in the years immediately preceding the cessation of his *Review*; and also shows that this recoil was due to deep study of Pius IX's condemnation of modern reformers, liberals, revolutionists,—the so-called movement party, professing to labor for the diffusion of intelligence, and the promotion of science, liberty, and human progress. "It is not science," he says, "liberty, or progress that she opposes; but false theories substituted for science, and the wrong and distinctive means and methods of promoting liberty and progress adopted and insisted on by liberals and revolutionists . . . A great clamor has been raised by the whole movement party throughout the world against the Encyclical of the Holy Father, dated at Rome, December 8, 1864, and even some Catholics, not fully aware of the sense and reach of the opinions censured, were at first partially disturbed by it; but the Holy Father has given in it only a proof of his paternal vigilance, the fidelity of the Church to her divine mission, and the continuous presence in her and supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost. The errors condemned are all aimed at the unity and invariability, universality, and persistency of truth, the reality of things, the supremacy of the spiritual order, and the independence and authority of the divine law, at real science, and the means and conditions of both liberty and progress."

To pass over many articles equally worthy of mention, but of which an analysis might weary the reader, who can consult the articles themselves, only a few remarks will be made on these contributions to the *Catholic World*. Relieved from business cares of his *Review*, and writing at leisure, the writer's attention was more concentrated on his work, and in spite of almost

incessant bodily suffering, these articles would not only have been more conciliatory and pacific in their tone generally, but equal in power to any productions of the same author, but for the consciousness that the editor was likely to emasculate them. Though he said jestingly that he had abandoned liberalism for obscurantism, he gives proof, in an article on the *Church and Monarchy*,* that he was just as devoted to civil and religious liberty as the most advanced liberal of them all. Furthermore, he proves that Protestant principles afford no basis for either civil or religious liberty. "I do not claim," he writes, "that Catholics founded civil and religious liberty in the United States, nor do I deny that so far as men had a hand in founding them, they were founded by Protestants; but I do contend that our Protestant ancestors acted in regard to them on Catholic rather than on Protestant principles. . . In every nation that accepted the reformation the feudal monarchy [as distinguished from the Roman, or representative monarchy] was retained and still subsists. The crown in them all is an estate, as in England, and in some of them is, in fact, the only estate recognized by the constitution. The Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Kings of Sweden, of Denmark, and of England and Scotland, became each in his own dominions, supreme pontiff, and united in his own person the supreme civil and ecclesiastical powers. The same in principle became the fact in the Protestant Netherlands and the Protestant cantons of Switzerland; and though some Protestant European states tolerate dissent from the state religion, there is not one that recognizes the

* Works, Vol. XIII. p. 107.—Cath. World, February, 1867, p. 627.

freedom of religion, or that does not subject religion to the civil power. He proves that the principles of Protestantism afford no basis for civil or religious liberty, and not claiming that Catholics founded either in the United States, he contends that our Protestant ancestors acted in regard to them on Catholic rather than on Protestant principles,—principles advocated by Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Augustine, Thomas of Aquino, and Suarez, asserted by the law of Moses, the Gospel, and every martyr to the Christian faith; and struggled for by the VII and IX Gregories and the III and IV Innocents.

In an article on *Civil and Political Liberty*,* Brownson shows that "the true basis of American liberty is in the assertion of the rights of God, represented by the Church, or by religion, as bounding or limiting the power of the state, whether imperial or popular. But under Protestant influences, the rights of God are resolved into the rights of man, and the Christian republic becomes simply a humanitarian republic, which can offer no solid foundation for liberty of any sort. The rights of man are no more sacred and inviolable than the rights of the prince or the state. It is only when the rights of man are resolved into the rights of God in and over man, that they are sacred and inviolable, or inalienable." Here we see the importance of the doctrine on *Rights and Duties*, which Brownson so earnestly contended for, against the *Civiltà Cattolica*, in his defence of Donoso Cortés. When our forefathers declared that man had by the law of nature those inalienable rights, they really asserted them as the rights of God, because pre-

* Works, Vol. XII. p. 201; Cath. World, March, 1870.

scribed as inherent in human nature by the eternal Reason itself.

During Hecker's absence in Rome, in attendance on the Ecumenical Council, Hewit took his place as editor of the magazine, and after reading this last named article and some others, he wrote:

ST. PAUL, December 10, 1869.

My dear Doctor:—I have read and examined your MSS., which please me very much, as well as the previous one. I do not care how much you pitch into Gallicanism, since it is now evident that the Holy See has always regarded it as an error only tolerated for a time, and I believe that the Council will condemn it. I have erased the passage on Père Hyacinthe, who sails tomorrow for Europe, because F. Hecker did not wish any further allusion to him beyond what was in his sermon which was published expressly for the sake of that one sentence. * The reason is the same which has induced the authorities at Rome to procure silence in the journals, that no obstacle may be put in the way † of his return to obedience when he goes on to the Council.

Your statement that the rights of man declared in our Declaration of Independence are the rights of God, is one of the pregnant principles that sum up a whole philosophy in a sentence and will live forever as an

* *Father Hecker's Farewell Sermon*, Catholic World, December 1869.

† In a letter to his son, Brownson writes: "Père Hyacinthe, or rather, Charles Loyson has made a fool of himself, and there is little hope, I fear, of his return to his obedience. He says he is a Catholic, but holds that he and Protestants all belong to the same brotherhood of faith. I am afraid there is a woman in the affair. At any rate I regard him as lost. Father Hecker, his former friend, has been frightened, and has become conservative, almost, if not quite, a Papist."

axiom. I borrowed some of your ideas for a Lecture at St. Stephen's Church.

In the next article I would be well pleased if you could answer the questions proposed in Prince de Broglie's article on the Council in the Correspondant respecting liberty and show the misapprehensions which confuse the minds of these excellent Catholics of the liberal school. If it is not too much trouble I would be very glad if you could write a short article in the Tablet on the distinction between *genus* and *species* in the scholastic philosophy, especially elucidating the distinction in the two terms as applied to the human race as a *genus* and also as a *species*. What is the distinction, if any, and how are we to be guided in using the terms.

I trust you are as comfortable as usual and may continue to improve in health and be able to work yet a long time in the glorious work of a champion of the faith and the divine law. With great regard for Mrs. Brownson &c. I am with profound respect and sincere affection,

Yours very truly,

AUG. F. HEWIT.

In the April number of the Catholic World, Brownson concludes his series of articles on Protestantism in relation to liberty, and disposes of the recent claim made by some Protestants that their principles are favorable to religious liberty; * for everybody knows that the first reformers never pretended anything of the kind.

A number of articles on closely related subjects, *Independence of the Church, Church and State, Rome and*

* Works, Vol. XIII. p. 222.

the World, The School Question, and The Future of Protestantism and Catholicity, are brought together and presented as a whole in *Church and State*.* Many philosophical, controversial, and scientific essays by Brownson in the *Catholic World*, may be ranked among his most valuable writings, as they were both by their Author and by the Editor. The relations between these two were sometimes a little strained; but each tried to avoid any cause of serious rupture. In a letter of March 19th, 1868, the latter writes: "It gives me pleasure to hear that your health is better and of your visiting us soon. I shall be glad to have the opportunity of settling the difficulties which have recently sprung up. Our opinions on the effect of the Fall, and what is the best policy, † undoubtedly do differ; but not to an extent that we cannot work together. This I think can be made evident when we talk it over together. I shall expect to see you at your earliest convenience. Your article on the *Church Review* ‡ is in my opinion one of the best of its kind which has ever come from your pen. All think so who have read it in our community."

The article here referred to was in reply to one in the *Church Review* entitled "Orestes A. Brownson as a Philosopher," rather boldly criticising an exposition of Cousin's philosophy in the pages of the *Catholic World*. Cousin had been commended by some for his war against the sensism of Locke and Condillac, and his defence of spiritualism;—not the spiritualism of the great

* Works, Vol. XIII, p. 268; Cath. World, May, 1870.

† The policy of presenting Catholicity in its strength, or the policy of presenting it as differing as slightly as possible from Protestantism.

‡ *The Church Review and Victor Cousin*. Works, Vol. II, p. 330.

philosophers of the Church, but a spiritualism that slides off into pure rationalism and pantheism.* His philosophy had ceased to be in vogue in France, but the party of the *Correspondant* had been treating him with great consideration, more, however, for his liberal politics than for his philosophy; and it was on their account mainly that Brownson wrote his criticism of *le grand éclectique*, as Heine called him. There was nothing in the criticism that could offend his friends; but a young writer in the *Church Review* came forward as Cousin's champion, and maintained that Brownson had misunderstood Cousin's philosophy, and had even falsely classed it as eclecticism. Now, Brownson thought he was the last man to be accused of not understanding Cousin's eclecticism. His defence of it in the *Christian Examiner*, in 1836, met Cousin's approbation as he shows in the third edition of his *Fragments Philosophiques*, published in 1838; and he exerted himself to the utmost to get Brownson appointed Professor of Philosophy at Harvard about the same time. For years Brownson was regarded as a favored disciple of Cousin, and was certainly accounted one of the most competent, as he certainly was one of the most indefatigable defenders of his philosophy in this country, and ceased to be so only in 1842, when his mind was beginning to be turned towards the Catholic Church.

An esteemed friend wrote Brownson an interesting account of the critic who believed he understood Cousin's philosophy better than anybody else.

* *Le Rationalisme Contemporain.* Par l'Abbé H. de Valroger, Paris, Lecoffre, 1846.

UTICA, November 10, 1868.

My dear Dr. Brownson:—I have been meaning for some months to write you a few lines by way of explanation of the recent Articles in the "Church Review," but have put it off for various reasons and no-reasons until to-day,—and being now shut in the house by a violent storm, at the house of our Senator (U. S.) Mr. Conkling, I have concluded to do what ought to have been done before.

When your Article (for yours I judged it to be at the time by certain unmistakable signs) on "Cousin" appeared in the Catholic World, I spoke of it favorably in a letter to Dr. C. S. Henry * and in reply he desired me to send it to him, which I did. He wrote me afterwards that his son, a young man not then quite 21 years old I think, had prepared a critique upon the Article which the Editor of the Church Review intended to publish. I read the Article, I confess, with astonishment on account of its tone and spirit, and thought it weak and foolish. I was glad you treated the youthful writer with such courtesy and forbearance, and the consequence is, his last Article in the Church Review for October, is apologetic, though I have not yet found time to read it carefully enough to judge of its merits. It has, however, as you will see, something still of the conceit of youth. I don't know whether you will think the young man deserving of further attention—perhaps good may come of it irrespective of him. I understand he is a student at law and has rather wild radical

* Rev. Caleb Sprague Henry, D. D. Editor of *The American Advocate of Peace*, then of the *New York Review*, and later Professor of Philosophy in the New York University.

notions in regard to the Church, but of fine abilities and "much promise," as the phrase goes. Perhaps with gentle treatment he may yet see a little deeper into the interminable or insoluble puzzles of Philosophy—*insoluble*, that is, to him and to many others. And this reminds me to express the earnest hope that you have not abandoned the purpose of giving to the world your work on Philosophy (of which you once spoke to me)—"The Problem Solved." We have no one in the country so well qualified to grapple with present difficulties or whose words would be more sure of a hearing.

By the way I saw before leaving my place at Oxford, New York, a very thoughtful review of Bronson Allcotts' book "Tablets," in the last or the next to the last no. of "The Round Table," and in the course of it reference was made to yourself two or three times. I laid the no. aside intending to send it to you and will do so on my return the last of the week. The Article I should think *might* have been written by Frothingham, author of the volume on "Ontology." It is very much in his style.

Be pleased, my Dear Doctor, to accept the assurances of my most unfeigned respect, and with warmest wishes for your health and happiness believe me your deeply obliged and grateful friend,

W. AYRAULT.

Most of the subjects treated by Brownson in the *Catholic World* were discussed at the request or suggestion of Hecker. March 14, 1868, he writes: "Were not my hands so full I would have started off to see you to-day. The article on Draper was crowded out of the April number, but will be in the March [May]. An

article on Modern Literary tendencies, or one on Pantheism—Ditto on Materialism. These either or all would be welcome. . . . In the April number of the Atlantic there will be an article treating of Catholic matters and which will not be unfavorable to us, but containing opinions which your pen might take up and refute. The idea is that the Catholic religion is the best going, but a more perfect religion is coming. It is the old idea of the Church of the future. . . . The tract, 'Is it honest?' has created great excitement, called forth several sermons and newspaper articles. . . . You cannot be very far gone into oscurantism or you would not be willing to confess the fact. God is calling on our nation to exert its national conscience and *it will do it*. This is his way of extricating us as a people." On the 22nd he writes: "I send you the second sermon of Mr. Bacon on 'Is it honest?' I shall esteem it a favor if you will take up the sermons and refute their errors."

March 27th, he says: "I feel a great interest in the reply to Bacon, and satisfied it is in the right hands. Your article on 'Rome and the World' has been translated into French and published in the *Revue Générale*, of Brussels."

November 6, he sends Porter's *Human Intellect*, saying, "If you can look at this Vol. of Porters, and give an article, or a notice of it for the C. W. please do so."

June 8, 1869, he writes: "With this note you will receive the July no. of Putnam which criticises an article entitled 'Our Established Church.' The Archbishop *

* Archbishop Hughes died some years previously, and his former Coadjutor, McCloskey was appointed to succeed him. Between the latter and Brownson, there was always a harmonious understanding. The article criticised in *Putnam's* was by Brownson.

of New York has made corrections &c. on the margin—that is, he promised me he would. I send also an article from the Journal of Commerce, and one from the Express on one of the points—the School question. Tomorrow or Monday I will send comparative statistics from the State and the City, of grants received by protestants and catholics. You would be aiding the good cause and doing me a favor by writing an article for the August no. of the C. W. in reply to the Putnam. The Archbishop remarked that you were the one to write the article and said, he liked your way of treating the school question. The common schools were a pet of the American people, and it was not good policy to run a tilt against them. He also suggested leaving out entirely the point of political offices. Let those whom this concerns attend to that. Could the article be got ready by the first of July it would serve us well. These fellows have been fattening on public pap, and the moment a spoonful is put in our mouth, they cry out: 'Church and State.' It is a fixed fact, my going to the Council. The Bishop of Columbus, Ohio, has appointed me his procurator which will rank me with the Episcopate in the Council."

March 8, 1869, Hecker wrote: "The Article on the 'Woman Question,' two on the 'Old and New', with your letter of the 6th have been received. These 10 months past I have been thinking on the woman Question and taken some steps in the way of discussing it in the pages of the C. W. I read the Revolutionist, and have several tracts published on the subject. My intention was to send these tracts to you. Your article on the subject is most welcome, and your

treatment of it most satisfactory to my judgment. If you wrote the article under any restraint Dear Doctor, in my opinion you never wrote better in your life. I say this with all sincerity. The two articles intitled 'The Old and the New' I have not had time yet to read. They will be all right. I send you a book by Epes Sargeant entitled *Planchette*. Its subject is Spiritism.* I see he quotes you and me on the subject. Evidently Spiritism is not dead; and S. gives the best side of it. The dark side he conceals. With his book I send you a pamphlet 'Spiritualism unveiled,' and one from Judge Edmunds. I should like to have an article from your pen on this matter."

March 18, Hecker wrote: "In the matter of Spiritism between us there is no difference of opinion. The thesis—'The order of facts as far as not jugglery or explicable on rational principles, are of satanic origin'—which you suggest, seems to me the best. What is real in spiritism is satanic, and leads finally to either insanity or immorality. Sargeant knows this, but conceals its effects designedly and culpably. Spiritism is the revenge of neglected Catholic truth. 'The Woman Question' will be the first in the May number, and the one 'Pope or People' is terse, pointed, perfect. This will also appear in the May no. In reading your letter again it strikes me as a new and most important point to show that Spiritism does not 'afford any evidence of the immortality, or future existence of the soul.' It certainly does not, and yet this is their main stay. No one can regret more than I do your ill health, and were my prayers answered, your health would be restored, and your life preserved for the glory of God and the advancement of His Holy Church in our land 'ad multos annos.'

To-morrow is St. Joseph's feast, and you will have a special memento in my mass. It seems to me Dear Doctor that there is an awakening in the public mind in regard to Catholic questions and the church, that has no precedent in our country. The Catholic question is a live one in almost every thinking mind. The School Question will be brought before the New York Legislature this winter. A bill will be presented in the Senate this week. Its object is to pave the way for denominational schools. It is broad, and unsectarian, that is, it demands no exclusive privileges for Catholics. The future of the church is involved in our success in this matter. It may take several years to obtain success."

June 7th, in reply to Brownson, Hecker wrote: "Your opinion of your own articles is not just, if I be any judge. You never wrote more finished articles than those on the Woman Question and Spiritism. The first took me quite by surprise—its gentle tone and polish did not at all abate your usual strength. The Archbishop of New York expressed his complete satisfaction with those articles, and said you never had written better. He is not alone in this opinion," and again, "The making of articles in the C. W. personal would involve a change which at present at least, does not seem to me advisable." "I subscribe to every one of your criticisms on the articles in the C. W. Gilmary Shea wrote the article on the Bible."

August 26, Hecker writes: "My last note was a blunder. Yours of 24 shows me clearly that I failed entirely in communicating my thought. My intention was to express to you what I have done by word of mouth on many occasions, my most sincere appreciation of the

value and high importance of the contributions of your pen. Any other thought than this was not present to my mind."

From Rome he wrote February 4, 1870: "I send by mail Cesare Cantu's article on 'Chiesa e Stato,' which may serve, if you choose, as a basis for the article on Church and State, which I suggested for your pen. . . Cesare Cantu stands high in the esteem of the Pope and all sound Catholics of all parties. I formed his acquaintance here, he resides in Milan, and has returned home. The Council is in the *via purgativa* of discussion, and from appearances it will be some time before it will enter upon the *via illuminativa*. 'L'homme se meut, mais Dieu régit,' are the words of Bossuet, and applicable to men in the Council even with more force than men without. Light will come and action will follow in due season. I trust you will write the article suggested,—you shall be remembered at the Altar for help from above from to-day forward. Your pen and experience make it a duty."

In a letter to a son Brownson wrote a month later: "Father Hewit wanted me to write an article on the School Question, and Father Hecker wrote me from Rome the outlines of an article on Church and State for me to fill up for the Catholic World. These, with an article on Emerson, and the concluding one on the Abbé Martin have, with my writing for the Tablet, kept me so perplexed and busy that I have had hardly a moment in which to write you. I beg you to excuse me as well as you can, especially as my eyes are so bad that I ought not to write at all. . . You may be sure I did not fill out Father H.'s outlines. I have written the article in my

own way. I expressed my own views, which I think agree well enough with Father H.'s, if he only knew his own mind and could express it. And yet I am not sure it will be accepted or printed as I wrote it, as I have given *carte blanche* to Father Hewit, the editor at present. Very few of the reports from Rome, if any, can be relied on. There is no doubt that too many of the prelates lack the courage of their faith and are too afraid of the secular powers. You will like my article on the School Question.

"I was glad you liked my book.* They are already printing a Second Edition, I am told. Father Hecker made a mistake when he showed a reluctance to publish it in the Cath. World for which I originally wrote it. I have published it with my name as a feeler. If you were as good at writing as you are at thinking, and could endure the wear of continuous thinking and writing together, I would revive or have you revive Brownson's Quarterly Review. I believe the public would now support it. The amount of writing would cost me less labor than I now bestow on the Catholic World; and if I could get it reëstablished and live to conduct it for three or four years, it might fall then into your hands, and be a valuable property to you. Think of it. I can't get about, but I can work in my study.

"I thank you for sending the article on the Funding System in the Chicago Tribune. It is the only sensible thing that I have seen on the subject, and says what every one who has mastered the simplest rudiments of finance knows perfectly. Mr. Chase never knew anything of finance, and Mr. Lincoln knew less. From the

* *Liberalism and the Church.*

beginning of the war up to the present, the real manager of our finances has been the Philadelphia humbug, Jay Cooke, who has contrived to impoverish the country and to build up a colossal fortune for himself. It would have been far better to have paid 18 per cent on the money actually borrowed, or \$15 per \$100, than \$6 for \$40, or even \$50. The Tribune is right. Mr. Chase was told so at the time, but he would believe nobody but Jay Cooke. There never would have been any need of bank suspension, of legal tenders, or even of treasury notes, if the Secretary had known anything. A loan of \$500,000,000 could at any time during the war have been placed at 9 or 10, at furthest 12 per cent, and the banks could have continued to pay specie. There would have been no inflation of prices, and the debt at the close of the war would have been less than one-third of what it was, and would, with the high taxes we have had, have been two-thirds paid off by this time. But that was not what Jay Cooke wanted. He wrote elaborate essays to prove that 'a national debt is a national blessing,' and fools believed him. But how we are to pay our debt, I know not. The national resources are not equal to it, and funding at a lower rate of interest is out of the question when money is worth more than the present rate, and there is very little seeking permanent investment, and we do not want our bonds to be taken abroad. Mr. Boutwell is no financier, and Mr. Grant is—President."

Brownson's philosophical essays in the *Catholic World* were connected in plan, much more than might be inferred from the titles. After an essay on the *Cartesian Doubt*, in which it is shown that scepticism is no

solid basis of philosophy, he discusses the *Old Quarrel* of St. Anselm and Rosceline, Abelard and William of Champeaux, and demonstrates the objective reality of the true Universals,—not of abstractions or conceptions,—but of ideas or intelligible species. This was followed by an article on Cousin; and of these two last he gives some account in a letter to his son: "I am glad," he writes April 24, 1867, "you like my Old Quarrel article. I thought it would help you to clear up your own views. The great and important point, certainly the original point, in it is the exposition I give of what the peripatetics meant by their phantasmata and intelligible species. I had previously hinted something of the sort in my Review, but I have never before fully developed it and got it clear in my own mind. I think I have defended the Scholastic philosophy and showed the ground of reconciliation between it and my own, or Gioberti's. There is less originality in Gioberti than I at one time supposed, and while I regret nothing I ever took from him, or approved of in him, I do not rate him so high as I at one time did. At one time he mastered me; now I think I have mastered him. I hope I have smoothed the way somewhat for you, and enabled you to master and use what you learned from your professors. You have to carry out and complete what I have begun.

"My next article in the C. W. which will appear in June, is on Cousin, and as you will see, is a supplement to the one on the Old Quarrel. Cousin mastered me once; but I think I have fully mastered him now. Indeed I never master any one till I have made myself his disciple, and allowed him to master me. It is on the principle, *credo ut intelligam*, a more important principle.

than is commonly supposed. We understand by sympathy, and never master an author till we have seen his doctrine under an aspect under which it is not false, or till we see what has led him to believe it true. Never begin an author, a real author I mean, in a critical spirit. Allow him to enlist your sympathies as far as he can, and to carry you away, provisorily, with him; see with his eyes, and think with his thought, till you have taken all there is of him up into yourself. Then you may turn him over and criticise him as if he were yourself, and thus master him, and put him in his place. Read always with an open, not a closed mind and heart. This has been my method of study through life. The drawback in my case has been that the circumstances of my life have compelled me to write and publish while the process was going on, before I had time to complete it. Hence the charge of fickleness and frequent changes of opinion. The world has never known, and never will know, the steadiness with which I have adhered to my principles, any more than it will know the loving heart and generous sympathy with which I have always studied. The loving heart is the true auxiliary of the comprehensive mind,—the truth Plato had in view when he made love and intelligence the two wings of the soul, on which it soars to the Empyrean. You yourself will soar much higher when you find fuller scope for the strong and generous affections which are implanted in your nature."

During Hecker's absence in Rome, Hewit controlled the columns of the Catholic World, and the correspondence between the latter and Brownson shows that subjection to editorial supervision was sometimes very irksome, and even irritating to the old Reviewer.

February 3, 1870, writing to Hewit, he says: "Will write the article on Education you have requested, if my eyes get better, and you do not in your wrath countermand it. Father Hecker and I have had some doctrinal quarrels, and he has insisted that I should, in writing for the Tablet, accord with the Catholic World. I have not considered that he had any right to control not only what I write for the Catholic World, but also what I write for the Tablet. I differ from you on the question of realism and nominalism, on original sin, and probably on the dogma of exclusive salvation. You follow the Jesuit theologians; I follow rather the Augustinians. But however this may be, whenever you feel aggrieved by anything I do or say, I shall always listen with the profoundest respect to your remonstrances and as far as possible remove the grievance. I will simply add now, that I will henceforth refrain from all adverse criticisms of the C. W. and will never allude to it in the Tablet save to commend. Do not run away with the notion that remonstrances are lost on me, especially if they come from yourself, whom I have so much reason to love as a friend and to respect as a teacher. There is little, except abandoning principle, that you cannot make me do, if you try, for the truth you tell me even in wrath I will accept as if it was told in love."

In writing a notice of the Catholic World for March, 1870, in the N. Y. Tablet, which Brownson edited after the suspension of his Review, he tried to keep the promise made to Hewit, and alludes to this in a letter to him dated February 22, 1870:

"I have written a notice [in the Tablet] of the last number of the C. W. I have expressed the opinion that

Mrs. Ellet's article on Friedemann Bach is out of place in the C. W. My daughter wrote at Father Hecker's invitation a story for the C. W. which was sent back with a most insulting note from Mr. Kehoe because it touched on the subject of love. I have suggested, also, that the article on the *Iron Masque* must have been written before M. Topin had published his book. I have done this so that it should not appear that the Tablet is a mere tender to the Magazine.

"I have read the proof of the last article on the Abbé Martin. I hope it will appear in the April number, for I should not like to have any break in the publication of the articles. I hope the article on the School Question meets your approbation. I was not displeased with it myself. I think I have placed the question on its true ground, and on a principle that we can maintain, and which no Protestant, not an infidel, can gainsay without disloyalty to the American State. You will perceive that I deny that the American State is infidel or has any right to protect infidelity, and maintain that it is bound by the religion of its citizens, or their conscience. In the Tablet you will see that I go further, and maintain that it is bound by the Catholic conscience in all cases where the Protestant conscience does not exact, though it permits, as in the case of divorce *a vinculo*. I have aimed to interpose a barrier to the alliance of Catholics with infidels, and to make my appeal to the religious and moral sentiment of the country.

"Father Hecker suggested to me some time ago an article on Church and State, but I cannot recall his particular suggestions. He has written me from Rome requesting me to write the article. My doubt is,

whether I have not anticipated it in the articles on the Abbé Martin, and that just sent you on the School Question. I could write something more on the religious obligation of the government, and in doing so discuss the proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, recognizing the Divine Being, Christ, and the Holy Scriptures. If you think it desirable, I will write an article covering the subject, but I should prefer another title, say, The duty of the State to religion, State Religion, Religious Obligation of the State, Separation of Church and State, or Union of Church and State. Will you at as early a moment as convenient tell me your views and wishes? Perhaps, Father Hecker has told his more at length in a letter he says he sent me by Bishop Bacon, but which I have not received.

"My eyes are troubling me again, but I am pretty well, if I keep quiet and regular. You wonder at the amount of work I do, yet I am idle half my time, and do not a quarter of the work you do, for I work only on my past work."

In reply Hewit says: "Your article in the Tablet was entirely satisfactory to me, and so also is the article on Schools, in which I have made only slight verbal changes. I have also appended a note which is not an explanation or modification of the article, but an addition to it, extending the principle it contains to colleges and universities. The one on the Abbé Martin will appear in April. I am rather glad to have literary criticisms on the Catholic World, because they make every one more careful, and I cannot myself do the work of actual editor, or regulate everything according to my own will. I

hope the Tablet goes to Rome, for its influence there will be important and salutary.

“Bishop Bacon has not yet arrived with F. Hecker’s manuscript. . . . It seems to me there are two great points to be discussed. 1. What would Catholic principles require of Catholic voters here, if they were in a preponderating majority in one or more states, or throughout the United States. 2. Same question, if they were the whole people of the United States. The first shows the principle of accommodation to an existing state of things which varies from the perfect ideal of a Christian state. The second shows the ideal state itself when it is a republic. An exposition of the Idea of the American Constitution must necessarily be given in order to compare it with the Catholic Idea.

“My notion is, that the universally accepted Christian Code of political and social morality, the Christian Common Law, is our religious basis. The only ultimate standard of appeal is the universal conscience of the sovereign people. When this conscience is enlightened and instructed it must follow the Law of the Church in all things and become a Catholic conscience, just as would be the case with a monarch. Enforcing conformity to the Law of the Church in those things not directly against the life of the State and Society upon any portion of the people who have been educated in another religion would be unjust, and enforcing the same upon rebels and apostates may be very frequently impolitic and hurtful, if they have become strong enough to survive the attack of power. The case of Mormonism or the supposed case of a sect of assassins shows how the

civil power might be obliged by its duty to suppress a false religion.

"I am at the end of my paper, and with sincere affection must subscribe myself your devoted friend."

This letter was dated February 24th, and on the 25th, Brownson wrote back:

Rev. and dear Father:—I have just received your note. You do not reply to my question, whether I have not already sufficiently discussed the question of Church and State, and whether it would not be rather overdoing the subject to prepare another article *ex professo*. You give me instead your opinion on the question of Church and State itself, which I of course highly appreciate, but it was not what I asked for.

I have, however, after reading Il Signor Cantù's article on the question, which Father Hecker has sent me, begun the article. My plan is, First, What is the normal relation between the two powers? Second, How far does the relation established here conform to that normal relation? My main purpose will be to show, though our American State falls short of the true principle, yet it recognizes it, in recognizing as antecedent to it, and binding it, the inalienable rights of man, which in the last analysis are the rights of God. I think as my materials are ample I can make out something.

My articles are of course subject, even when accepted, to your editorial revision and correction; but I am rather particular in my choice of terms, and a little sensitive to verbal changes, for the change of a single term is not unlikely to change my whole sense, and upset my logic. From what I have read of your writing, I think I am more nice and exact in the use of terms than

you are yourself, and that you do not always attach the same value to single words that I do. I would more willingly submit to your doctrinal corrections than to your verbal changes, unless in cases where I have been careless and have obviously used an incorrect term.

The Catholic World wants an editor, and an editor that has ample leisure to attend to it. Yet it suffers less than I should suppose it would. There is danger, however, of its becoming too heavy for a magazine, and it has too many feminine writers, whether they wear skirts or breeches. It wants, as a whole, robustness, true manliness, which it might have without being less courteous or conciliating. I do not dare put forth my strength in writing for it, and feel nothing of the freedom that I do in writing for the *Tablet*. I feel that in writing for the C. W. I am only half a man, and that I must suppress the rough vigor of thought and expression that is natural to me. Father Hecker restrains me, and my mind does not, and will not work freely under his eye. He patronizes me, but treats me as an inferior. I can face to face converse more at my ease with him than with you, but I can work far more freely under you than under him. You do not disarrange my working gear, nor wound my amour-propre. But I have done my best things, and am only fit to be laid upon the shelf. Have the charity to remember me in your prayers.

Yours truly,

O. A. BROWNSON.

REV. A. F. HEWIT.

ELIZABETH, February 25, 1870.

Hewit's next letter was as follows:

ST. PAUL'S, March 3, 1870.

Dear Doctor:—I suppose you will understand from my sending you F. Hecker's letter his opinion about the necessity of an article, and although it is not necessary for me to give mine after his has been expressed, yet, for your satisfaction I write to say that it concords with F. Hecker's. *Nil obstat, Imprimatur.* The article on Schools has been sent down for the April number. Of course it is too late to have the one you are preparing in before May, and I doubt much if you can do justice to the subject in less than two articles.

It is undoubtedly a great humiliation for you to be in any respect subject to one so much inferior to yourself in intellect and in most departments of knowledge. The only consolation I can give you under this trial is, that you have the opportunity of gaining great merit and making a sacrifice of the most difficult kind to God, and thus gaining an eternal crown of much greater value than any worldly glory. The powers which I must necessarily have and exercise, I always use with scrupulous respect toward every author who is a master in his art, and to you especially, and never meddle with a word unless conscience or an evident reason of propriety requires it. If there is a difference on any point, I have to act like Susan Nipper's conscientious goblin in the garret, and fulfil "the painful duty of my position." I do not know why the prospect of getting through with your labors should be so distressing. You have done enough to satisfy your conscience, if you never write another line till you go "to the kings and consuls of the earth." I should think the prospect of getting through would be rather pleasant than otherwise to yourself, al-

though to a great many others it will be like the loss of a principal part of their world. I sincerely hope it will not fall to my lot to preach your funeral sermon, and I should not wonder if some day the Tablet would come out in black lines with a splendid obituary on the lamented Father Hewit from your pen, which he himself will never, like Archbishop Spalding, have the pleasure of reading, or the malicious satisfaction of criticising. You will probably think that in this state of levity of mind, my prayers will not be worth very much. Bye and bye I will make an act of contrition and become as grave as my Father ever was; as grave as my brother the Doctor is, in the intervals between his jests, * when he is delivering a lecture; and offer up a prayer that Dr. Brownson may become as great a Saint as he is a philosopher, and though his sight may become dim and his steps feeble, that he may have strength with one mighty and last effort to tumble over the pillars of the temple of heresy, and then go up to receive the felicitations of St. Augustine and St. Thomas. I must now fold up my wings and come down. I think we had better both of us, recommend ourselves to the prayers of Mrs. Brownson, and, who knows but we might even at the eleventh hour get the grace of conversion and become like two little lambs? Mr. Alger has at last exhausted my patience, and will receive the first tickling of the rod in the next number. Dr. Marcy do. although the latter is gently treated as being only a weak brother.

* Dr. H. S. Hewit's jests were constant, full of meaning, but generally grim. Ex uno disce omnes. He says in a letter of July 30, 1870, "I had a letter to-day from some pious nuns out West asking for Geo. Peabody's address. I replied that I was not quite sure, but they might try *Heaven*."

My best respects to Mrs. Brownson and Sarah. I remain with sincere regard and affection,

Yours very truly,

AUG. F. HEWIT.

Brownson's next letter to Hewit was this :

ELIZABETH, March 8, 1870.

My Dear Father Hewit:—I have written the article on Church and State, and shall finish and send it this week. It will make from 14 to 15 pages. I have modified the original plan in accordance with Father Hecker's suggestions. Yet I have written my own views rather than his, but I do not think I have run athwart them. I do not confide so much in the people as he does, and I do not understand precisely whether he wants me to side with the Revolution or not, nor do I know what he would have the Church concede to it. His suggestions are too vague. Yet I have followed them—with my own paces—as far as I have been able, and believe I have reached his conclusion. Whether I have done so or not, you must judge, and if not you must alter *ad libitum*, without fear of my growling. I would send the article to-morrow, only I wish to read it over again after cooling.

There is no humiliation in my being obliged to work under you and F. H. The difficulty is that under F. H. my mind is restrained, and my faculties will not work freely. It is not that I cannot express freely my views, but that I cannot express them with the ease, *abandon*, or *nerve* I would wish. You mistake me. I am not distressed or sad at the prospect of leaving this world,—except that I have made no provision for my wife and daughter. But you overrate what I have done. I say

unaffectedly that to me it seems I have done nothing, and that my life has been frittered away. I have not fulfilled my early promise, nor used the opportunities I have had given me, and my only sadness is in the thought that it is too late to redeem the time lost or to do anything now. Of all my mighty plans not one has been executed, and I cannot persuade myself that I have done or can do anything worth remembering. This is said as sincerely as if in the confessional. But I am not very unhappy, nor very grave.

Very truly yours,

O. A. BROWNSON.

REV. A. F. HEWIT.

Hewit's reply, nearly three weeks after, shows, among other things, how far he, as well as Brownson, was from the extreme views of Hecker.

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, N. Y., March 28th, 1870.

My dear Doctor:—I am very well satisfied that you made your article so conservative in tone, reserved in language and explicit in avowing the principles of the Syllabus. So far as Europe is concerned, I think it, if not a mistake, at least premature and conjectural to forebode the triumph of the Revolution. The fall of the temporal power has been foreboded, but these forebodings have proved to be the suggestions of fear and a weak faith, and I think the Holy See will know what instruction to give to Europe when a new emergency arises. I am loyal to our constitution and government because it is legitimate and the only one possible for us, but I cannot share in the enthusiasm for popular sovereignty. F. Hecker will, I suppose, be satisfied with your modest

recommendation of American principles as far as it goes, though he might wish it to go further, and as the proposal to treat this subject was from him, the only question of importance is whether he is satisfied. There is one point which you have not yet made clear, viz.; how it is that the Catholic Church becomes lawfully recognized as the true Church by the State, and how her laws are brought to bear upon the State so that the State is bound to accept them and coöperate with them. If the State is incompetent to decide which is the true church, how can she ever be bound to submit to any laws of any church any more than an individual who has no data for deciding what church he is bound to submit to? If you have read Montalembert's letter you will, I think, see that you have been more generous than just in your judgment of him. I hope he has found Our Lord equally lenient, and that posterity will also forget his errors and remember only his glorious works whose lustre he would have tarnished or destroyed if God had not taken away his strength and finally his life. His death is a blessing to his reputation, to the cause of the Church, and I hope to his own soul also. It is astonishing how the hidden venom of Gallicanism and Liberalism has been brought out by the Council, and how dreadfully hard it dies. I am certain that many will openly revolt when the definitions of the Council are published.

I believe every person feels like you when he looks back on his life, unless it may be that some of the Saints who have been made use of by Almighty God to do superhuman works are an exception. I am sure I do, and I do not know what we can say except this: "Domine, non eges bonorum nostrorum." It is something

to have given testimony to truth, justice, right, and the law of God in face of a multitude. If it be but little and its effect is not perceptible to our eyes, we may leave to God the care of his own work, and hope for eternal life as a pure boon of his goodness, through the merits of Jesus Christ. I think all the decrees De Fide will be passed and promulgated after Easter, the Council then adjourn about June 29 or until October, and a great number of bishops receive permanent leave of absence. Perhaps the Council next year which will have only questions of discipline to decide will be much smaller in numbers. I wish you good health and the blessing of God on yourself and family. Yours with sincere affection.

A. F. HEWIT.

Returned to New York, Hecker wrote July 15th: "I send the *Mercersburg Review*, with a leader, 'Where is the Church?' and told Mr. Kehoe to obtain the other noticed in the article 'Union with the Church.' An article on the subject of *Union with the Church* would come apropos of the meeting of the Holy Alliance in this city in September. The article would appear in the October number. I hope your health is improving. Mine has been remarkably good since my return."

The article requested was published in October, and soon after the Reverend J. W. Santee, the author of the article in the *Mercersburg* wrote to the Publisher of the *Catholic World*, from Cavetown, Washington Co., Md.:

"Allow me to address this letter to you, with the request, kindly made, to let the author of an Art. in the *Catholic World* on Union with the Church, see it, that being a review of an Art. on same subject in the Mer-

cersburg Review, by myself. First of all, I would thank the author for his kindness in noticing it, and for the strictures he saw proper to make. To any of you, who have not been in similar conditions with us in Prot. who are anxiously battling with forces so foreign, it seems to myself, to the true idea of the Church and the Christian life. You may not understand our perplexities, and think strange of us for even attempting to hold on to Prot. disfigured as it is. We have our education, our training and all the weight of a life, which moulded us and formed us, to carry, and then to overcome. We pray you then, judge not harshly of us. My own mind has been agitated more than once on this subject of life or death, and I find relief only when I dismiss it, and keep myself aloof. That, you would say, is not the way, but cut the knot, and settle the case once for all. I have come that far that I can see that all the contrivances against popery are that much bosh. I have read too much for that. Balmes, Moehler, . . . &c., which works I have read and reread some, tell me differently. I am sincere, and want to do what is right, and pray for light."

The article on the School Question in the *Catholic World*, and still more those in the *Tablet* gave very general satisfaction to Catholics of all degrees. The Bishop of St. Paul wrote to the publishers of the *Tablet*:

ST. PAUL, MINN, March 23d, 1870.

Messrs. Sadlier & Co.—Will find enclosed draft for amount of bills.

I was greatly disappointed in the lecture of Rev. Mr. Preston. It is a very feeble statement of the Catholic view of the School Question, and in my opinion will injure rather than benefit the cause. A poor defence is

worse than no defence. There is a writer in the *Tablet* who manifests a thorough knowledge and a grasp of the subject in all its strongest points. He could do the subject justice, and he would render a great and most needed service at this moment if he would present the Catholic views and grounds upon the School Question to take the place of Rev. Mr. Preston's pamphlet for general circulation.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. GRACE, Bp. of St. Paul.

Preston also liked the *Tablet* articles, for he wrote:

SAINT ANN'S CHURCH, NEW YORK; April 27, 1870.

To the Editor of the *Tablet*:

The course of the *Tablet* upon the School Question has been so able and so just that I feel with many other Catholics a debt of gratitude to your journal. Let me bid you Godspeed in the good work, and express the hope that ere long our countrymen may see that we are contending for rights which underlie the very foundations of our government. As for Catholics, there can be no difference of opinion when the authorities of the Church have clearly spoken. "He that gathereth not with me scattereth," says our blessed Lord. We may have our own opinions upon local matters; we cannot differ from the Bishops and the Supreme Pontiff on the question of religious education; nor are we free to *advocate* the system of instruction pursued in the Public Schools as the one suited for Catholic children.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

T. S. PRESTON.

Lest it be thought that Brownson's present views on our Schools are at variance with former censures which he passed on them, it should be remembered that when indicating what he regarded as their defects, he had expressly stated that it was with the ideal standard of Catholic Education that he had the right to compare our Catholic Schools, and must judge them as they, by the instruction they gave, and the influence they exerted, did or did not tend to its realization. He always maintained that the education given in our schools, however defective it might be, must ever be preferred to that given in schools in which the dogma is rejected or mutilated, and can never be justly censured save when compared with its own ideal, or with what it would be, were it truly and thoroughly Catholic. This shows his intention, and that his censures of Catholic schools and education meant only that they fell far below the Catholic standard, that is, they did not realize the Catholic ideal. His error, if error it was, consisted in asking too much of Catholic schools, more than the very best schools can practically give, not in his specification of the defects of the education actually given, for most of these defects, viewed from the Catholic standpoint, are undeniable. There were phrases in his former articles which it is very likely the writer would not now use, and he would be more careful to explain what he meant by "Modern Civilization" and "Progress," which he never really understood in a sense contrary to the Syllabus. Since the discontinuance of his *Review* he had modified his views on some questions on which during the last three years of its existence he had given more or less offence to some of his Catholic friends, and while yield-

ing to no one in his love of liberty, planted himself firmly on the Syllabus, yet on the school question and the relations of Church and State he found no reason to modify his doctrines.

The Archbishop of New York expressed his approval of Brownson's articles in the *Tablet*, for some time after he began writing for its columns. But the restraint which Brownson put on himself when others were involved in the responsibility for what he wrote, leading him to adopt the milder tone his critics had always clamored for, in April 1871, McCloskey complained "of the Editorials of the *Tablet* as being rather tame and not sufficiently vigorous." He also alluded "to the anti-Catholic spirit displayed by the sectarian papers tending towards a sort of a crusade against us, which should be energetically met." He was "highly pleased with the paper," but "it did not say enough."

Mild as McCloskey was towards persons, he seems to have been as fierce as one could wish when attacks were made on the church. In December 1870, James Sadlier, one of the publishers of the *Tablet*, wrote Brownson: "I send you by this mail three copies of *Harper's Weekly*—about which a word or two—Week before last there crept into the advertising columns of the *Tablet* an advertisement which I enclose eulogistic of the abominable sheet. A complaint has been laid before the Archbishop, and his Secretary, Father McNeirny called upon me in relation to it. The Archbishop desired me to send the papers to you with a private note, asking you to condemn the atrocious caricatures of religion and the Holy Father. He says you cannot be too severe in what you say—nothing can be too strong. Do not al-

lude to our having advertised the sheet, as that would only call attention to it, but as Greeley once said, 'damn it on general principles.' The Archbishop is much annoyed at this matter as he has received many letters about it, so that, the more vigorous and characteristic your condemnation, the more he will be pleased. The Archbishop desires you to consider this note as private and not to let it appear that the article was suggested from 'Headquarters,' but emanates from the Editor of the paper."

A great number of articles were written in reply to arguments, misstatements, and false charges of the anti-Catholic press, not only of Harper's publications but of the *New York Observer*, the *Church Review*, the *New Englander*, the *Church Union*, the *Hartford Churchman*, and countless others.

At the same time the *Tablet* sought to avoid all dispute with Catholic journals, and Sadlier was so pacific that he wrote Brownson, April 12, 1867, "I send you the *Freeman's Journal*, on the first page of which is a most unwarranted and unprovoked attack on you. I send it to you for your reading, but I would not notice it. All McMaster wants is for some able man to galvanize him into life, but don't you be instrumental in doing it—let him alone very severely." And the next day he wrote: "With regard to your articles in the *Tablet*, Mrs. Sadlier and myself are more than pleased with them. They have the true ring in them. McMaster never noticed the *Tablet* during the two years Dr. Anderson edited the paper, because very few of the outside papers took any notice of his articles. The contrary is the case now, hence the anger of the man of the *Freeman*."

What particularly aroused the ill-humor of McMaster at this moment, was that in a controversy with Dr. Stewart Robinson, of the *Free Christian Commonwealth*, on the question whether Catholicity or Presbyterianism maintained the principle of persecution, the Presbyterian cited against McMaster Brownson's doctrine that the spiritual order is supreme and the temporal subordinate, and Catholic states have the right to exclude emissaries of the sects from their territory, as he had been maintaining in the *Tablet*. McMaster's reply was only abuse of Brownson and a disrespectful allusion to Mrs. Sadlier.

In the *Tablet* of April 27, Brownson said after a brief statement of the controversy and of Robinson's reply to McMaster: "It is perhaps a little surprising that the editor of the *Journal*, a man of acknowledged high mental and moral culture, and whose fertility of invention is unrivalled, should have found no better answer to this than that Dr. Brownson is an old man, who lacked the advantages of early education and a liberal culture, and that the *Tablet* is edited by a woman, and he never reads it. It, of course, would never occur to any one to rank the *Tablet*, as a Catholic paper, with the *Journal*, or Dr. Brownson, as a theologian, with its learned and accomplished editor; but as this answer does not seem to us to meet the question, we hope it will be considered no intrusion if, so far as we are concerned, we answer the Presbyterian Doctor for ourselves.

"Dr. Brownson very possibly asserts the supremacy of the spiritual order, for that is a Catholic doctrine, and is asserted by every one who believes in the spiritual order at all. We must obey God rather than men, and when the spiritual and temporal come in conflict, the temporal must

give way. To maintain the contrary would be simply to maintain that man is above God. That God is to be obeyed rather than man is a dictate of reason itself, and is true, let who will assert it, or who will deny it. Does Dr. Stuart Robinson deny it?

"Everybody knows that the Church is intolerant in the theological order as distinguished from the civil. The Church tolerates no heresy. . . . But this is not the question. . . . The real question, then, is: Do the principles of the Church require her to call on the civil power to use, under her direction, its physical force to suppress heresy, or to punish. . . . those whom she condemns as heretics? This, as we understand it, is the real question at issue, fairly put.

"To this question we answer, as we have answered over and over again: No, emphatically NO."

Brownson referred occasionally to Hecker in the *Tablet*, for it came in his way in replying to the Protestant press; but by no means so repeatedly as one would infer from Sadlier's complaint when he wrote June 3rd, 1868: "Don't you think that you are giving Father Hecker a little too much prominence by introducing him into almost all of your late articles? I assure you there is no class in the community that dislike having one man continually before the public more than the priests. I would in future write on general subjects without reference to any person."

The very next article sent to the *Tablet*, after the receipt of Sadlier's letter, was one on Mumford's attack on Hecker, and appeared in the number for June 13th. Hecker himself was not pleased with Brownson's apparent defence of him, to judge from a letter of Sadlier's, of

July 28th, 1868, in which he says: "I had a conversation with Father Hecker and he complained very much of an article written by you that appeared in the *Tablet* some six weeks or two months ago. He said that he was not correctly reported and that the writer in the *Tablet* founded his strictures on a report of his lecture as given by a Protestant minister. It would be as well for the *Tablet* to let him defend himself in future. Unless you agree with him and look through his spectacles at every question, he evidently is not pleased. So the best way is not to take any notice of any attacks that may be made on him, as your line of defence he considers an attack on himself."

That Hecker was correctly reported is evident from the fact that all that Brownson says of the Detroit lecture is substantially contained in every lecture he ever gave and repeated in every conversation of his relating to the same subject. All that Brownson took from Rev. Thomas J. Mumford's review of the lecture was these words: "Father Hecker asserted that the Catholic Church was best adapted to the political doctrine of self-government, and was a friend of the oppressed." And all that Brownson said himself of the lecture was: "Father Hecker had labored in his lecture to show the harmony of Catholicity with republican government, and that the Church maintains in her dogmas the only principles on which man can be regarded as capable of self-government." That such was Hecker's constant line of argument cannot be questioned.

What really displeased Hecker was the line on which Brownson replied to Mumford. "We do not," he wrote, "take the ground taken by Father Hecker, and

Mr. Mumford's reply proves that, whether tenable or not, there is very little use in taking it. We take higher ground, and assert that religion has no account to render of herself to politics and politicians. Religion, if anything, is the *lex suprema*, and gives the law to politics, instead of taking it from them. . . . Moreover, we do not accept Hecker's reasoning. He argues the compatibility of the Church with democracy, from the fact that she rejects the doctrine of total depravity, and preserves to man his reason, and his manhood, and therefore asserts capacity for self-government. This is very well, but democracy assumes not only the essential goodness of human nature since the fall, but the purity and rectitude of all his instincts, passions, propensities, and affections, which no Catholic can concede. Man is not, indeed, totally depraved, struck with absolute moral inability, as Calvinism asserts, but he has fallen; his nature has been averted from God, and the flesh inclines to sin, and when left to himself he runs into all manner of iniquity, as the experience of the world proves. He is born under sin, in bondage to Satan, his will enfeebled, and his understanding darkened, so that he needs the illumination and assistance of grace. He has not that rectitude and purity of nature that is necessary to render him capable of self-government, as democracy supposes, and as Father Hecker seems to concede, and hence we maintain that neither democracy nor any other form of government is capable, by nature alone, of answering the end of good government, or without the infusion of grace and inculcation of those principles which the Church, and she alone, in every age and nation, asserts and maintains

with all her supernatural wisdom and strength. Exclusive supernaturalism is bad ; exclusive naturalism is no better."

CHAPTER XVIII.

SETON-HALL COLLEGE.—CORRESPONDENCE.—DISSATISFACTION WITH HECKER AND HEWIT.—REFUTATION OF ATHEISM.—MRS. BROWNSON'S DEATH.—REVIVAL OF BROWNSON'S REVIEW.

THE ARTICLES written for the *Ave Maria*, *Catholic World*, and *Tablet*, to which last he contributed sometimes six columns a week, seldom less than four, his letters to the daily papers on the political issues of the moment, together with the reading of the books which he wrote notices or elaborate reviews of, might seem a great amount of work for an old man to go through with; and yet to all this must be added his lectures at Seton-Hall College. These lectures, it is true, gave no trouble in preparing, but they took a whole afternoon for each one, on account of the travel there and back. It was nearly a mile from his house to the station where he took the cars for Newark ; quite a ride from one station to the other in Newark ; and a drive from the South-Orange station to the College ; and besides there was a long delay between trains at Newark. The students had Balmes's *European Civilization* for their text-book, and the lectures were illustrative of the subjects there discussed. Bishop Corrigan endeavored to get a suitable residence for Brownson at South Orange, but the price

was too high for his means, and he gave up the intention of removing to that place, and finally was compelled by the difficulty of the travel to discontinue the lectures.

Brownson complained that not half of his time was occupied, and much as he disliked in his old age all physical exertion, his mental industry was all the more conspicuous, and apparently indefatigable. His private correspondence was large. He seldom wrote letters to his friends and acquaintances where the object was merely to keep up a correspondence, and many on this account thought him neglectful; but to his children and sisters he wrote often and long. Often he was consulted on questions of every nature, generally by persons he had never seen, and his answers were given with careful thought. There are among his papers, twenty letters, by actual count, from Mrs. Dahlgren, all dated the same year, and all, or nearly all, answered. Hecker's letters were perhaps more numerous, but they usually called for only short replies. There was William G. Dix, who for years wrote lengthy letters about his religious difficulties before he became a Catholic, which demanded more labor to answer than to write articles on the same matters; for he wanted revealed doctrines proved to his reason, as well as Catholic practices rendered worthy of his approbation, and all this in detail, before he was ready to accept the truth he could not understand, in reliance on God's veracity. Some women were even, or almost, as bad. Sometimes questions were asked in a way that left it doubtful what was the real difficulty to be solved. An instance of this was a question proposed by the Reverend E. M. O'Callaghan, of Youngstown, Ohio, to which Brownson sent a long answer only

to be told, "You will recollect that I proposed for your decision the following question : 'It is not repugnant to the sanctity of God to suppose an order of things in which it is possible for him to forgive a man one mortal sin upon the performance of certain prescribed acts of virtue accompanied by attrition, and at the same time to retain other mortal sins of which he (the man) is guilty.' This question is not, it is true, clear, for the parties would not agree to couch it in precise terms, for such a presentation of the question would perhaps incline the balance to one side or the other, and neither party was willing to yield the advantage to his adversary.

"But if I may presume to interpret its sense (for the parties are not now here), it is this. Repeated mortal sins, other things being equal, make the sinner guilty before God in proportion to their number ; thus A. B. who is guilty of *five* mortal sins to-day is more offensive to God than he was yesterday when guilty of *four* only. Now, may we not suppose an order or system in which A. B. upon the performance of certain virtuous acts accompanied by attrition, might obtain of God the remission of so much of his guilt as he incurred by the last (or fifth) mortal sin, and stand as guilty as he was yesterday when guilty of *four* mortal sins only? For as the guilt of mortal sins increases by acts, why may it not decrease by acts also, if God so ordered it? This order would not be repugnant to God; for 1st, he would still hate sin and would not be reconciled to the sinner till the guilt of all mortal sins would be cleansed away, for between mortal sins and God there can be no reconciliation. 2dly. It would also cause the sinner to refrain from sin, for he would be convinced that even one mor-

tal sin would separate him from God and prevent reconciliation. 3rdly. It would place the sinner on the way of returning to God, for if the guilt of many mortal sins could be thus seriatim remitted, as soon as the guilt of the last remaining sin would be forgiven, the sinner would then be reconciled to his God, and worthy of heaven. This is not reconciliation by attrition with confession and absolution according to the Council of Trent, nor by imputation according to Calvinism.

“This is the sense attached to the question by the parties, and on this the dispute arose. The question was whether there could be a gradual return of the mortal sinner to God by a partial remission of his guilt.”

The following was Brownson's answer :

ELIZABETH, N. J., October 4, 1866.

Rev. and dear Sir:—I have almost entirely forgotten what I wrote in reply to the question submitted for decision, but so far as I remember, I supposed the question to be substantially as you interpret it, viz.: “Can there be a gradual return of a mortal sinner to God by a partial remission of his guilt?” Is it compatible with the sanctity of God to forgive on attrition, confession, &c., a sinner guilty of a number of mortal sins, one of his mortal sins, while he retains the rest ?

I think I answered the question, as you now state it, and I repeat it, in the negative. What I mean to say is, that though the sinner's guilt undoubtedly augments in proportion to the number of his mortal sins, yet God cannot forgive one of the number without forgiving the whole; therefore the remission must be complete, or no remission at all. Did I not in my former letter so reply?

My reasons are that forgiveness on the part of God is not forensic or external justification, as Calvinists teach, but intrinsic, remitting not simply the penalty, but removing the sin, and receiving the sinner into the Divine friendship, which is not possible so long as one or more mortal sins remain unforgiven or unremitted. With this view of remission I cannot understand in what would consist the remission of A. B.'s *fifth* sin while the *four* were retained. He is just as far from being grateful to God as ever. He who is guilty of one point is guilty of all. Not *as* guilty as if he had broken every point of the law, but just as far from justification. He may deserve less punishment, but he is just as far from the friendship of God, which is as effectually broken by one mortal sin as by a hundred. The man guilty of one mortal sin is just as effectually out of the state of grace as he who is guilty of the five you suppose; and as remission places the sinner in a state of grace, and restores the lost friendship of God, there can, in the nature of the case, be no remission for the one sin which is not also a remission for the other four. This seems to me to be conclusive.

Besides, the conditions or acts on the part of the sinner, necessary to obtain remission of one sin, are amply sufficient for remission of all his sins; and if not sufficient for all, they are not sufficient for one. No man has attrition, or imperfect contrition, for one mortal sin, which with confession &c., suffices for absolution, while he has none for the other mortal sins he has committed. That attrition must be for particular sins indeed, but it must also be for sin itself, and reach the sinner's sinful state no less than his specific sins. Suppose the sinner in the state proper for the remission of one mortal sin,

you suppose him in the state proper for the remission of *all* his mortal sins; and if not in the state for the remission of all, then not in the state for the remission of one.

I cannot then understand any such thing as a partial remission. It must be total, complete, or not at all. The sinner is grateful to God, or he is not. If not, his sins are not remitted; if grateful, no mortal sin is retained against him. He either is or is not in a state of grace; if he is, then no mortal sins are retained against him; if he is not, then none have been remitted.

I grant that the man who has committed five mortal sins has offended God more than he who has committed only four, but both have alike offended him, only not in equal degree; and neither can be received into friendship as long as one mortal sin is retained; and as remission is intrinsic, and must be with God, who is truth and can tolerate no sham or fiction, and renews the broken friendship, it follows necessarily that there is and can be no partial remission. This is my decision, and these are my reasons.

I may have only repeated what I wrote before, if so, you must pardon me, for the subject had completely gone out of my head. If you find my reasons obscure, unsound, or inconclusive, pray state your objections frankly, without any apology or fear of trespassing on my time. I am wholly at your service, and have rarely anything pressing to occupy me, except that most laborious work of—doing nothing.

I am, Reverend and dear sir; your most obedient
and devoted servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

REV. E. M. O'CALLAGHAN,

St. Columba's Church, Youngstown, Ohio.

A priest at the seminary near Milwaukee published^d a sketch of Brownson and his work, in the *Star of Bethlehem*, without taking the trouble to become well informed in the matter, and with much complacency forwarded his production to Brownson, who acknowledged it in a letter which contains so much about himself that it is here inserted.

ELIZABETH, N. J., December 1, 1870.

Reverend and Dear Sir:—I beg you to accept my sincere thanks for your flattering notice of me and my writings in the *Star of Bethlehem*. You praise me much beyond my merits. I have no claim to be regarded as a learned man, and have all my life long suffered from the defects of my early education. I really know no language but my own, but when hard pressed, I can make out to read and understand six or seven others. I have never been what is called a hard student, and have always shrunk from long-continued, close application. The only subjects I have really studied are English style, * philosophy, the philosophy of history and of re-

* In connection with what Brownson says of English style, an extract is inserted from a letter written me by my eldest brother: "You know better than I do the wonderful scope and power of his giant mind. He told me once, 'if I am a success in life, I owe it to my knowledge and use of my mother tongue, of English, Anglo-Saxon English,' and I find it so. There seems such a command of language, such a felicity of expression, always the best word in every case, and withal such enthusiasm that although I never could and cannot yet agree with all his conclusions, I am lost in admiration at his language and infallible logic. His example does-

ligion, or theology. Under the head of philosophy I include politics, or the moral law applied to the state.

In your notice of me the reader would infer that my "New Views of Christianity, Society, and the Church" was published in 1840 or 1843. It was published in 1836, before "Charles Elwood," and was inspired by the St. Simonian publications and the "D'Allemagne" of Heinrich Heine. The writer who first turned my mind in the direction of the Church was the Abbé Maret, now Mgr. Maret, by his work on *Le Panthéisme en la Société Moderne*.

You commend me as a philosopher, and yet singularly enough pronounce the principle on which all my philosophy is based a manifest error, an absurdity, which somewhat more than neutralizes your praise. I must believe, Reverend Sir, that you or I do not understand *Ens creat existentias*, or mean the same thing by *primum philosophicum*. When I say, the Ideal formula, *Ens creat existentias*, is intuitive, I do not mean that the proposition, *Deus creat vel creavit existentias*, is intuitive. Doubtless *Ens* is *Deus*. but this is not intuitively affirmed, and can be ascertained only by discursion or by revelation. When I say *Ens creat existentias* is the *primum philosophicum*, I do not mean that the understanding commences its development with an explicit intuition of that formula. but it expresses the formula to which the principles of all the real and all the knowable are reducible, and therefore that it is the basis of all real intelligence, all real science. The mind cannot exist, nor

more to prove a divine essence in faith than all else I have witnessed. But I cannot write of him without a weight of sadness too heavy to bear, and sure to overpower me."

operate without the principle of all science. The principles then must be given intuitively, prior to all experience, and therefore by the Creator. The only question then is, What are the principles so given? Those given are the *primum philosophicum*, not the *primum* from which all science is deduced by reasoning, but on which all science depends, and to which all may be reduced at last.

Let me say that the philosophy I defend has no relation with the Ontology of the Louvain professors, which I have condemned and refuted before it was censured by the Holy See. The seven propositions censured I have never entertained, and always have regarded them as pantheistic. I am not an ontologist any more than I am a psychologist: my *primum philosophicum* is the synthesis of being and existences, or being and existences united in their real relation, by their real nexus, the creative act of being.

You are mistaken in supposing me to have been misled by Gioberti. I had worked out and arrived at substantially the philosophy you suppose I borrowed from him before ever I had heard of him; but I had not expressed it in terms sufficiently precise to guard against a pantheistic interpretation. What I owe to Gioberti is simply a more exact technology. He led me into no error, but enabled me to guard myself against pantheism.

You will, I trust, pardon me, if I intimate that you have condemned the formula, which is only the first verse of Genesis, in consequence of not understanding it in the sense of those who maintain it. If you had read the philosophical articles in the *Catholic World*, all or nearly all, written by myself, you would hardly, I think,

have treated it quite so flippantly. If you are right in your condemnation, I certainly do not deserve the praise you give me as a philosopher, and I cannot understand on what principle you give me that praise. I call no man a philosopher whose principles are false and absurd.

In speaking of me you might have added that I am a frequent contributor to the *Catholic World* as well as to the *New York Tablet*. I write for the C. W. on the average an article a number, and the greater part of the elaborate articles published in it, whether philosophical, polemical, or theological. I wrote in it the articles in review of the Abbé Martin on the Future of Protestantism and Catholicity, The School Question, Church and State, Hereditary Genius, Union with the Church, The Great Commission, Steps of Belief, and Answer to Difficulties, published since last January, and also a review of Emerson's Prose Works. I am in fact writing and publishing more than I wrote when conducting my Review.

I take your article on me kindly, for I believe it well meant, but had you consulted me before publishing it, I should have begged you not to publish it. I am now an infirm old man, and past the age when praise or blame can much affect me. You have praised me, in general terms, and censured me, without giving any good reason to justify either your praise or your censure; and as your censure is inconsistent with your praise, you will pardon me if I say frankly I would rather you had said nothing than you should have said what you have. Yet perhaps it is churlish to say so, and I pray you to pardon me if I have said anything amiss, or do not seem so grateful as I ought. A man approaching seventy, who has been all

his life before the public, cannot be expected to be very grateful for being spoken of as if he had just made his *début*. What I wish is, to be suffered to remain in quiet, to make my soul, to die, and be forgotten of men.

I have the honor to be with sincere esteem your obedient servant,

O. A. BROWNSON.

REV. THO. LAGAN,

Seminary of St. Francis.

If, after the suspension of his Review, Brownson had resumed the work, begun more than twenty years before, of putting his philosophy in a condensed and systematic form as a text-book for use in the higher schools, some of his friends believed he would have supplied a serious want in text-books. He had thought of it long before, and was half inclined to attempt it at times ; but found it almost impossible to be as brief as such composition required. His habit, as a reviewer, of bringing into the discussion of a question all the opinions and theories of other writers bearing on the same point, and of showing the connection of his view with the whole order of truth, led him invariably into what in a text-book would be inconvenient digressions. He even urged one of his sons to write such elementary work, and he would have done so, but for other reasons which applied in his case as well as in his father's. If those who control the philosophical instruction given in our higher institutions of learning were as sincerely desirous of teaching a true philosophy at once in accord with reason and the nature of things, and with what is known by revelation, as they have proved themselves obedient to an

order or command, extorted by apprehension of a dangerous tendency of the age to pantheism by way of ontologism, it might have been hoped that Brownson's philosophy would be given a fair hearing and judged on its merits. But to the present day there has been a persistent effort on their part, both in their contributions to periodical literature and in their collegiate instructions to misrepresent it, to set forth as his doctrines he repudiated, and then to refute these and claim they have refuted him.

These remarks will be seen to have a bearing on his answer to Sister Eulalia Pearce asking for a text-book of philosophy. She wrote:

MT. DE CHANTAL, October 18th, 1871.

My dear friend:—Sr. Staunine, our best English teacher, has requested me to ask your advice in the selection of a text book for her class of mental Philosophy. She can teach it admirably without a book, and in fact, her instruction would do credit to many a professor's chair, but the girls not having time to reflect fully upon what she gives them in class are desirous of some book which can aid them in recalling and preparing. She has Abercrombie and Havens, and Dr. Brann's "Curious Questions." The first she says appears to her to contain very little of any real mental philosophy, the second is too voluminous, with a propensity on the part of the Author to spin out every detail, while Dr. Brann's is excellent for proving the utter worthlessness of the study excepting to show us the narrow limits of the human understanding, and our utter dependence on God. What she wants is a small strong book with a comprehensive system condensed into as narrow bounds as pos-

sible, and permeated with the Catholic spirit. Do you know of any such? If not, how I wish you would write one! It is a great want in our schools, and with your information and command of language such a work could be *speedily* accomplished.

I have been looking for Sarah's promised biography of Prince Gallitzin. Has it escaped me, or is it not yet out? With kind regards from the community, and begging to be most cordially remembered to your family, I remain in the sacred hearts of Jesus and Mary,

Your sincere friend,

SR. M. EULALIA.

To which Brownson replied:

ELIZABETH, N. J., November 17, 1871.

My dear Sister Eulalia:—I should have answered you much sooner if the rheumatic gout had left me a free use of my right hand. I have been obliged to desist from writing, as much as possible, to let my hand rest.

I cannot answer your question, for I know no work on mental philosophy in English that I can recommend. No Catholic has written, as far as I know, a philosophy in our mother tongue. The least objectionable work known to me, is a work of Professor Upham, of Bowdoin College, Me., called I believe, *Upham's Philosophy*. The Author follows in the main the Scotch School. Dr. Walker, late President of Harvard College, Ms., published an abridged edition of Dr. Reid's philosophy with notes, 1 vol. 12 mo. which I think your professor might put into the hands of her pupils, with some advantage, and no great danger. Donahoe of Boston can tell you, if they are out of print or not.

Others besides yourself have asked me to write a work on philosophy, but the Jesuits have a controlling influence over Catholic education, and I cannot accept their philosophy, and it is against their conscience to go out of their society for a text-book of philosophy. Besides, I am a layman, and under a cloud. No work I could write would be received and used in our higher schools generally.

I have also no time to do it. I am now writing a Refutation of Atheism and False Theism, which I wish to follow by a book on Revelation, another on the Mysteries of Faith, another on the Church, another on Natural and Christian Ethics, to complete the plan which I think I communicated to you some years since.

This with my contributions to the Catholic World is as much as an old man in his 69th year can calculate on living to complete. I discontinue after this year, 1871, my contributions to the Tablet. Father Hewit, by his "Problems of the Age" superseded the one I had half-completed on the Great Problem. I have half-a-dozen other works partly written that I hope to bring into the series of works I have named.

My daughter's Life of Prince Gallitzin has not yet gone to press. She thanks you for the inquiry. My wife thanks you for remembering her, and I thank you for them both. Remember me with great esteem to Sister Baptiste, and believe me ever your faithful friend in Xt.

O. A. BROWNSON.

Brownson's Review had hardly been suspended for a twelve-month before he dreamed of reviving it. As early as June 29, 1866, he wrote to his son, an officer of

artillery at Fort Warren, Mass.: "Is there anything in the rules of the service that would directly or indirectly be interfered with were an officer to become an editor providing he discharged faithfully his military duties?"

"Could he edit a review, for instance, without endangering his position, provided he maintained his proper attitude towards the government and his superiors? Would he run any risk in any respect whatever?"

"I ask these questions, because I have a project in my head. You know I always intended you for my successor. If you are free, why not become the proprietor and editor of Brownson's Quarterly Review?"

"You are on good terms with the Jesuits, and by publishing in the first No. an article favorable to them you would at once secure their support, which would insure you success. I would write you two or three articles for a number, if you needed so much. From officers of the Army and the Navy you could get articles of great interest and value. My aid might be avowed or not as you thought best. At any rate, you would be the sole and responsible editor.

"You could count on all my friends and on a circle of your own. I think it might be made more popular than ever it was. I throw out these suggestions for consideration, and I wish you to decide for yourself, uninfluenced by any supposed wishes of mine. If the Review is resumed, it should be published at Boston, and, I think, as a General Review, holding itself responsible to authority, but without seeking its approbation in advance. It is possible, however, that your position as an officer in the Army is incompatible with any undertaking of the sort. [Certainly it was.]

"I give up my intention of writing books. My books will not sell. The *American Republic* is comparatively a failure. I cannot resume the publication of my Review myself, for reasons which I could tell you, but which I cannot write. Yet these reasons have no weight against your doing it"

Relations as a contributor to the *Catholic World*, with the Editor, whether it was Hecker or Hewit, as has already been alluded to, were never very harmonious with regard to the fundamental views of theology and of the Incarnation as the basis or origin of the whole supernatural order; and to this dissidence was soon added a philosophical discord between Brownson and Hewit, which finally wrought such rupture as to sever their literary connection.

When Hecker returned from Europe in 1867, Brownson had a free talk with him, after which he said of him, "He has improved by his foreign visit, and although we do not precisely harmonize in our views, we I trust, will be able to jog on together without much mutual snarling and growling."

In February, 1868, he wrote: "Father Hecker and I have had a fight, but it is over now. It grew out of his rejecting one article, and mutilating another, because my views conflicted with some views on original sin, published by Father Hewit in the *Problems of the Age*. In the first instance, I did it ignorantly; in the second instance, I thought I had avoided the main objection, and as I expressed my view in the words of the Council of Trent, I trusted it would pass. But no, Father Hewit might contradict the Council of Trent, but nobody in the *Catholic World* must contradict Father Hewit, whose

orthodoxy on more than one point is more than suspected. But after firing off several letters at Father Hecker I feel better. But if another such case occurs, I will explain it in the *Tablet*. Father Hecker was sick a week from the scolding I gave him, and we are good friends again. I shall not be surprised if Father Hewit, who is really a holy man, modifies at least the expression of his doctrine, which you will find Vol. IV. pp. 528-530."

Brownson having expressed in a note to Hecker his intention of discontinuing his contributions to the *Catholic World*, the latter wrote:

NEW YORK, January 30, 1871.

Dear Dr.:—I greatly regret that you were hindered in coming to dine with Dr. Marshall and other gentlemen on the 25th inst. More so, because it would have given, I am sure, the occasion of our coming to a satisfactory understanding.

It seems to me that if you would continue to write such articles as you have done the last two years or more in refutation of the calumnies of the enemies of the Church, in applying Catholic principles to the social and political questions of the day, in directing the young Catholic mind how to judge and act in the midst of existing difficulties, which never were greater or more threatening, and in boldly confronting and silencing the leading advocates of heresy and error, you would promote to the greatest degree Catholic interests, give the highest satisfaction to the hierarchy, and interest most the readers of the Magazine.

Believe me, Dear Dr., you can have no idea of the great good which you have done by your pen employed in this direction. I, who am in more direct contact with

the readers of the Catholic World, hear the satisfaction expressed on all sides and by all classes for articles of this nature, all rejoicing that in you they have found a champion of their faith and a master who teaches them how to harmonize their duties as Catholics with the best interests of society and the state.

Whatever value you may attach to my judgment or sincerity to my friendship for you, believe me, that this is a matter of most serious consideration in the presence of God, before you leave this great field of doing good, and give up the privilege of leading and directing the Catholic mind of our country.

I have never known you to falter in what you considered to be your duty, and whatever may be your deliberate conclusion in this matter, the high esteem and sincere friendship which I have borne for you now nearly forty years, will be none the less, or in no way affected.

As ever yours faithfully and affectionately,

I. T. HECKER.

A little later Brownson writes to his son: "The only trouble I have grows out of the fact that Father Hewit is not sound on the question of original sin, and does not believe that it is necessary to be in communion with the Church in order to be saved. He holds that Protestants may be saved by invincible ignorance, and that original sin was no sin at all except the individual sin of Adam, and that our nature was not wounded at all by it. Father Hecker agrees with him on these points, and is in fact a semi-pelagian without knowing it. So I am obliged to abstain from bringing out what I regard as the orthodox doctrine of original sin and of

exclusive salvation. But in all other respects I am unrestrained."

Hewit for years professed to follow Brownson in philosophy, though he never really understood him, and when ontologism was condemned by the Holy See, seeing that his own philosophy was censured, he at once decided that Brownson's was likewise. Brownson had equally refuted both Ontologism and Psychologism; but Hewit could never get it into his head that any philosophy was possible except one or the other of these sophistical, or one-sided systems. Hence he could not comprehend Brownson's insistence on defining his precise view. In an article on McCosh's "Christianity and Positivism," * Brownson said it was erroneously supposed that Gioberti and himself maintained that the ideal intuition was formal intuition of Being, and appended a foot-note defining their real doctrine on this point. This note Hewit omitted for reasons given in a letter to Brownson, as follows:

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, N. Y., August 2, 1871.

My Dear Dr.:—Your 2 articles have been received. The first one will go into the October Number, as the September Number was already full, and F. Hecker had left the list of contents here before his departure for Lake George, where he now is. I am very well satisfied with it, and think it a very able and thorough exposition of the topics handled. The note on Gioberti I think is unnecessary and unadvisable. The real point is sufficiently brought out in the text, and will be understood by those who are capable of understanding a longer ex-

* Works, Vol. II p. 428.

planation. The rest may be left to their own forgetfulness. I have preserved the Note, in case you may want to use it elsewhere.

The other article I have not yet read, and will take up to F. Hecker. I have no doubt it is all right, as it must agree with your other articles in whose principles and doctrines I fully concur.

I wish you good health and the blessing of God, and remain yours very truly,

AUG. F. HEWIT.

This drew from Brownson the following answer:

ELIZABETH, N. J., August 3, 1871.

My dear Father Hewit:—I am not quite sure that I like the omission of my note. I like to confess and get absolution, and never could go on maintaining views as if I had never held the contrary. Others may forget, but I cannot. I have no doubt that in omitting the note you have done what was best for yourself, for you really had maintained a proposition which the Holy See had censured,—immediate intuition of God, which I never had done, though accused of doing it. If I recollect aright, the ideal formula, in the sense ascribed to Gioberti and Dr. Brownson, is modified and rejected in the text, which leaves me in a false position without the explanation given in the note. I am apparently censured, or suffered in the text to lie under a false charge, for I never held any different view of ideal intuition from that given in the article with which you express yourself satisfied. If you strike out the note, it strikes me that you should strike out all allusion to Gioberti and to me in the text. I have never fallen, since a Catholic, on the

point in question, into any error the Holy See has censured. My *Review* will show you that I was never an ontologist, and always held that true philosophy is the synthesis of the ontological and the psychological. But I will own to you that I had not sufficiently explained what I meant by *ideal intuition*. Perhaps I did not clearly understand myself, though I think I did, only I thought any further explanation unnecessary.

I have read carefully the propositions of the Louvain professors, M. Branchereau, and now Mgr. Hugonin. My *Review* censured them, as unsound, long before the Holy See had censured them, but principally for their pantheistic tendencies. Fathers Ramière and Kleutgen show that ontologism is censured because it asserts immediate intuition or cognition of God, a point I did not hold, but on which I did not dwell. These Fathers are right in their assertion that ontologism is censured, but are we thence to conclude that ontology is no part of philosophy, and that philosophy is reduced, as Sir William Hamilton maintains, to psychology and logic, or with Cousin, that the ontological is logically deducible from the psychological? Because ontologism is censured, must we hold, with these good Fathers, that psychologism is approved and must be held? I wish to speak respectfully of them, but neither of them has any *ingegno filosofico*, or the slightest conception of the questions to be solved, and in refuting McCosh I have virtually refuted them and their whole school.

The fact is, the Jesuits profess to follow St. Thomas, which is well; only they first make St. Thomas in their own image; and Dmowski, Liberatore, Tongiorgi, and that whole school are as far from following the real St.

Thomas as Père Martin, Rothenflue, or Fournier. I claim to be a Thomist in both theology and philosophy, and I follow him, but I try to understand him, which neither these men nor Balmes, none of whom was ever born to be a philosopher, understand at all, in my judgment at least.

Yet you surprise me by approving my article on McCosh after having disapproved my article on Ontologists and Psychologists,* for if I understand myself, both articles maintain one and the same philosophy, which is substantially that of St. Anselm in his *Proslogium*. I can really see no reason why you should approve the one, and reject the other, unless it be in the article on McCosh I have succeeded better in explaining what I mean by ideal intuition, and showing that it is simply intuition of the ideal or ideas, which reflection identifies and verifies as *ens necessarium et reale*.

With great respect and many wishes for your health,
I am,

Yours truly,

O. A. BROWNSON.

REV. A. F. HEWIT.

Hecker wrote from Lake George, August 9th, 1871, "All your articles are accepted, and will appear in the *Catholic World* as soon as possible."

December 21, 1871, Hewit wrote: "The review of Dr. Hodge is about as complete and masterly a refutation of the whole basis of Presbyterianism as I have ever seen, † in fact the best in so small a compass. He will

* Afterwards published in *Brownson's Review*, and to be found in his works, Vol. II p. 468.

† *The Protestant Rule of Faith*, Works, Vol. VIII p. 418.

have but a very small circle to argue in after this, about as small as Napoleon III at Sedan. The answer to objections against Papal Infallibility is equally good, particularly in reference to liberty."

Peace seemed restored; but the articles on which Brownson was engaged, and which he sent to the Editor a few days after Hewit had thus written, created a greater breach than ever. Hecker wrote January 8, 1872, "I have read and re-read your article on the necessity of Revelation, and consulted with F. Hewit, and in answer to your question whether it clashes with views held by him, I frankly say it does, as well as those maintained always by myself. In my judgment it would seriously impair the influence of the C. W. to bring out in its pages conflicting views on such important subjects. . . . F. Hewit writes the enclosed on the article on Ontologism, &c."

The enclosure from Hewit was a long reply to, or criticism of, an article afterwards incorporated into the *Essay in Refutation of Atheism*. As Brownson states Hewit's objections in his answer, it is not necessary to insert Hewit's letter; Brownson's only is given.

ELIZABETH, N. J., January 11, 1872.

Rev. and Dear Father Hewit:—I am a little surprised at your rejection of my article on Ontologism and Ontology, after having accepted the article on Dr. McCosh, for they both contain the same philosophy.

I thought I had escaped all possibility of being suspected of holding any improbated proposition, and being misapprehended, as you seem to misapprehend me. You evidently suppose that I understand by intuition, cognition, perception, notion, or some other active oper-

ation of the intellect; but such is by no means the case, though I may have failed to note distinctly enough the fact, as I intended another article to complete my design.

In intuition, as I have always maintained, the intellect is passive, or receptive only; in cognition it is active. Intuition corresponds to the *species impressa* of the Schoolmen; cognition to the *species expressa*. In receiving the object, according to St. Thomas, the intellect is passive, and distinguished from *intellectus agens*, which perceives, or takes note of the object, or mentally expresses it. In intuition the object acts and affirms itself; in cognition *we* act and note the object intuitively presented. This, as I understand it, is the doctrine of St. Thomas. The authors you refer to * do not seem to me to have any understanding of the Thomist psychology, and to be mere routinists. I own their words have little weight with me, for I think I comprehend their ignorance. They all, as you do yourself, proceed on the assumption that intuition is not simply the presentation of the object, but the active perceiving or noting it. Bearing the distinction I have made, or rather, which St. Thomas makes, in mind, you will see, I think, that your criticisms are hardly called for.

You accept my analysis of thought, and boggle not much at my analysis of the object, only you would place the empirical element before the ideal. My reason for not doing so, is that I follow the scientific or logical order, which is the real order. The empirical presents particulars, singulars only, but these cannot be thought without

the ideal, for without it they do not and cannot exist. It may be, and probably is true, that we *note* the empirical long before we note or advert to the ideal, and some men, like Dr. Newman, never become aware of it ; yet the ideal is logically prior, and the intuition of both in their real relation is given, that is, presented simultaneously, and hence the mind can never rest in particulars, but is always looking for the universal and the apodictic. Your criticism rests on the supposition that noting or cognition and intuition are identical, and that all the activity proceeds from the mind.

Your remark, about the two objects, surprises me not a little. I neither assert nor imply two objects, the one empirical and the other intelligible, and I should nullify my whole argument by doing so. What I maintained is, that the object intuitively presented contains two distinct elements, the empirical, or contingent, and the ideal, in their real relation. There is for us no purely intelligible. Being can stand alone, but neither the empirical nor the ideal can ; for *the ideal is being in relation to our or the human intellect*: the empirical, or contingent, cannot stand alone, and therefore can be presented only in its relation to the ideal on which it depends. Hence the object in intuition is complex, the *synthesis* of the ideal and the empirical, or of being and existences, as in the ideal formula, only intuition does not analyze, or distinguish the elements. That is done by reflection.

The points to be noted here are, in opposition to Plato, that the ideal is not presented to us separately as pure ideal, without the empirical ; and 2, against the sensists on the other hand, that the empirical is no

without the ideal. Both are elements of one and the same intuitive object, and both are given together in their real synthesis in one and the same intuition. Neither alone is or can be the object of intuitive thought, and they are distinguished only by reflection, an operation of the *intellectus agens*. Now, I think that this view saves us alike from ontologism, and from sensism, nominalism, or conceptualism, and must, I am sure, relieve the difficulty you feel, if you do not, as perhaps you do, deny the reality of universals, and hold with Dr. Newman that extra animam "all things are unit and individual, and nothing else" (*Gram. of As.* p. 7), and maintain that universal and necessary ideas are abstractions created by the mind itself.

I do not understand your difficulty as to what is meant by the *identification* of universal and necessary ideas, or the ideal, with real and necessary being. I meant and could have meant only proving or establishing the identity of the idea with being, or demonstrating that they are identically *Ens necessarium et reale*, or in your language, "concrete being." Is this obscure or ambiguous? I had shown that we have in the object intuition of the ideal, and I stated the next step in the ideal demonstration of the existence of God was to show the identity of universal and necessary ideas, or the idea, with real or necessary being; for we know that being is, only *mediante* universal and necessary ideas given in every intuitive thought. This, with me, is a fundamental point.

The identification of *Ens necessarium et reale* as the next and last step, you say, presents no special difficulty. With your permission, it is the most difficult of all, unless

I have previously proved that the relation between the ideal and the empirical is the creative act of the ideal ; for otherwise I have proved no more than the pantheist himself admits. Nay, I have not made out my proof, till I have gone further and proved that God is final as well as first cause. This is not easily done.

Your hypothetical cases are disposed of by the distinction between *passive* and *active* intellect, taught by St. Thomas, and between intuition and cognition, which necessarily follows.

Your argument from analogy may be very useful in illustrating the attributes of God, or when the question is not, *An sit Deus?* but, *Quid est Deus?* Analogy is not apodictic, and a God generalized from the perfections of the human soul, is an abstract God, not real.

Perhaps I have not the respect for the authorities you quote that I ought to have, but in philosophy I bow only to reason, and the authority of the Holy See. I understand the Holy See to have improbated what you call *immediateness*, or that we have immediate cognition of God, and that this cognition is the very light of the intellect, in fact, the intellect itself, and this improbation I show in my article is warranted by reason itself, and I should accept it even if I could not so show. But the Jesuits are not authority for me.

I have fallen into neither of the errors of ontologism improbated by the Holy See, for I hold that the human intellect is a created light, and that we have neither immediate cognition nor immediate intuition of God, and attain to a knowledge that God is, only mediately, *mediantibus* universal and necessary ideas, or the ideal. I cannot therefore believe that I have in the article, in-

tended to be the first of three, incurred the improbation of the Holy See.

Yet I am not able to understand why the C. W. is closed to me, and opened to the same philosophy which I defend, in Father De Concilio, unless because he is a priest and I only a layman.* Yet I own that my philosophical articles would be out of place in a Magazine that indorses and praises Dr. Newman's *Essay at a Grammar of Assent*. Dr. Newman confesses that his philosophy can only prove the probable existence of God, though the Holy See decides that it can be proved *with certainty* by reason. My theology, too, it seems, is under the ban of the C. W. This too is fitting, for I follow the Council of Trent and the C. W. does not, if I understand it. The C. W. virtually, if not actually, teaches that original sin was sin only in Adam, and that in his posterity it is only the penalty of sin,—a heresy condemned in the 12th century.

I am sorry that I can be permitted to write no more theological or philosophical articles for the C. W., but the editor has the perfect right to open and shut to whom he will, and I am not the man to dispute it. I submit.

Very truly and affectionately yours,

O. A. BROWNSON.

Writing on the 17th of the same month to his son, he says: "I have been prevented from writing you sooner, by bad eyes, a lame hand, and an unusual press

* A little later, De Concilio was excluded from the Magazine, and for the same reason as Brownson. In a letter of November 27, 1874, he asked to have the second volume of his work published in the *Review*, and said: "I have offered long ago to continue writing it for the Catholic World, but my first article of my second volume was rejected as holding a system which was contrary to that of the Problems of the Age, by F. Hewit."

of writing. I find I had undertaken more work than I could accomplish, that I could not write for the *Catholic World* and the *Tablet*, and have any time left to prepare the series of works I have, as you know, in contemplation. Consequently I have broken off my connection with the C. W.

"The immediate occasion of my doing it was the rejection of my article on Ontologism and Ontology, and another on Reason and Revelation. Both my theology and philosophy being under the ban of the C. W., I thought it best to have nothing more to do with it, and leave the Paulists to themselves. I shall hereafter devote my time to the *Tablet* and the preparation of my contemplated works.

"The Refutation of Atheism, I have more than half done. These works will all be written anew, and nothing will be copied from my previous writings, except thoughts and ideas, as in the case of the *American Republic*. The Essays in the *Review* and the *Catholic World* I shall leave as they are. I am really writing new works. The first will refute Atheism, and demonstrate Theism; the second will prove the supernatural and the Christian Revelation against Deism, Materialism, Naturalism, &c. The third will treat the Mysteries, the Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, &c. The fourth, the Church; the fifth, Ethics; the *American Republic* concluding the series. This is my design, and if I should not live to complete it, you will be able to complete it substantially from what I have already written and published. This sketch will tell you what heads to arrange them, and guide you in your selection. This matter will be left to your filial affection."

Brownson's original intention to publish the *Refutation of Atheism* as a separate work was not carried out, because it was hardly finished before he determined to revive his Review, in which he inserted it with slight changes. The revival of the Review also prevented him from preparing the other works he purposed, and the loss of which is greatly to be regretted.

The *Refutation of Atheism* was not made up from his former writings, but was really a new originally written work, in which he brought out and more fully explained the synthetic philosophy, supplied some gaps, and moulded it into shape. He modified no essential principle, but he considerably modified his manner of explaining and defending it.

He begins by the analysis of thought, and shows that it is in fact composed of three inseparable elements, subject, object, and their relation, simultaneously given. Then he proceeds to the analysis of the object, and finds it also composed of three elements, simultaneously given, the ideal, the empirical, and their relation. The ideal is given in intuition, which must be distinguished from perception or distinct cognition. In ideal intuition the activity is in the object; in cognition or empirical intuition, Kant's cognition a posteriori, the subject as well as the object acts. The ideal intuition answers to the phantasmata or intelligible species of the Schoolmen. It presents, they say represents, the object. In sensibles the intellectus agens, or reflection, takes the object presented immediately from the presentation; but the ideal, though presented, can only be taken as represented in language, the sensible representation of the ideal.

He identifies the ideas with the Categories, and reduces their number to three, being, existences, and their relation. The necessary and apodictic ideas he integrates in being, and their correlatives in existences. Then he shows that the relation is the creative act of being, whence he proves that being is God, personal because he has intelligence and will. He had after that four chapters, one on existences; one on God as Final Cause, in which he arrived at the moral law which proceeds from God as final cause, in distinction from the physical laws which proceed from him as first cause; another showing that the moral law commands us to worship God in the way and manner he prescribes, whether naturally or supernaturally; and the last on the place and office of tradition.

This brief outline tells very little of the character of the book, but it gives some idea of the argument, which is almost exclusively analytical, and that it was not constructed without hard thinking.

Hewit made no reply to the last letter from Brownson, except an article in the *Catholic World* for June, 1872, of which Brownson said in a letter to his son: "Father Hewit in the last *Catholic World* has an article on philosophy, which has damaged him much in my estimation, by its dogmatic and arrogant tone, and utter unconsciousness, or apparently so, that he or the C. W. has ever defended the philosophy he condemns. It is aimed principally at me, though it does not name me. The man is no philosopher, and an indifferent theologian."

It was hardly right in the *Catholic World* to repudiate ontologism without acknowledging the fact, and still

less without distinguishing the ontologism which it very justly repudiated and which has been improbated by the Holy See, from the synthetic philosophy which it previously defended but now rejected. The *Catholic World* was before and for some time afterwards impersonal, and as it steadily refused to permit its contributors to sign their names to their own articles, it could not shift the responsibility of its former philosophical essays from itself to the writer, let him be who he may. By publishing them it made them its own.

Not a few persons knew, however, that its leading philosophical articles were written by Brownson, and that through misapprehension or misrepresentation the public confounded the philosophy advocated in them with the ontologism which he repudiated, from which it widely differs. It was due to itself, to the public, and to Brownson personally that it should have recognized this difference and corrected this false impression, especially since it persistently refused to suffer him to do it and set himself right before the public in its own pages.

Brownson was the more surprised at what he considered its disloyalty from the fact that the writer of the article in the June number had himself defended in the Magazine the very ontologism improbated by the Holy See, and which Brownson had never held, and even against his expostulations. Knowing, as Hewit did, that Brownson was accused of holding that ontologism, and that he did not, and never had held it, he should, in the circumstances, have recognized the fact.

After revolving the matter for a long time in his mind, Brownson wrote to his son, March 25th, 1872: "I have finally resolved to revive my Review, Brownson's

Quarterly Review, Last Series, Vol. 1, No. 1, beginning the year 1873. . . There are looming up any number of questions on which I wish to have my say. . . I want also to place myself *rectus in curia* before I die, for the sake of the cause, for the sake of my children and grandchildren, which I could not do in the C. W., and cannot do in the Tablet. Do not try to discourage me, but speak encouragingly."

When Brownson made the final resolution thus announced, his wife was nearing her end. She had for a long time been failing; but in spite of increasing feebleness, kept up her practice of attending Mass daily. The distance was considerable for her to walk, especially in wintry weather. A cold caught in a January storm settled on her lungs, which had been weak for twenty years or more, and she expired early in April, 1872, aged 68 years.

In a prepared introduction to the Last Series of the Review, Brownson wrote, but did not publish, the following paragraphs:

"One of the last requests made to me by my dear wife before her recent peaceful and happy death in the Lord, as I cannot doubt, and for whom my tears are yet fresh, was that I should revive my Review, which I suspended eight years ago. She insisted that I owed it to the vindication of my own honor as a Catholic, to my surviving children who must suffer from any stain of my reputation for orthodoxy and devotion to the Holy See, and in fine I owed it to the Church in this her hour of affliction, when her enemies seem to have gained a victory over her. I hope I may say that my wife was what the Scriptures call a valiant woman, and under God, I am

principally indebted to her meek and unobtrusive virtues in all the relations of her heroic life that my own mind was turned to the study of the truth, and by her generous encouragements led to embrace it, although she was not at the time within the pale of the Church.

"Her instincts were always pure, and her judgment was rarely, if ever, at fault, and her wish so clearly expressed in the last days of her earthly career became sacred, and I dare not resist it. . .

"I revive then my Review, because I wish to set myself right before the Catholic public, and vindicate my honor as a loyal though unworthy son of the Church, and to prove that I have no sympathy with those of my former friends who resisted or still resist the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, and have grieved the maternal heart of the Church and ruined themselves. I revive it, because I wish to protest against what goes by the name of Liberalism, whether in religion or politics, and to prove myself a true papist, a firm adherent of the papacy, and an earnest defender, as far as my ability goes, of the Apostolic See. I also revive it, because there are coming up every day great and vital questions for discussion in which I wish to take part, and in which I cannot take the part I wish without an organ under my own control, through which I can speak in my own name, and on my own responsibility, subject only to the ecclesiastical authorities, to whom I trust I shall always be found ready to yield all due deference, as a loyal Catholic."

These paragraphs were omitted from the Introduction as published ; perhaps their author was afraid they would seem too egotistic, or be regarded as claiming for

his position, words, and opinions an importance which did not attach to them ; but they seem only a proper explanation to those who remembered him.

The majority of the generation which he formerly addressed, and from many of whom he had received precious marks of confidence and affection, were gone to their reward. Death had been busy with his old friends as well as in the bosom of his family ; and he felt that to a great extent, in reviving his Review, it was to a public to which he was unknown that he must address it.

When in 1864 he suspended his Review, not from the lack of subscribers, but because he was unwilling to continue a periodical which had not the full confidence of the Catholic hierarchy, in many circles he was distrusted as a Catholic, and the common talk was that he had returned, or soon would return to some form of Protestantism. It was said he was disgusted with Catholicity, and was turning against it. Eight years had passed away, and he was still a member of the Church, with no temptation even, to abandon her communion. Whether or not he had erred in his opinions, never for one moment since his conversion in 1844, had his faith been shaken, his confidence in the Church been disturbed, or the thought of leaving her been entertained. There was, he said, nothing out of the Church to tempt him ; she only had the words of eternal life, and everything to win his love and to fill his heart and his mind with joy and gladness. She is the Kingdom of God on earth, and outside of her there is neither peace nor joy ; there are only doubt and uncertainty, darkness and despair. It was hard for him to conceive how the Dölingers, the Hyacinthes, the Hubers, the Friedrichs, the

Michaelises, and others, if they were ever really Catholics in faith, could be so deluded as to assume their attitude towards the Church, and in her hour of deep affliction, join Bismarck and the Revolution against the Holy Father, who stood alone among sovereigns or sovereign states in defence of justice, of right, of international law and the independence of nations, against might. How is it that any man worthy of the name can suffer himself to be seduced from his allegiance to God which guaranties him freedom, and make himself a poor miserable slave of Satan? Brownson, at least, had no such pride of intellect, pride of learning, as to be wiser than his Maker, or proud in the presence of the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE LAST SERIES OF THE REVIEW.—HUGHES.—SPALDING.—MONTALEMBERT.—WOMAN-WORSHIP.—FR. HILL.—THE NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL ORDERS.—REMOVAL TO DETROIT.—AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.—END OF HIS LIFE.

As soon as his mind was made up to revive his Review, Brownson began the necessary preparation for issuing the first number, and in a letter to the *New York Tablet*, copied largely into other journals, announced its appearance in the following January, 1873. The response was more general and favorable than he had anticipated. Priests and laymen from all parts of the United

States and Canada expressed their delight, and told how they had missed the Review for so many years.

Bishop Whelan and his Vicar General, John T. Sullivan, no longer viewing Brownson as another Robespierre, hastened to subscribe, and after receiving the first number, Sullivan wrote, January 22nd: "I am delighted with the ring of the articles." The bishop was strongly southern and secessionist in the days of the civil war, and violently prejudiced against New England; but for some years prior to his death in 1874, his bitterness of feeling towards the Union had passed away. His love of study and reading was great; but his intellectual power was overrated. His devotion to duty was allied with a bravery of soul, and a self denial, and a purity of intention, which force us to lay any defects of his to the account of a mistaken judgment. He opposed Infallibility in the Vatican Council, probably on the ground of inopportuneness, for he afterwards accepted it.

The Bishop of Newark, the diocese in which Brownson lived, was not applied to for approbation or permission; but he wrote: "As to the review, I shall be most happy to see it succeed, and increase in circulation. The articles which you have given to the world will long continue to be read with interest and with profit, and I trust God will spare you many years to carry on the good work.

"Hoping to see you soon in Elizabeth. I remain very truly yours,

"M. A. CORRIGAN, Bp."

Neither did Brownson ask any permission or approbation from the ordinary of New York, where the Review was published; but some months after he had re-

sumed the publication, hearing that Archbishop McCloskey thought it strange that he had not applied to him first, the Reviewer wrote explaining his reasons for publishing his Review without ecclesiastical sanction. McCloskey answered:

Archbishoprick of New York.

NEW YORK, October 15, 1873.

Dear Dr. Brownson:—I beg to acknowledge the due receipt of your esteemed favor of 11th inst. to which I have had no opportunity of making earlier reply. Permit me now to assure you that I have at no time misunderstood or misinterpreted your motives in abstaining from seeking my approbation of your Review, or my permission to have it published in this city. I knew them to be as you now represent them entirely free from any intended discourtesy or disrespect. I wish you to continue as you have begun, and I rejoice to see that your intellectual powers still retain the force and vigor of earlier years. As to your orthodoxy and especially your *Romanism*, both, I think, are established beyond peradventure.

I remain, dear sir, very truly yr. fd. and servant in
Xt.

JOHN, ABP. of NEW YORK.

In the revived Review, the most prominent place was given to articles on the Papacy and the Church. The very first article, after the Introduction, was on the *Papacy and the Republic*, and the next on the *Döllingerites, the Nationalists, and the Papacy*; in the second number, he wrote on *Bismarck and the Church*; and in the third, on *Papal Infallibility*; and in others, on *Gallican-*

ism and Ultramontaniam, on Papal Infallibility and Civil Allegiance, Newman's Reply to Gladstone, and the Church and the Civil Power. *

These articles are a fit conclusion of the long series published in the *Review* from 1853 to its suspension, and then in the *Catholic World*, and all together, furnish a complete discussion of the relations of Church and state, and of the temporal and spiritual orders. There is undoubtedly some repetition of arguments and explanations; but no more than was made necessary by persistent misrepresentation and misunderstanding on the part of those who prior to the Vatican Council openly defended political atheism, but since then have been contented to practise it while disavowing it.

The publication of the works of Archbishop Hughes, and of the Life of Archbishop Spalding, in 1873, gave Brownson an opportunity to publish his estimate of these Prelates, in his *Review* for January, 1874. In speaking of the former, while laying aside all resentment for private wrongs at his hands, and aiming to be just to the memory of the departed, he went so far as to accuse himself of injustice to the Archbishop in too freely speaking his thoughts of him, and declared him a large-hearted, and in most respects, an eminently great man, a prelate of rare energy and activity, untiringly devoted to the interests of religion.

Archbishop Spalding was, according to Brownson, the only Catholic writer, except Dr. White, who had the knack of writing proper review articles; but was too diffuse

* These articles may be read in Vol. XIII of *Brownson's Works*, pp. 326, 351, 384, 412, 462, 488 and 499; and the last named is a reprint of the *Temporal and Spiritual*, Vol. XI. p. 1.

and unable to condense his thoughts within a reasonable compass, and less exhaustive of his subject than was desirable; wanting in concentration and vigor of thought, he rarely suggested more than he actually said. Brownson had sometimes thought Spalding too conciliatory towards Protestants, in his controversy; but, "yet," he says, "if he was timid, it was only on the surface of his character. In his nature he was manly, bold, and fearless, and no one contributed more than he to the marked change in regard to manliness and courage that has come over the Catholic publication of this country within the last thirty or forty years, or to abolish from Catholic controversy that apologetic and deprecatory tone which so disgusted us, while we were still outside of the church, and made us look upon Catholics as spiritless, mean, crouching, and cowardly, who hardly dared say, in the face of their enemies, that their souls were their own."

The Catholic Advocate, a journal established in Louisville by Spalding himself, thought this praise of him rather more than his due, and said of it: "Whilst we also appreciate the services of the late Most Rev. Dr. Spalding in lifting the countenances of Catholics from their time-out-of-mind cringingness to brute force, we are disposed to assign, as the chief instrument in God's hands, not His Grace of Baltimore, but Dr. Brownson himself. It is meet that this should be hidden from the Hercules of American controversy, but it is not meet that we who are benefitted by this more healthy tone should be forgetful of him to whom, under God, it is mainly attributable. Thirty years back dates the commencement of this revival, and thirty years back O. A.

Brownson began his career as the chief of Catholic journalists in America. The coincidence in dates alone points to the cause. . . . Born of Catholic and Irish parents, on Irish and Catholic soil, we experience no feeling of impropriety in saying to our coreligionists that which a convert may well hesitate to say." The same writer, in the same article also says: "We again assert that in the cause of what may be termed the higher education of the best Catholic intellect in the land, in the true relations of Catholics with non-Catholics, of the Church to the current State questions, Brownson has labored more than all these [England, Kenrick, Hughes, Spalding, and others].

"At his feet, more than at those of any other man that taught in America, have the Catholic Bishops sat to hear words of wisdom on the relative position of things divine and things human in this country. To him, more than any colleges or theological treatises whatever, are the priests indebted for those principles of action which have enabled them to steer with rare prudence between the often sunken rocks of religious politics. And to him is due the honor of creating a line of Catholic political literature in this country which was absolutely necessary for the education of our clergy and intelligent laity, and which has no ante-type in any other country. In his 'Autobiography of a Convert,' Brownson says: 'I brought nothing to the Church but my sins.' That is true of everybody, but posterity will recognize that at his death he will have left something more in the church than the soiled water in the baptismal font. Brownson's vocation has been to teach the teachers—to pioneer before the

scouts of the Church in America. Brownson has been an eminently providential man."

Brownson's review of Montalembert's career, which he published in his journal for July, 1874, * contains, besides a valuable estimate of that great orator's course, a still more valuable, because a concise and accurate, statement of the relation of political reforms with the Church, as he viewed them after all those years of earnest discussion.

Of the count himself, he says, that he was erudite and eloquent, disinterested and chivalric, but neither a philosopher nor a theologian, and appears never to have understood the principle on which Catholicity regenerates society, and promotes its well-being.

This profound philosophy of the Christian religion, which Montalembert failed to grasp, as did also Louis Veillot, and LaMennais, Gioberti and Padre Ventura, Gratry and Hyacinthe, Döllinger and Lacordaire, consists in the distinction of the classical, Græco-Roman liberty, learnt from English literature, and clamored for by the liberal party and its demagogic leaders, a gentile liberty, based on pride, and which comes from without, from the liberty which comes from within, which the church promotes and consecrates, which depends on the operations of religion in the soul of the individual, and through the individual on the interior life of the nation. "It is not a free government," he says, and says truly, "that makes a free people, but a free people that make a free government. You may knock off the manacles from the hands, and the fetters from the feet of a people, but they are none the less slaves, unless at the same

* Works, Vol. XIV, p. 515.

time you free their souls, and make them freemen in Christ. This is because the source of freedom and of slavery is within, and neither originates without, in the external, or in a man's surroundings. No institutions or external arrangements can make or keep a people free that are as individuals in bondage to their lusts, and no efforts of tyrants or despots can reduce to slavery a people whose souls are free."

"The Church initiates and sustains liberty by regenerating the soul, through the operations of the Holy Ghost, elevating it to the plane of its supernatural destiny, restraining its inordinate passions, moderating its lusts, and warming the heart with the love of truth and justice. She freed society by first freeing the soul from the chains of Satan, its bondage to sin, its slavery to the lusts of the flesh. She can do it in no other way."

"Revolutions and all the methods or projects of reform approved by the movement party proceed on the supposition that liberty and social progress come from without, demand external changes, and depend on external arrangements, social and political organization; and, according to the principle and method followed by the Church, must necessarily fail, and simply aggravate the disease which they are intended to remedy. We by no means pretend that we are to acquiesce in every abuse of power, or that power may never be lawfully resisted; but we do pretend and maintain that the subject may never resist it on his own authority. We hold, with the American Congress of 1776, that the tyranny of the prince absolves the subject, but a higher authority than the prince must judicially declare his tyranny before the subject can resist or attempt to depose him. . . Democracy,

in the sense of Europeans and many* Americans, that is, democracy in the sense of the absolute sovereignty of the people, or their native and underived might and right to do whatever they please, and which is a plain denial of the sovereignty of God, is incompatible with Catholicity, but no more so than is the assertion of the same absolute sovereignty for Cæsar; and Cæsar has more than once made as fierce and as destructive war on the church as was made by the old French Jacobins, or the more recent Paris commune."

Brownson accordingly rejected Montalembert's view of liberty, after it became plain that the Count, though not wishing liberty without religion, and even holding liberty to be highly useful, if not necessary to religion, failed to conceive it as originating in and resulting from religion living and operating in the heart, and through the individual soul; but considered liberty and religion as two forces, originating, the one in nature, the other in grace, needing to be harmonized to make them mutually assist each the other. Brownson had early adopted and for a long time acted on this view; but in his latter days he condemned and repudiated the principle at its bottom, the assertion of liberty independent of religion, and rights of man not derived from nor included in the rights of God, placed under the safeguard of the Church, the representative of the divine sovereignty on earth. Liberty therefore is dependent on religion, and can neither oppose it nor form an alliance with it. The attempt to harmonize this classical, pagan, gentile liberty with religion, or to form an alliance between the Church

* The word *many*, would be omitted were the article written at the present time.

and it, was the dream of La Mennais ; it was Gioberti's ardent desire, the harmonious union and alliance of gentilism and Christianity, the spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world. Montalembert was carried away by trying to conform to the spirit of the age, as the others have been ; and it was only by abandoning all tendency towards liberalism that Brownson secured himself from following in the wake of so many great patriots wrecked on the same dangerous shoals.

Brownson's views of woman's rights and woman writers were freely expressed in the Last Series of his Review. They had been put forth by him in the Boston Quarterly Review, repeated in Brownson's Review and in the Catholic World, and were strongly asserted in his last series. These judgments were not lightly or capriciously formed, and the constancy with which they were adhered to through life, in spite of their unpopularity and the ill-will they aroused, makes it important that they should be set forth at some length, yet as briefly as the subject will permit.

He saw clearly that the woman-worship of our day, and especially of our country, is a shameful and degrading idolatry, alike injurious to woman and to man ; and that our woman's-rights people, both men and women, have turned their judgments topsy-turvy. They seriously contend that woman is really of a more angelic character than man ; that the Christian virtues and the Christian character are peculiarly feminine ; that the human character of our Lord was womanlike ; and the better Christians men are, the more like women they become.

It is gravely asserted that if women were allowed to vote at our elections, to sit on juries and the bench, to be governors and secretaries of state, members of the legislatures, representatives and senators in congress, general officers in the army, doctors, lawyers, and preachers, our whole society would almost instantly be elevated in its moral tone, our manners would be refined and purified, our legislative assemblies and courts of justice would be incorruptible, our army would be temperate and honest, and the learned professions would become disinterested, unselfish, using their professional skill only to restore health, vacate disputes, and to promote peace and good will. Our elections would be conducted with as much order, decorum, politeness, and refined and considerate delicacy as a wedding among the "400," or a fashionable ball given in honor of a sprig of royalty by the common council of New York.

This would be amusing, only one does not like being amused by fatuity. The moment that woman should gain the rights the few are contending that men should recognize, and woman began to exercise them, she would find all her restraining power over men gone with last winter's snow, and her presence would be as slight a restraint as the presence of the men themselves. She would be no longer the fine porcelain vase so highly prized, and protected with so much care and delicacy, but be tossed aside as a cracked jug of Brummagem ware. If she would preserve her power and prestige, and exercise a civilizing influence over us, she must keep down her veil in public, and make her home her forum. Exposure to the sun will hurt her complexion, and familiarity might breed contempt.

The effect would be similar to that produced by our feminine literature, which has corrupted the morals as well as the taste of the age, and rendered men weak, effeminate, and watery. We look almost in vain for a man who has any masculine vigor of thought, or character. There is brutality enough, for men grow brutal as they grow effeminate. They cease to be intellectual, abandon reason for the *heart*, and are governed by sentiment which, when it becomes passion, becomes brutal and tyrannical.

Nature has made woman to be sought and won, and man to seek and win. She has the power to attract and to resist; and seldom is she called upon to resist or repel an attack that she has not invited or seemed to invite. Men have, till corrupted by women, a natural awe of womanhood, a reverence for woman, a modesty and timidity towards women that women never have towards men. The unperverted young man looks upon woman as sacred, and himself as bound to guard her against being profaned. He is her born protector, her guardian, and her avenger; and if he ceases to be so, and seeks to make her the victim of his lust, the fault is chiefly hers. Society in all ages so judges. Women know it, and hence the severity with which they blame their fallen sister. Men do not always know it, and in their generosity take all the blame to themselves. Women are now by their influence on popular literature to reverse the universal judgment of all civilized society, sustained alike by religion and science. Women writers would induce society to make man the scape-goat of woman's sins, and have her, however defiled, regarded as innocent, and treated as worthy of social integration, at least after a

few tears, not of penitence for the sin, but of regret that social morality treats it as a crime.

Not that Brownson would allow no place for repentance. He would repel no penitent sinner, and would go as far as any one to restore the fallen to virtue, to a life of peace and holiness; but never by making light of the offence, certainly not by treating it as no offence at all. Our Lord did not pronounce a judicial sentence on the adulteress under the Jewish law, but he did condemn adultery as a sin when he bade her go and *sin* no more.

The sage Imlac gravely tells us that no man can fill his cup at the same moment at the source and at the mouth of the Nile. Women cannot be treated at once both as women and as men. If they claim the prerogatives of our sex they must give up those of their own. Their talk about their independence of man only betrays their forgetfulness of their origin, that they were made from and for man, because it was not good for man to be alone, and were not an original independent creation, as the man was.

The mistake of the women's-rights women is in trying to be what they are not and cannot be. God made them women, and they cannot, let them try their best, make themselves men. They have assigned to them by their sex, their constitution and temperament, their part in life and society,—a part no less honorable or meritorious than that assigned to men. They and men cannot exchange sexes, and it is worse than useless to try to exchange parts. In Christian society they are no more slaves to men than men are to them. It is for his wife and children that the husband and father toils,

wearies his limbs, and racks his brains, counts his losses, and dreads adversity. As a rule, ruder tasks fall to the lot of the husband, and the lighter to that of the wife ; and it is only a morbid sentimentality, originating in idleness and ease, and their excessive novel-reading, creating a perpetual thirst for excitement, that cause their uneasiness and make them imagine that the husband must be a brute, a tyrant, and the wife a slave. "My beloved waxed fat, and kicked."

They prate of their fine feelings, their delicate sensibilities, which are perpetually wounded by the coarse, blunt, unfeeling sex, incapable of heeding their exquisite sufferings, of understanding them, or sympathizing with them. Brownson cared not a fig for fine feelings and sensibilities, for the most part caprices born of the vapors, produced by physiological causes, and never the same for two consecutive moments, too changeable to be grasped, and too unsubstantial to be comprehended. Besides, women love best and cling the firmest to the man who heeds the least their fine feelings and exquisite sensibilities, and never yields a jot to their caprices. Woman demands her contrast, a strong, energetic, masculine nature in her lover or her husband. The men of our age, formed by your feminine literature and prevailing woman-worship, are too effeminate, too *womanish*, to command and fix the affections of a genuine woman, and hence we see so many who no sooner get married than they would be unmarried if they could. Poor simpletons! Did they suppose the sentiment which they call love, so sweet in the beginning, spreading a roseate hue over all nature, could survive the honeymoon? If it could and did, the happy pair would

go off in an euthanasia. There is nothing durable that is built on sensibility, or sentiment. The only happy unions are those which, when the disparity of the parties is not too great, are founded on principle and cherished by a sense of duty. The word, duty, has an unpleasant sound in these days, but it is none the less true that not only is duty no bar to love, but the highest form of love is only another name for duty, or rather, duty is the purest, sweetest, and highest form of love.

The Platonists give us three degrees of love. The object of love, according to them, is beauty, the beautiful; and the representative of the beautiful is a beautiful woman. The lowest form of love is the love of the sexes, or sensual love; the next is the sentimental; the third and highest of all is the ideal, in which the soul rises from the limited and imperfect representative to the idea represented, to the beautiful in itself. These three degrees or forms of love are in some sense involuntary, or voluntary only in the efforts of the soul by constant contemplation to purify its conception of beauty, and to raise its love from the lowest to the highest form. This love does not necessarily conflict with duty, any more than the beautiful, which Plato calls the splendor of the good, conflicts with the good itself.

Now, novelists and popular writers are Platonists, as far as they are anything, and confound the worship of beauty, of which woman is assumed to be the visible type, with the worship of God. Hence we find the transcendentalists of both sexes identifying art-culture with religious culture, and art with religion. The philosophy which underlies the mediæval poetry and the romances of chivalry is the Platonic; and the morality

they inculcate, under a varnish of Christianity, is the love and worship of beauty, personified in woman. Their superiority is that they made woman the personification of ideal beauty, and not of mere sensible beauty, as do our contemporary novelists. Consequently, the love they celebrate was chiefly the love of the ideal, a love into which the consideration of sex does not enter, and could, as we may learn from Shakspeare, be entertained by a man for another man.

Our contemporary poets and novelists attain never to the ideal, but remain always in the sensible or the sentimental, and both sensible and sentimental love originate in the senses, in the sensible, not the rational soul. There is no freedom in it: it comes or it goes without asking our leave. It is the love celebrated by all modern popular literature as fate or destiny, which the subject of it can neither bring on nor throw off at will. This love, the lowest form of the Platonists, is the highest form of love known to contemporary popular literature, is a love one undergoes rather than exercises, and is to the ideal love what sensible devotion is to spiritual devotion, a thing of which the masters of spiritual life make little account, as it has in itself no moral character.

Brownson did not mean to say that all rational love is identical or coincident with duty; but he wished to show that the antagonism between love and duty, of which so much complaint is made, is only between duty and the lowest forms or degrees of love. This love is sensible or sentimental love indeed, but not necessarily sinful or impure. It is the grand staple of every novel one reads; the purest, most ingenuous and generous o

women crave it, and count themselves blest when they find it ; on its strength they marry when they marry for love, not for money, for a home, or an establishment, nothing doubting that it will last forever. Experience dispels the illusion, the sentiment evaporates, for all sentiments are ephemeral and as inconstant as the wind, and the poor wife tied to a husband for life and for whom she no longer feels or can feel the sentiment she calls love, finds that the heart is vacant and to let to the first applicant. Now commences the struggle between love and duty. Duty binds her to her husband whom she does not mean to betray ; but love little by little inclines her to another, and at length her affections become fixed upon him. Then she pouts, frets against marriage, the only thing that protects her, cries out against the tyranny of man who has made the marriage laws to bind woman to him as his slave, and demands that divorce be made easy, or rather calls for free love in which the parties are bound to each other only by the silken cords of mutual affection and only so long as the affection lasts, utterly heedless of children, should any be born, and thoughtless of what will be her fate when she grows old, her youth and beauty gone, and she has left no power to attract a new lover or to inspire a new affection.

Brownson loved and honored woman: he never asked if she is inferior, superior, or equal to man; for things so different as the sexes do not admit of comparison. There are things which women can do which men cannot do at all, and others which they can do far better than men: so on the other hand, there are things that men can do that women cannot do at all, and others,

which though women may possibly do them, they cannot do as well as men. The constitution and temperament of the two sexes differ: so do their mental and moral characteristics; and their respective parts in life and the existence and well-being of society require that it should be so. But while he honored woman as the dutiful wife, the loving mother, the affectionate daughter or sister, the warm-hearted friend, he declared that if he were a young man, he would rather take a hurricane, a volcano, or an earthquake to be his wife than one of those spouting agitators who can breathe at ease only in the storm and tempest.

He did not pretend that what, after the Platonists, is called love, is identical with duty. That love is the love of the beautiful and has, except in the motive for which it is indulged or cultivated, no relation to duty. Art in itself is neither moral nor immoral. Plato himself seems at one time to identify the beautiful with the good, and at another to distinguish it from it; but it is not identical with the good; for it is not an absolute idea, but exists only for the creature endowed with imagination, that is, intelligence and sensibility. The love of the beautiful is not a love of that which is real, or absolutely independent of the lover, and in its highest degree it never rises above an affection of the sensibility and imagination. It changes as changes the lover, and may or may not be incompatible with duty.

But there is another love, the love of the good, which is an affection of the rational or superior soul, that is, of reason and will. What the novelists call love is not subject to reason nor controlled by free-will; it is involuntary, and comes and goes of itself. It is this sort

of love which forms the staple of the plots, and causes the tragic or comic interest of modern sensation novels. But the love of which duty is the highest and sweetest form is the love of the heart, and the heart in Scripture sense means always the will, as when Wisdom says, my son, give me thy heart,—is under control, and we can always freely give or withhold it. The object of the will which is appetitive in its nature, philosophers tell us, is good, and in its highest form is the good in itself. Its appetite or affection for its object, its craving for it, or its seeking it, is love, and love in its truest form and noblest sense. What else is duty but always willing and seeking the good, the true good, the highest good? *

It may be said that this is to make love spiritual, religious, and be asked, How then can creatures love one another, since God alone is good?

Brownson would answer,—In God, where they are, in whom they live, move, and have their being. True conjugal love, parental love, filial love are only forms of loving God in his creatures, or of loving creatures for his sake. The love sentimental young men and women demand is the love of creatures for their own sake, as separated from God, or without taking God into the account, in which sense creatures have no existence, are

* I do not say every affection of the will is a resolution of free-will. It is always voluntary, but the moral theologians distinguish between the *voluntarium* and the *liberum*, or *liberum arbitrium*. The *voluntarium* includes the spontaneous action of the will towards its object; the *arbitrium* or free-will is its deliberate choice of the object it will seek, and involves an act of intelligence and volition. Yet the *voluntarium* is controlled by the *arbitrium*, and may be directed by it at the command of the love of God or of duty, or wholly and instantly suppressed if contrary to it, so that we may, if we choose, will what it is our duty to will, and in this sense only is to be understood the assertion that the sweetest and highest form of love is that of duty.

nothing, and the love is only an inward craving to which there is nothing to correspond. Hence its hollowness, its emptiness, its unsatisfying character. It is idolatry, and an idol is nothing. As in the worship of idols nothing is worshipped, so in the love that begins and ends in the creature nothing is loved.

Those that live in this age of materialism (where men and women are remarkable only for their triviality and pettiness and no thought that goes deeper than the surface), may regard this as denying all love, or raising it so high as to be out of all reach. What mind the age has is devoted to the study of external nature and to the analysis of the feelings and sensations. The soul and its mysterious affections, by which man touches the angels, are forgotten or undreamed of. Men consider themselves marvels of knowledge and wisdom, and look down with contempt on the folly and ignorance of past ages, when they have not penetrated even the vestibule of the temple in which these worshipped.

Brownson did not and would not distinguish between love and religion, the mutual love of husband and wife, parents and children, taken in its purest and highest form, and the love of God. The culmination of chaste love between the sexes is marriage, and marriage is always a sacred thing, a strictly religious institution. If he was right, love and marriage are very serious matters, and not to be trifled with, and divorce must be unhesitatingly condemned. If a woman gets married and finds she has a hateful brute for a husband; or a man, and finds his wife a vixen, a virago, can neither love? With the sentimental love of novelists, of course not; but the love to which marriage binds them is not a sensible love which

is not subject to their will, but a rational love, always in their power to give when it is their duty. Love your husbands and wives in God, for God's sake, and the hatefulness will vanish, and you will see only God dying on the cross for you when you were as offensive to him as your husband or wife can be to you, you become absorbed in the love of God, and find in the trials your husband or wife causes you only the occasion for high merit, and in the sacrifices you make for them to God a sweetness, a joy, far surpassing that of the most fully reciprocated sentimental affection. Discard the novelists, scout the Platonists, who at best offer you only the love of the beautiful; and cease to seek happiness in the lowest form of love, and look for it only in the highest. It is the mark of folly to give up the greater for the less, the substance for the shadow. Be not misled by philanthropy, which is the love of mankind, of all men in general and of no one in particular, which assumes to be, in the highest sense of the word, love of God, that is, of Humanity, and the highest form of charity, the sublimest virtue, and the perfection of all the virtues. The Christian theologians, it tells you, never understood Christian theology; they have taught us that we must love God in man, or that the love of man is the love of God and there can be no love of God distinguishable from the love of man. Resolve the love into a sentiment or an interior affection of the sensitive nature, and you have both the religion and the morality of the nineteenth century, and which our sons and daughters draw in with the very air they breathe. Hence the sentimentalism of the age.

But as women are in general more sentimental than men, we can easily understand why they are superior to

men, and why woman should be placed at the head of the race, and instead of saying with St. Paul, the man is the head of the woman, we should say, the woman is the head of the man. What matters it that both philology and physiology revolt at it, and prove the contrary? Are they to be allowed to interpose a barrier to the progress of the species, to the indefinite perfectibility of the human race? Away with all old-world notions! Man has had the moulding of language, and has shaped it to express his pretended superiority. As for physiology, when women assert their rights, and become its chief cultivators, they will change it, as Molière's *Médecin malgré lui* changed the heart to the other side.

The most beautiful and sentimental young lady—she loses her divinity as she grows old—is held to be the most perfect impersonation of the Divinity; the highest and most perfect philanthropy is the love of woman—if young, amiable, beautiful, sentimental, and rich. But do not feel flattered at this, my dear young lady: the worship offered you degrades more than it honors you, and is rendered to you not for what you are, but for what you are not. The highest honor for one of your sex, is not to be treated as a goddess, or as an angel, but to be and to be counted a true woman. There never was an age when woman was less truly honored than our own, or perhaps when she was less deserving of honor, for she has had her full share in introducing, and has more than her share in extending, the modern worship of humanity, as false and as degrading as any known form of gentile idolatry.

With these views of feminine literature and of sentimental, passionate, and rational love, Brownson's criti-

cisms of Catholic popular literature were as just as they were severe. The "Nun of Kenmare," who had written him, when he revived his Review:—"I congratulate you, or rather America, on the reappearance of your admirable Review. . . . If I can do anything in forwarding its circulation, I would be very glad. My books have had such an enormous sale that even the Jesuits in London have asked me to assist in making their books known by advertising in mine";—when she read his short criticism of one of her books, waxed wroth and scolded in these terms: "It matters very little to me personally and will not in the least injure the circulation, now over 200,000, of my works, but I am *grieved* that you should allow any article to appear in your review, which has descended to personalities. I know it requires care to avoid the insertion of what an Editor may regret, and I am quite sure you must be above anything so very petty. To attack any Lady's private character, is bad enough, but it is surely worse to attack a nun's. Whatever I may be, and the writer cannot think worse of me than I deserve, it is not gentlemanly, and it is not Christian to charge a religious with not being true to her vocation; neither does such a matter come at all within the reviewer's province." Then after explaining that her book "was written at the *special request* of the Jesuit Fathers," she concludes: "It will, of course lessen the value of any criticism, when it is observed that the work ["Life of Gallitzin"] written by your daughter is the only one selected for enthusiastic and unlimited praise. I have thought it right to say this much. I fear your feeling against any woman (except one) who holds a pen will hardly allow you to receive this as it is meant, but

however I may regret this, should it be the case, I must remain,

"Yours very sincerely,

"S. M. FRANCES CLARE."

The "personalities," which provoked this outburst of *religious* censure, were not so awful as might be inferred, but were all contained in these few words: "In those of her writings which we have read, we miss that meek and subdued spirit, that sweetness and unction, that we naturally expect in a daughter of St. Clare. We miss in them the spiritual refinement and ascetic culture we look for in a religious, and their general tone strikes us as somewhat harsh and bitter, sarcastic and exaggerated." * The *justness* of the remarks is manifested by Miss Cusack's later career.

I am unable to find in this criticism of "Hornehurst Rectory" any personal allusions beyond the reviewer's province; for certainly it lies within that province to say whether a book is true or false, moral or immoral, in its tone and tendency, in its facts or opinions. When nuns write novels they must expect to be treated as novelists, just as the anonymous newspaper articles of clergymen must stand on their merits as newspaper articles, except so far as we have a right to demand that they be such as conform to their high calling. Yet I must be wrong in this, or at least singular, for even Sister Eulalia Pearce, who seldom found fault with Brownson, wrote him: "Hornehurst Rectory, as a tale of fiction, is a miserable failure. I am sorry, however, that in your strictness you did not confine yourself exclusively to her *works*, for the

* *Religious Novels, Works*, Vol. XIX p. 560.

personal allusion, exposing a lamentable weakness, appeared to me (pardon me for saying so) contrary to charity and beyond the province of the purely literary critic."

In one case, at least, a woman failed of her revenge by writing her satire on the Reviewer for one of the religious journals circulating chiefly among Catholics, but which Brownson had given up reading.* On the other hand, his works prove that he oftener commended women's books than men's, in proportion to the number reviewed.

In the last series of his Review Brownson published some philosophical articles which were either such as the *Catholic World* had rejected or else criticisms of recent works. Among the latter are two articles on Father Hill's philosophy. Lest it might be supposed that the Reviewer was actuated by any other motive than the desire to promote the teaching of sound philosophical principles, it may be stated that the author and the critic were and long had been the best of friends; and as a proof of the feeling on Father Hill's part, the following letter from him is here inserted:

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, October 15th, 1874.

Dear Mr. Brownson:—I write to you for this purpose: in our philosophy classes we aim to explain ethics as fully as the limited time permits, and you can help in that work by collecting into one volume your various articles on government, civil liberty, law, and the like. For example, your explanation of St. Thomas's defini-

* When I reproached P. V. Hickey, some months later, for a scurrilous article on my father in the editorial columns of "The Catholic Review," at first he denied that the article had appeared; but when I showed him the article in his paper, he said: "Oh! that was written by Miss Tinker."

tion of law published above twenty years ago, is a piece I always have my class to study when I can get a copy of the Review containing it. A volume of the kind, compiled from your Review would form a valuable collateral aid for a class studying ethics. The book might not have a wide circulation, as it would be too learned for the general reader, but it would be a valuable help to the higher classes in colleges. Now I suggest that you render the service of getting up the proposed work if not opposed to your judgment of what is expedient. I have long thought of proposing this task to you.

Let me add, Mr. Brownson, that I do not take your criticisms on my little work written at the suggestion of my superior, in an unkindly spirit; on the contrary, I thank you for your remarks which I can but suppose to have been well intended. The book has met with unexpected success, having reached the third edition, a copy of which I herewith transmit to you. I surely am thankful to you for what you have done towards bringing my book before the learned world; you are harsh in your manner, but I believe you to be upright in your intention. I pen this in cordial and christian love for you, but it is not written for publication. I surely have no right to think hard of you because you differ with me in some matters of opinion.

Yours most truly in Xt,

WALTER H. HILL, S. J.

P. S. If you should conclude to act on my suggestion and put together the articles of the character specified, I would require every student of my class to use it and to learn it. I am convinced it would be well received

in schools of higher education. I am myself preparing an elementary work on ethics, in which I shall refer the student to these articles or to the book by name and page, if it be brought out. Your writings on these topics are the most accurate and the most learned in the language so far as I know or can judge. To my knowledge there are no other writings, with the exception of Balmes, to which a student can be referred who is unacquainted with any language but the English. With every wish for your best welfare permit me to sign myself your friend in Xt,

WALTER H. HILL, S. J.

The philosophical question with which Brownson was mainly occupied in his latest writings, and which he explained with unsurpassed clearness and vigor was, and still is, the conciliation of nature and grace, reason and revelation, which Catholic philosophers, almost as uniformly as A Catholics, suppose to be two separate creations, or two created systems, dependent on two distinct and separate creative acts of God; a supposition growing out of the current philosophical error that the creative act is a transient act, by which God creates an existence, and then leaves it to subsist and act for itself. No creature has its being in itself; it exists, even as nature, only by the immanent creative act of God, of the supernatural. The principle of nature and grace is therefore the same: grace regarded in its creations is nature, * and nature regarded in its Creator is supernatural.

* Brownson did not think it important to discuss in the present state of the question whether Peter Lombard or St. Thomas was right, whether grace is created or not; but his own opinion was on the side of the Master of Sentences, who has received from the Council of Lateran in the begin-

The supernatural in all orders is the Creator and his act, and the creature in every order or degree is natural. Nature and grace are made one in the creative act; for the grace is not outside of the creative act; but is included in it, though manifesting itself in time, and under the aspect of completing or perfecting nature rather than of originating our existence. The system of the universe is thus seen to be, in its principle, medium, and end, one uniform and harmonious system. It is not, as a created system, divided into a natural system and a supernatural system. There is no supernatural creation, as there is no natural Creator. The created is natural, the Creator supernatural. The origin, the medium, and the end of nature are alike supernatural: man originates in and is sustained by the immediate act of God, and finds his end in his return to and possession of God, from whom, by whom, and unto whom are all things. Grace is not a supernatural creation; but the immediate act of God completing creation, and palingenesia, the new creation, only a higher manifestation of the creative act of God.

From the stand-point of these high principles, it was easy to distinguish true from false science, and to reconcile true science with religion or revelation. This is shown in the articles in the last series reviewing Darwin, Spencer, Mivart, Lubbock, Tyndall, Draper, Le Conte, and Bascom, which fittingly complete those in the *Catholic World* on Draper, Argyll, Owen, Huxley, Galton,

ning of the XIII Century a higher approbation than the Church has ever accorded to the Angelic Doctor, and whose teaching on this point seems more conformable to reason and tradition than that of his more peripatetic disciple.

Lubbock, and Spencer. * It was, of course, necessary for writing these reviews to go into many of the details of science, and to master new theories of the scientists as well as the facts alleged; but this labor was made little account of where the interests of truth were involved and it became necessary to meet the enemies of revelation in a new field of controversy.

Space does not remain now for further reference to these and several other important articles in the last series of Brownson's Review. One word, however, may be said of the controversy in the volume for 1874 on the presumption of validity of Protestant Baptism. In his Literary Notices for October 1873, Brownson spoke favorably of Rev. John B. Bagshawe's *Threshold of the Catholic Church* and defended it against the attack of Rev. W. F. Clarke, S. J. writing in the *Catholic Mirror* under the name of *Sacerdos*. *Sacerdos* sent a long communication for insertion in the *Review*, which was published in it without comment. Another Jesuit, however, Father Weninger, signing himself *Alter Sacerdos*, took up the discussion in the same Review, to show wherein Father Clarke was wrong. Nobody but Brownson knew that *Sacerdos* and *Alter Sacerdos* were both Jesuits. †

After the death of his wife Brownson's family at Elizabeth consisted only of himself and one daughter, and in 1874 this daughter was married, and could no

* All these articles are contained in the IX Vol. of Brownson's Works, pp. 292-566.

† Venerable Bede relates a curious case of St. John of Beverly declaring the baptism of Herebald, one of his clerks, void because the priest who baptized him was dull of understanding, wherefore Herebald says he was baptized over again, *Ecol. Hist. Bk. V. Ch. VI.*

longer be expected to give him the care and attention required by his age. It thus became less difficult to induce him to go to Detroit and live with his son in that city. In the Summer of 1875, he adopted this plan, to carry out which he determined to close his *Review* with the number for October following, which would complete the third volume of the last series. The labor too, of writing was harder upon him as his infirmities increased. "I discontinue the *Review*," he wrote in his valedictory,* "solely an account of my precarious health, and the failure of my eyes; and circumstances render it inconvenient to keep a secretary, or to employ an amanuensis. I have been obliged to republish several articles from early volumes of the *Review*, because I was too ill to fill out the numbers with new matter expressly prepared for them. Much of the time for the present year I have been unable to hold a pen in my hand. The present number, indeed, with the exception of extracts from works reviewed, is all written with my own hand, and if I could be assured of being as well for the year to come as I am just now, I would not discontinue the publication. But of that I have and can have no reasonable assurance. No man willingly gives up what has been his life's vocation, and I have loved my vocation as a reviewer; but I feel myself unequal to its continuance: many things admonish me that it is time for me to retire, and leave the field to younger and more vigorous laborers, to men who have hands, eyes, and memory unimpaired. . . . It is not without a pang at parting with old and dear friends, that I take my leave of them as a reviewer. But it must be; though, in some other way, I may continue to

* Works, Vol. XX p. 496.

labor, as long as I am able, for the cause so dear to me and to them, and I hope they will not forget to remember me in their prayers."

After removing to Detroit, at the end of October, 1875, Brownson wrote one article for the first number of the new *American Catholic Quarterly Review*,* which he intended to be the first of a series explaining the mysteries and dogmas of revelation. In this article he explains that as the age has lost all respect for authority, the real difficulties of the more cultivated classes of unbelievers are not met by proof that the Church is divinely commissioned and assisted to teach the faith, and is therefore infallible; nor are they thereby prepared to accept any article, dogma, or proposition of faith for the reason that she teaches it. This had been the gist of his earlier controversial essays; but for twenty years past, he had been satisfied that the argument from the external evidence of the Church's infallibility was not sufficient to produce entire conviction of the truth of her doctrines. Even if revealed, men will not believe what seems to contradict reason. To meet this difficulty, it is necessary to show that the natural and the supernatural are not two separate and disjoined wholes, and that the reasonableness of faith does not rest exclusively on an authority foreign to human reason. "We speak with diffidence," he says, "for we are fully aware of our own limited knowledge; but we think that our theologians have not dwelt with due emphasis upon this second point, the dialectic relations of the natural to the supernatural, and have, by their neglect, given occasion to unbelievers to suppose that we really, when we are not

* *The Philosophy of the Supernatural*. Works, Vol. II. p. 271.

assumed to deny nature in the sense of Calvinists and Jansenists, exclude the supernatural from the primary design of creation, and hold it and the natural to be two separate and unrelated orders. We know that it was a long time before we learned to connect them by a real nexus, to think of them otherwise than as two parallel orders, without any real passage from one to the other, any reason in the constitution of the natural for anticipating or asserting the supernatural. They seem to us, in their fear of running one order into the other, and confounding nature with grace, to have left it to be inferred that the natural order would have sufficed for us, if God in his excessive goodness had not resolved to provide something better for us."

The supernatural, he proves by rational science, really exists, and the natural has its principle, origin, and end in it; and therefore is dialectically related to it, and dependent on it, as the effect on the cause. The act which creates the natural is the identical act which in the Incarnation is carried to its highest pitch completing that order, and founding the supernatural order. Hence the natural and supernatural are united in principle; the creation in both its parts is one system; and the several articles or dogmas depend alike on the Incarnation, the principle of the supernatural order, and are one, flowing from one and the same principle, through one and the same medium, to one and the same end.

He purposed in subsequent articles to show the relation of each particular doctrine of the Church to the Incarnation, and in the January following, he attempted the second, but got no further than the heading when he was overcome by a disinclination to work, and deter-

mined to rest awhile. This desire of rest grew stronger from day to day, and in the beginning of April it was only by an effort that he could arouse himself to talk. He was free from pain, and quietly his life on earth was nearing the end. On Holy Saturday the Vicar-General of Detroit, Hennaert, a priest of great learning and virtue, who was his confessor, heard his last confession. The Holy Communion was brought him on Easter Sunday, after which he received Extreme Unction. About dawn on Monday morning, while the prayers for the dying were recited by his side, he gave sign by a longer and stronger breath that his spirit had gone to meet the absolute good and the absolute truth.

His funeral obsequies were held in St. Anne's Church.* An eloquent eulogy was delivered by the Vicar-General of Mobile, McDonough; and the body was deposited in the Catholic cemetery. In June, 1886, it was taken to Notre Dame, Ind., and with impressive ceremonies placed in the crypt which had been prepared for it underneath the chapel which formed part of the new extension of the church, and was to be known as the Brownson Memorial Chapel. During the Solemn Mass of *Requiem* in the church the Rev. Stanislaus Fitte, Professor of Philosophy in the University, preached an eloquent sermon on the life and character of the deceased; and after the Mass the venerable Father General Sorin spoke for a short time of his long and intimate friendship with the distinguished dead whose remains he received with a melancholy satisfaction within the peaceful shades of Notre Dame.

* The first Catholic Church Brownson ever saw was St. Anne's of Detroit. *Early Life*, p. 20.

Here the reader might very naturally look for a concise estimate of Brownson's moral and intellectual qualities, and of the nature and value of the work he accomplished; and if that work falls short of expectation, the reasons why the effect was not proportionate to the labor expended. Aware, however, that the partiality and bias produced by most intimate relations with the departed one may be suspected of rendering the judgment of a son respecting his father more friendly than just, it has been my aim, throughout these volumes, to let others speak for me. With this view, and for the purpose of clearly showing in what surroundings he passed his life and what influences were working on him, letters have been freely inserted from those who found fault as well as from those who applauded, showing the reasons of the blame or praise, and nothing has been concealed because unfavorable. The bulk of the books has been greatly increased in consequence of this method; but it would have been difficult otherwise to furnish the candid reader with premises on which to form a just and impartial judgment.

If it shall appear that unwearied labor in behalf of truth was often wasted, the reader has the materials at hand to guide his opinion as to who thwarted his effort to place Catholicity before his countrymen in its naked purity, stripped of the unseemly garments which in other times and other lands it has become disguised in; and what were the reasons and motives of their opposition. That the work attempted by Brownson will ever be carried out with success is less likely now than it was in his life-time, for the obstacles in the way are growing daily more difficult to overcome or remove. But God

is all-powerful, and can as easily move mountains as ant-hills, and in his own good time, if he sees fit, will bring the people of this land into the one fold, under the one Supreme Pastor.



GENERAL INDEX.

(Brownson's Early, Middle, and Latter Life are respectively indicated by I, II, and III.)

- Abolitionism. II, 282, 289.
Acton, John D., Letter from, II, 471.
Address of the Charlestown Workingmen, I, 281.
Alcott, A. Bronson, I, 214, 234.
Allegiance, civil and spiritual, II, 599.
Allen, George, II, 170.
Allen, Joseph, Letter from, I, 131.
Allen, Joseph H., II, 91; Letter to, 92.
Allen, Samuel C., I, 113, 180; Letter from, 113.
American Catholic Quarterly Review, III, 612.
American Republic, The, III, 449.
American Review, The, II, 81, 199.
American Revolt, *The*, II, 327.
Americanism and Catholicity, III, 4, 80.
Ami de la Religion, L', II, 415, 450.
Analysis of thought, III, 577.
Andover, II, 97.
Andrew, John A., I, 454.
Annuity, Presentation of an, III, 444.
Anti-Slavery Society of Boston, I, 173.
Archer, Wm. S., II, 108.
Arians, I, 410, II, 27.
Arnold, Thomas, Letter from, III, 164
Arnold, Thomas D., I, 278.
Atheism, Refutation of, III, 577.
Athens, I, 274.
Auburn, I, 21, 24, 25, 35, 36.
Augustine, St., On the soul and body of the church, II, 108.
Austria, II, 321, 322, 338.
Avarice, our besetting sin, I, 71.
Ave Maria, The, II, 78, III, 497.
Ayrault, Wm., Letter from, III, 516.
Bailey, James R., II, 184, III, 339, Letter from II, 79.
Baillargeon, C. F., II, 511, 604.
Bakewell, R. A., II, 438; Letters from, 439, 516.
Balfour, Walter, I, 51.
Ballou, Hosea, I, 39, 51.
Ballston, I, 9.
Balmes, Jaime, II, 410; *Protestantism and Catholicity*, 220, 221, III, 442.
Baltimore, II, 350.
Bancroft, George, I, 178, 211, 214, II, 254; Oration on Lincoln, III, 479; Letters from, I, 179, 184, III, 479; Letters to, 454, 457, 459, 480.
Banks, Nathaniel P., II, 551.
Barry, John, Letter from, III, 63.
Barry, Wm. J., III, 198, 273; Letter from, 180.
Bartlett, Elisha, I, 268, 275.
Bellarmine, Robert, II, 409.
Bellinger, John, Letter from, II, 18.
Bellingham, Mt., I, 137, 138.
Bellows Falls, I, 85.
Bentham, Jeremy, I, 265.
Berengarius, I, 411.
Bible, Belief of, I, 23.
Biography, Why popular, I, 1; defective, 2; the present, 2, III, 615.
Biran, Maine de, I, 406.
Bishops of U. S., Letter from, II, 116.
Bonnetty, Augustin, II, 450.
Books, for children, I, 7.
Boston, I, 37, 88, 104, 137, 138, 139, 148; slave-owners in B. 174; Universalism 39; Want of a Catholic library, II, 149; literary oligarchy, 637.
Boston Reformer, The, I, 161.
Botta, Vincenzo, and wife, II, 609.
Boulanger, C., Letter from, II, 122.
Boyce, John, II, 527; *Shandy McGuire*, 151; Letter from, 152; *Mary Lee*, III, 181, *ib. n.*
Brady, James T., I, 337.
Brewster, B. H., I, 228, 230.
Brishane, Albert, I, 291.
Brook Farm, I, 306.
Brown University, I, 375.
Brownson, Daphne Augusta I, 3.
Brownson, Orestes A., Birth, I, 8; Name, 3; Childhood, 4, 59; Reading, 6; Youth, 8, 59; at Ballston, 9; a Presbyterian, 10; in a printing-office, 10; teaches school, 10, 20; at Detroit,

20; a Unitarian, 20; a sceptic, 22, 60; Edits the *Gospel Advocate*, 24; his Creed, 25; his Gospel Creed, 30; at Hartford, 34; at Boston, 37; Joins Fanny Wright, 41; supports the Workingmen's party, 48; an independent preacher, 51; Edits *The Philanthropist*, 60; Advocates temperance, 91; His Oration at Ovid, 65; Address for Clark's execution, 77; Conversation with a Presbyterian, 78; Goes to Walpole, 85; influenced by Constant's Works, 86; by Boston Unitarians, 88; his preaching, 99; Appearance, 90; Writes for *The Unitarian*, 95; for *The Christian Register*, 103; Moves from Walpole to Canton, 106; His Dedham Oration 111; Writes for *The Christian Examiner*, 120; Moves to Chelsea, 127; Organizes the *Society for Christian Union and Progress*, 138; accused of infidelity 152; his *New Views*, 158; Edits *The Boston Reformer*, 161; His Oration on Emancipation prevented by a Boston Mob, 172; his opposition to slavery, 174; his early political action, 178; Steward of the Marine Hospital, 211; Edits *The Boston Quarterly Review*, 213; Essay on the Laboring Classes, 240; denounced by both parties, 250; replies to objections, 251; Letter to *The Lowell Offering*, 270; to *The Intelligencer*, 278; the Workingmen's Address, 281; He Revises his promises, 287; His Views of Reform, 296; His connection with Dorr's rebellion, 342; with *The Democratic Review*, 344; *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, 349; His Education, 369; Oratory, 371; Influenced by Cousin, 342, 400; How he came to Believe, 422; His work for Social Reform, 445; His Conversion to the Catholic Faith, 471; His Strength of Feeling, 481; He continues his Review after his conversion, II, 1; His Knowledge of Catholicity when Converted, 2; Forced by his Bishop to repeat the old arguments, 4; His Doctrine of Life, I, 440, II, 7; is put in a false position by his Bishop, 8; his fairness in argument, 10; His high tone in controversy, 11; is accused of going too far, *ib*; Why he was not allowed to set forth the faith in its unity, 27; compared with Wiseman, 28; He opposes Newman's theory, 34; His tone towards Protestants, 91; Letter to Allen, 92; to Brigdon, 94; to a Woman seeking faith, 95; to a Son, 158, III, 198, 320, 335, 422-425, 481-497, 578, 579, 522, 525, 562, 563, 565, 575; to *The Pittsburgh Catholic*, II, 492; to the *Dublin Tablet*, 386; to Ward, 53; to O'Connor, 499, 598; to *The Catholic Telegraph*, 503; to Cummings, 180, 134, 186, 192, 214, 220, III, 253; to Hall and others, II, 555; to McMaster, 449; to Montalembert, 328, 335, 618, 621, III, 31, 46, 866; to Newman, II, 482; to Nevin, 873; to Hughes, 521; to *The Herald and Visitor*, III, 284; to Wood, 287; to Henning, 330; to Veuillot, 54; to Hewit, 59, 537, 581, 535, 567, to McMullen, 208; to Elder, 235; to Nolan, 245; to O'Callaghan, 561; to Sr. Eulalia, 560; to Sumner, 450; to Bancroft, 454, 457, 459; to Forrest, 461; to John Sherman, 465; to W. T. Sherman, 469; to Washburne, 452, to J. C. Hurd, 477; to the *N. Y. Tribune*, 473; to the *N. Y. Times*, 475; Relations with his Boston publisher, II, 638; is offered *The Freeman's Journal*, 79; Submits his writings to censorship, 98; withdraws his writings from censorship, 633; instrumental in conversions, 96; III, 91; Asserts his faith publicly, II, 97; Essay on *The Great Question*, 102 conversation with a Puritan, 105; Defends the Jesuits, 124; Criticises the Catholic Press, 155; Pecuniary losses, 193, 238; Return to Metaphysical Studies, 215; His Relations with the Puseyite Converts, 376; Invited to the Irish University, 469, 478; Moves to New York, 637, III, 1; Writes more Freely, 3, 79; Blamed by the Irish, 4; severe as a Critic, 8; Criticism of Montalembert, 33, 589; of Spalding, 311, 596; of Hughes, 586; of Ward, 520; Moves to Elizabeth, 196; is denounced to Propaganda, 250; Lectures, 57, 63, 128, 136, 410, 548; His alleged changes, 300; Change of Policy, 261; Avoidance of Extreme Views, 143; His Writings should be taken in Connection, 188; His Political Course in 1860, 845; His View of Slavery, 349, 382; Reply to Hughes on Slavery, 380; Views of Education 152; of Democracy, 263; of Hill, 265; His Piety, 273; Tendency to Liberalism, 277, 307, 338, 509; Trouble

- with his eyes, 309; Nominated for Congress, 381; Slighted by the Jesuits, 415; Essays on the Reformation, 314; Efforts for his Son's Release, 434; Discontinues his *Review*, 437; is given an Annuity, 444; Writes for the *Ave Maria*, 499; for *The Catholic World*, 506; for the *N. Y. Tablet*, 542; relations with the editors of *The Catholic World*, 563; Wishes to revive his *Review*, 561; Does revive it, 538; His Refutation of Atheism, 577; his estimate of Hughes, 586; of Spalding, 586; of Montalembert, 589; His Scientific Articles, 608; Discontinues his *Last Series*, 614; Writes a single article for the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 612; Death, 614.
- Brownson, Orestes A., Jr., I, 311, 315; II, 157, 163, 164.
- Brownson, Relief Metcalf, I, 3.
- Brownson, Sally Healy, I, 481, 485; III, 580.
- Buchanan, James, I, 467; III, 341.
- Bunker Hill, I, 87.
- Burland, F., Letter from, III, 87.
- Bushnell, Horace, *Discourses*, II, 14.
- Cæsarian Operation, The, III, 334, n.
- Cabill, Dr, II, 441.
- Calderon de la Barca, A., Letters from, II, 299, 303.
- Calderon de la Barca, Mrs. A., Letter from, II, 311.
- Calhoun, John C., I, 178, 860, 467; III, 268; Letters from, I, 302, 320, 323, 324, 361.
- Calvinism, I, 478.
- Canton, I, 108, 110, 111.
- Cardenas, II, 297, 312.
- Carey, Mathew, I, 45.
- Carlyle, Thomas, I, 479.
- Categories, identified with the ideal, III, 578.
- Catholic Advocate*, The, on Brownson and Spalding, III, 587.
- Catholic Institute of Canada, II, 353.
- Catholic Mirror*, The, on Brownson, II, 539; Letter to, 584.
- Catholic Press, The, II, 155.
- Catholic Relief Bill, II, 172.
- Catholic Telegraph*, The, II, 157, 167, 509, 510, 560; III, 370; Letters to, II, 503.
- Catholicism, I, 173, 382; C. and Americanism, III, 4, 80; C. and Irishism, 4; C. and *Naturalism*, 447.
- Catholics, Their timidity, II, 97; III, 587; their liberalism II, 98; their intolerance, III, 840; their sympathy with the Democratic party, 375; with rebellion, 358; C. and Know-Nothings, 376.
- Causality, Idea of, I, 402.
- Celts and Teutons, III, 178; C. and Despotism, 180.
- Chandler, J. R., II, 517, 551.
- Channing, Wm. E., I, 56, 88, 100, 106, 160, 295, 300, 449, 451; Letters from, 106, 190, 442; Letter to, 442.
- Channing, Wm., H., I, 337, III, 208; Letter from, I, 159.
- Charles Elwood*, I, 414.
- Charles River, I, 137.
- Charleston, Convention, III, 345.
- Charlestown, I, 36.
- Chauncey, Charles, I, 51.
- Chelsea, I, 137.
- Chevalier, Ed., Letter from, III, 90.
- Children, Books for I, 7; Flogging of, 38.
- Chiniquy, C., Letter from, II, 268.
- Christian Examiner*, The, I, 120, 199, 213, 227, 386, 396; on Hecker, III, 448.
- Christian Register*, The, I, 101, 103.
- Christian Union and Progress*, Society for, I, 138.
- Christian World*, The, I, 454, 464.
- Christianity, a protest against the priesthood, I, 244; Pure C., 247; C. and Reform, 96; C. Not subjective II, 366.
- Church, The, Office of, I, 452, 465; C. and Modern Society, 476; Unity of C. and State, 252; No Salvation out of the C., II, 102; Soul and body, 103. The beginning of the C. 153; C. fosters art, 263; Opposes despotism, 347; III, 184; is not despotic, 280.
- Church against No Church*, The, II, 13.
- Church and Monarchy*, The, III, 510.
- Church Question*, The, II, 9.
- Church Review*, The, on Brownson, III, 514.
- Church and the Republic, III, 64.
- Civil Law, II, 437.
- Civil and Political liberty, III, 511.
- Civilization and Religion, not antagonistic, III, 446.
- Civiltà Cattolica*, La, II, 403.
- Clark, Guy C., Execution of, I, 77.
- Clarke, James F., I 464.
- Clarke, Richard H., Letter from, II, 516.
- Clarke, Wm. F., III, 611.
- Classes, Division of, I, 260.

- Clergy and Laity, III, 282, C. and Reform, I, 171, 242; III, 437.
- Clerk, George E., Letters from, II, 233, 238.
- Cleveland, Father I, 213.
- Cochin, Augustin, Letter from, III, 364.
- Cognat, Abbé, II, 415.
- Common Law, II, 243, 480, 435, 437.
- Comstock, James, I, 10.
- Connecticut, Universalism in C., I, 35; C. River, 3, 85.
- Conservatives and Radicals, I, 163.
- Constant, Benjamin, I, 86, 440.
- Constitution, Letter on amending Mass. C., II, 455.
- Controversy, apologetic, II, 10; What questions belong to C.; 7; Brownson's fairness in C., 10.
- Convert, The*, III, 134.
- Cooper, J. F. II, 258.
- Corbett, Michael, Letter from, III, 181
- Corrigan, M. A., Letter from, III, 584.
- Corruption begins with clergy, II, 180.
- Cortés, Juan D., II, 229, 326, 405, 410.
- Coskery, H. B., Letter from, III, 88.
- Cousin, Victor, I, 236, 388, 440, 441; Letters from, 394, 446; III; 514.
- Credit, I, 92.
- Creed, Brownson's, I, 25; His Gospel C., 30.
- Crimean War, II, 622.
- Crittenden, Col., II, 299.
- Cuba, Expeditions against, II, 297.
- Cumming, Wm., Letter from, III, 92
- Cummings, J. W., II, 214, 220; III, 191 n., 198, 300; Letters to, II, 130, 134, 186, 192, 214, 220; III, 253; Letters from, II, 126, 132, 187, 189, 218, 611; III, 251, 254, 255, 443; Letter to Finotti, 250.
- Cusack, Mary F., III, 605; Letters from, 605.
- Cushing, Abel, I, 181.
- Dana, Charles A., I, 312.
- Dana, Richard H., II, 247.
- Daniel, Charles, Letter from, III, 150.
- Davis, William J., II, 96.
- DeBlieck, J., III, 139; Letter from, 141
- Debt, I, 92.
- Dedham, I, 111.
- Deism, I, 387.
- DeLaTour, G., II, 325, 326, 339; Letter from, 329.
- Democracy, I, 47, 169, 284; II, 153, 348; III, 263.
- Derby, Earl H., Letters to a kinsman, II, 15.
- Descent of Property, I, 248.
- DeSmet, P. J., II, 515; Letters from, 259, 512.
- Despotism, III, 187; Ecclesiastical, 193.
- Detroit, I, 20; III, 612.
- Development, II, 58, 71, 77, 386, 561; Distinguished from growth, I, 441; Newman's theory of D., II, 59; Brownson's, 60.
- Dial, The*, I, 215, 229, 233, 234, 308.
- Donahoe, P. II, 266, 441.
- Donelan, James, II, 190.
- Dorr, Thomas W., I, 342.
- Doubleday, Ulysses F., I, 34, 36.
- Dred Scott Case, III, 108.
- Drunkenness, I, 91.
- Dublin Review, The*, on Development, III, 322 and n.
- Dupanloup, Félix A. P., II, 333, 337.
- Earle, Ebenezer, I, 480.
- Ebionites, II, 26.
- Ecclecticism, I, 388.
- Education, I, 112, 368; by the State, 43, 44; liberal, 197; popular, 200; universal, 207; of women, 208; *Address* on E., 206; necessary for virtue, 73; in manual-labor schools, 113, 190; secular and regular teachers, II, 182
- Catholic E., 201; III, 152, 541; paganism in E., II, 415; the French law on E., 228.
- Egypt, I, 74.
- Elbridge I, 480.
- Elder, Wm. H., Letters from, III, 221, 231; Letter to 225.
- Election and reprobation, I, 16.
- Emerson, Ralph W., I, 101, 228, 308, 314; II, 252, 442; Letter from, I, 214.
- England, constitution of, III, 34; Irish hostility to, 17; influence of, 167; E. and Napoleon Third, 169.
- England, John, *Works*, II, 136, 237.
- Equality, I, 47, 112, 263; Social E., 17.
- Essays on the Reformation*, III, 314.
- Etudes Religieuses*, III, 148.
- Eulalia, Sister, II, 97; Letters from, III, 368, 559; Letter to, 560.
- Eustiss, F. A., I, 230.
- Eutychiens, II, 27.
- Evangelical, Conversation with an, I, 78.
- Evangelicalism, II, 543.
- Everett, A. H., I, 232; Letters from, 232, 235, 300.
- Everett, Edw., I, 193; Letters from, 125, 194.
- Everett, L. S., I, 24, 38.
- Evidence of Miracles, I, 432.
- Example, I, 92.

- Factory System**, I, 267.
Faith, two kinds of, I, 435; Protestant F., 436; F. in Miracles, 435; F. and Reason, 17; Disregard of F. by English and Irish Catholics, II, 362; F. to be sought by prayer, 95.
Falloux, Frederic A. P. de, II, 333, 337.
Farrell, Thomas, Letter from, III, 128, n.
Fenwick, B. J., I, 472; II, 121.
Fichte, J. G., I, 406, 412.
Fillbustering, III, 101.
Fillmore, Millard, II, 308, 418.
Finite and Infinite, I, 404.
Finlayson, W. F., Letter from, III, 22, n.
Fitte, Stanislaus, III, 615.
Fitzpatrick, J. B., I, 475; II, 357, 415, 416, 620; Urges Brownson to continue his Review, 3; teaches him theology, 4; restricts him to old arguments, 5; puts him in a false position, 8; fails to sustain him, 636; his conservatism, III, 2.
Forbes, J. M. II, 157, III, 100.
Forrest, Edwin, II, 140.
Forrest, J. K. C., Letter to, III, 461.
Fort Ann, I, 21.
Fourier, Charles, I, 291, 448; II, 181, 143, 192.
Francis de Sales, St., II, 101.
Free Enquirer, The, I, 41.
Freeman's Journal, The, II, 79, 83, 127, 183, 405, 533, 539; offered to Brownson, 79; sold to McMaster, 80.
Free-Soilism, II, 289.
Fremont, John C., III, 402, 437; Letter from, 399.
Fuller, S. M. I., 214, 234.
Fullerton, Georgiana, II, 264.
Fullerton, James, II, 239.
Future Life, I, 56.

Gadsden, James, Letter to Chazel, III, 64.
Gaduel, Abbé, II, 416.
Gallicanism, II, 217, 224.
Gannett, E. S., I, 62, 129; Letters from, 126, 139.
Garesché, A. J. P., Letters from, II, 341, 443.
Garland, Hugh A., II, 348, 443, 525; Letter from, I, 306.
Gartland, F. X., Letter from, II, 238.
Gaume, Abbé, II, 415.
Geneva, I, 21.
Geography, II, 470.
George, Anita, Letter from, II, 298.
Gilbert de la Porrée, III, 503.

Gioberti, Vincenzo, II, 215, 223, 237, 319; III, 302, 337, 442.
Glover, T., II, 64; Letter to Shaw, 68.
God, Existence of, I, 58; as known from nature, 22; in nature, 371, identified with the ideal, 391.
Gospel Advocate, The, I, 24, 34, 41, 42.
Gotteschalk I., 411.
Government, II, 316; depends on individuals, I, 72; Reform of, 247.
Grace and Nature, Orders of, III, 609.
Grace, Thomas L., Letter from, III, 539.
Granger, Francis, I, 49.
Grantly Manor, II, 264.
Greeley, Horace, Letter from, I, 365.
Greene, B. H., II, 638; Letter from, 637.
Greene, Wm. B., Letter from, II, 209.
Gresselin, Charles, III, 416; Letters from, 142, 204, 248, 261, 417.
Growth, distinguished from development, I, 441.
Guy, Robert E., Letters from, III, 323, 326.

Hall, L. Randolph and others, Letter from, II, 553; reply to, 555.
Hamilton, James A., Letters from, III, 427.
Harrison W. H., I, 183, 322.
Hartford, I, 34.
Hartland, I, 20.
Haskins, George F., Letter from, II, 189.
Havana, Outrages at, II, 300, 307.
Hawkes, Hannah, I, 375.
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, II, 256.
Healey, George P., Portraits of Brownson, III, 422; Letters from, 421.
Healy, John, I, 480.
Healy, John P., II, 468, Letter to, 455.
Heathen, Conversion of, I, 14.
Hecker, Isaac T., II, 276; His Aspiration of Nature, III, 116; Separation from his Congregation, 114; His democracy, 263; His Detroit lecture, 545; Letters from, I, 335, 336, 340, 504 and 552; II, 271, 273, 561, 637; III, 91, 112, 121, 123, 444, 447, 449, 514, 517, 522, 538, 584, 569.
Heckerism, III, 262, 305.
Hecker, John, I, 334; Letter from, 501.
Hall, I, 32, III, 265.
Henning, Joseph, Letter to, III, 330.
Henri V, II, 323, 337, 431.
Herald, The Catholic, II, 115, 237; III, 283, 291, n., 372; Letter to, 284.
Hereditary, Descent of Property, I, 248, 260.

- Hewit, Augustine F., II, 213, n.; III, 578; Letters from, 75, 819, 512, 529, 583, 536, 566, 569; Letters to, 53, 527, 581, 585, 567, 570.
- Hill Walter H., III, 189; Letter from, 607.
- Hilton, George H., Letter from, III, 57; Letter to, II, 507.
- Hoffman, Wm., III, 435.
- Hogan C. J., Article on Ireland, III, 241.
- Hogan, Wm., II, 107.
- Hopkins, John H., I, 467; Letter from, 468; *The British Reformation*, II, 12.
- Hours of Labor, I, 170.
- Hughes, John, I, 385; II, 77, 87, 178, 188, 486, 521, 604, 637, III, 586; Letters from, II, 522; III, 67, 73, 190, 257; Letter to, II, 521; He attacks Brownson, III, 67, 80, 82, 418; On Slavery and the Rebellion, 356; His Mission to Europe, 864.
- Hungarian Revolt, II, 821.
- Hunter, R. M. T., I, 820.
- Huntington, J. V., II, 898, 414, 487, 597; His books, 402; On rights and duties, 405; Letter from, 898; Letters to, 598, 601.
- Huntington, Joseph, I, 51.
- Hurd, John C., Letter from, III, 476; Letter to, 477.
- Hyacinthe, Père, III, 441.
- Ideas, I, 391; Origin of, 402; Innate, 405; Identical with Categories, III, 578.
- Idleness, I, 92.
- Immaculate Conception, Bull defining, II, 891, 561.
- Immortality, I, 57.
- Incarnation, II, 26.
- Independence of Mind, I, 287.
- Indians, II, 259, 260.
- Inequality, I, 260; Causes of, 248; Effects of, 256.
- Infants dying unbaptized, III, 284, n.
- Infidelity and reform, I, 92.
- Infinite not obtained from the finite, I, 404.
- Inquiry, Free, I, 53.
- Intemperance, I, 91; Its causes, 92.
- Intuition, I, 391; II, 218, 216; III, 577.
- Ireland. Hogan's article on, III, 247.
- Irish, The, II, 242, 530; The Catholic I., 107, 112; III, 178; Their press, II, 119; Their hostility to England, III, 7.
- Italy, union of, III, 186.
- Ithaca, I, 21, 25, 51, 61, 77.
- Ives, L. S., Letter from, III, 314.
- Jaffrey, I, 21.
- Jefferson, Thomas, I, 265, 266.
- Jesuits, II, 121, 124, 180, 182; III, 414, 419.
- Joachim, Abbot, III, 504.
- Jones, John W., II, 820.
- Joss, Ed., Letter from, III, 162, n.
- Jouffroy, Theodore, I, 296.
- Journalism, II, 155; literary, I, 483.
- Kant, Emmanuel, I, 406.
- Keegan, M. R., Letter from, II, 563.
- Keene, I, 3.
- Kehoe, L., Letter from, III, 507.
- Kelly, Wm. D., I, 228, 882; Letters from, 229; III, 411, 466.
- Kenrick, Francis P., II, 215, 604; *Primacy*, 12, 182, 136; *Four Gospels*: 184, 237; *Vindication of the C. Church*, 506; Letters from, 114, 170, 184, 850; III, 86.
- Kenrick, Peter R., II, 440, 515, 604; Letters from, 840, 843.
- Kneeland, Abner, I, 102, 400.
- Know-nothings, III, 7, 94, 876, *Mass. State Council*, II, 542; Reply to, 543.
- Kossuth, Louis, II: 418.
- Labor, Hours of, I, 170; free and slave, 241, 256; III, 842.
- Laboring Classes, I, 119, 123; L. C. and the Church: 171, 240; Essay on, 240.
- Lacordaire, H. D., II, 225, 228.
- Lady Alice*, II, 398, 402.
- Lafayette, Motier de, I, 40.
- Lagan, Th., Letter to, III, 564.
- Laity and Clergy, III, 282.
- La Mennais F. de, II, 224.
- La Rocque, A., II, 232, 234.
- Law, Civil, II, 487; Common, 243, 430, 435, 487; of Nations, 305.
- Leach, George, II, 96.
- Legislation, needed, I, 248.
- Leonard, C. H., Letter from, I, 639.
- Leroux, Pierre, I, 440, 441; II, 211.
- Lewis, Dixon H., I, 820; Letters from, 826, 328.
- Liberalism, II, 224, 228, 291, 346; III, 307.
- Liberty, I, 67; II, 847; civil and religious, 485, 547, pagan and Christian, III, 589; reconciled with authority, II, 368.
- Libraries, II, 149.
- Life, doctrine of, I, 440; the Christian, 451; the future, 83.

- Lincoln, Abraham, proclamation of Emancipation, III, 395; opposition to his renomination, 397; renominated, 401.
- Lincoln, Levi, Jr., I, 301.
- Linton, M. L., Letter from, III, 356.
- Linton, Wm., Letter from, II, 525.
- Litchfield, I, 21.
- Literature, American, I, 375.
- Locke, John, I, 265.
- Lopez, Narciso, II, 297, 313.
- Loretto, Mission at II, 273.
- Louisville Guardian, The* III, 312.
- Love, different kinds of, III, 597.
- Lowell, James R., II, 250.
- Lowell Operatives, I, 267.
- Luers, J. H., Letter from, III, 219.
- Lycœum Lectures, I, 89.
- Lying II, 181.
- Lynch, Anne C., I, 214; II, 609; Letters from, I, 224, 487-501.
- Lynch, Patrick N., controversy with Thornwell, II, 15, agreement with Thornwell, III, 370; Letter from, II, 19.
- McCabe Wm. B., quarrel with Lucas, III, 9; Letters from, 10, 17, 23.
- McCaffrey, John, Letters from, II, 140, 172, 178, 352.
- McClintock, John, II, 551.
- McCloskey, John, III, 542; Letters from, II, 36, 123, 129; III, 585.
- McCloskey, Wm., G., III, 258; Letter to the author, 259.
- McGee, Thomas D., III, 67, 68.
- McMaster, James A., II, 83, 127, 183, 186, 199, 223, 445, 449, 535; III, 177, 5, 42; Letters from, II, 71, 76, 80, 83, 86, 185, 200; Letter to, 449.
- McMullen, J., Letter from, III, 206; Letter to, 208.
- McSherry James, *History of Maryland*, II, 175.
- Magazine, The U. S. Catholic*, II, 78, 90.
- Maguire, Bernard A., II, 517.
- Maistre, Joseph de, and Newman, II, 49.
- Major, Henry, II, 115, 156, 184, 237, 516.
- Malou, J. B., II, 512.
- Manahan, Ambrose, III, 252 n.
- Maret, H., Letter from, III, 146.
- Marine Hospital, I, 211.
- Marriage, I, 293; M. and Divorce, 44; of Protestants, II, 235, 236.
- Martineau, Harriet, I, 141.
- Martinet, Abbé, *Solution de Grands Problèmes*, II, 218, 220.
- Mary, Devotion to, II, 373.
- Mary Lee*, III, 181 and n.
- Massachusetts, Letter on New Constitution, II, 455.
- Matignon, Letter to O'Reilly, III, 148.
- Matter, M., I, 199.
- Mazzini Joseph, II, 419.
- Meagher, Thomas F., II, 440, 526.
- Medill J., Letter from, III, 397.
- Meditation, value of, III, 275.
- Meline, James F., III, 370; Letters from, II, 521; III, 372.
- Mercerburg Review, The*, II, 362.
- Metcalf, Jotham, I, 3.
- Method of Studying the Fathers, II, 392.
- Metropolitan Magazine, The*, II, 487, 516, 525.
- Miège, J. B., II, 515.
- Miles, George H., II, 140, 178, 215, 267; Letters from, 146, 350, 520.
- Miracles, objection to, I, 427, 431; witness to revelation, 438.
- Mission of America, The*, III, 74.
- Missions, Foreign, I, 15.
- Mitchel John, II, 548.
- Mob, at Boston, I, 173.
- Mobile, Outrages at, II, 303.
- Modern Society and the Church, I, 476.
- Moehler, Johann A., *Symbolism*, II, 220, 221.
- Monev, worship of, I, 18.
- Montalembert, Charles de, II, 225; III, 33, 170, 294, 441, 539; Letters from, II, 326, 335, 613, 621; III, 26, 35, 48, 171, 199, 292, 295, 432, 439; Letters to, II, 326, 335, 613, 621, III, 31, 46.
- Montreal, II, 282, 235, 287.
- Morals, II, 144, 180, 257.
- Morris, John B., II, 375.
- Morton, Marcus, I, 286.
- Mudd, J., Letter from, II, 560.
- Mulligan, James A., III, 63.
- Murphy, W. S., III, 166; Letter from, II, 513.
- Napoleon the First, II, 428.
- Napoleon the Third, II, 323, 337, 359, 424, 439, 444, 616; his conduct in connection with the Orleans estates, 433, his relations with England, III, 169.
- Nashoba, I, 40, 41.
- Native Americans, II, 167, 528.
- Nature, worship of, I, 370; God in N., 371; N. and Grace, III, 609.

- Nestorians, II, 27.
 Nevin, J. W., II, 362, 393; Letter from, 369; Letter to, 373
 New American Cyclopædia, III, 131.
New Views, I, 158.
 Newman John H., II, 34, 440, 561; on developments, 53, 59, 68, 71, 77, 360, 386; N. and Maistre, 49; denies objective certainty, 385; N. and the Irish University, III, 163; Letters from, II, 469, 479, 481, 484; Letter to, 482.
 New Orleans, II, 608; Outrages at, 300
 New York, I, 374.
Niebelungenlied, II, 266.
 Nolan, P. J., Letters from. 242, 243; Letter to, 245.
 Novels, Religious, II, 262.

 Oaksmith, Appleton, III, 387 n.
 Obedience, II, 179.
 O'Brien, Nicholas J., II, 136, 197.
Observer, The Catholic, II, 136, 193, 197.
 O'Callaghan, E. M., Letter from, III, 550; Letter to, 551.
 O'Callaghan, Jeremiah, II, 356.
 O'Connell, Daniel, II, 173.
 O'Connor, Michael, II, 485, 490, 561, 604; Letters from 38, 434; III, 83, 89; Letters to, II, 489, 593.
 O'Leary, Dr., III, 251, n.
 O'Neil Joseph, Letter from, III, 136.
 Ontologism, II, 212.
 Opinion, Public, I, 93.
 Oration, Fourth of July, I, 65, 111.
 Orders, The spiritual and temporal, II, 224, 336, 485, 541; The natural and Supernatural, III, 609.
 O'Reilly, Devin, II, 192.
 Orleanists II, 324.
 O'Sullivan, J. L., I, 344, 347, 349, 355.
 Otis, Dr., I, 212.
 Ovid, I, 65.
 Owen, Rob't Dale, I, 41, 48, 291, 448; objections to his scheme, 292.

 Paley's *Natural Theology*, I, 60.
 Pantheism, I, 392.
 Parisis, Pierre L., II, 229.
 Parker, Theodore, I, 287; II, 288; Letter from, I, 238.
 Parkman, Francis, II, 259.
 Party, The Federal and Republican, I, 47; The Workingmen's, 45; P. preferred to truth, 53; parties in 1860, III, 345.
 Patterson, H. L., I, 230, 233.
 Peabody, Elizabeth P., Letters from, I, 152, 227.
 Pearce, Mary, *see* Eulalia, Sr
 Peirce, Isaac B., I, 62, 487; Letter from, 63.
 Pelagius, I, 411.
 People, Sovereignty of, I, 356.
Philanthropist, The, I, 61.
 Philanthropy, II, 282, 345.
 Philosophy, Principles of, II, 216, 624; results of defective, 219.
 Phrenology, I, 386.
 Pickens, Francis W., I, 320.
 Piety, Sentimental, III, 273.
Pilot, The, I, 173; II, 560.
Pittsburgh Catholic, The, II, 498; Letter to, 492.
 Pius IX, on the Rebellion, III, 378; Syllabus of Errors, 509; Letter from, II, 621.
 Poland, II, 322.
 Policy of Minimising Christianity, I, 430.
 Polk, James K., I, 360.
 Poor, not all vicious, I, 5; punishment of rich and P., 237.
 Pope, Authority of the, II, 110; temporal power of, III, 246, 298; his Roman States, 185.
 Potter, Elisha R., I, 344.
 Prayer, I, 56.
 Preaching, I, 89, 252.
 Premises, False, I, 287.
 Presbyterianism, I, 16, 478.
 Preston, Thomas S., III, 191, n.; Letters from, II, 514; III, 540.
 Priesthood, the cause of inequality, I, 243; the enemy of progress, 244; Christianity a protest against the P., 244; celibacy of the P., 245.
 Principles of Philosophy, II, 216, 624.
 Privilege, I, 260.
 Problems, must be solved by every one for himself, I, 290.
 Progress and Conservatism, I, 163.
 Property, the right of, I, 261; common, 262; individual, 263; equal division, 46; descent of, 248.
 Protestantism, I; 382, 478; its ground of faith, 436; definition, II, 92; lack of unity, 24; unintelligible save in Catholicity, 2; lack of science, 6; of principles, 21; its least reputable sects the strongest, 6; its death, 221.
 Psychologism, II, 212, 367.
 Public Men, vices of, I, 70, 71.
 Punishment of rich and poor, I, 237.
 Purcell, Edward, II, 604; III, 370.

- Purcell John B., II, 157, 501, 604; Letters from, 163, 164, 167, 610.
 Puritans, I, 88; II, 180, 293.
 Puseyites, II, 377.
 Putnam, Edward, Letter from, III, 360, n.

 Quakers, I, 253, 384, 465.
 Quebec, II, 232.

 Rayner, Br., I, 35.
 Reason, I, 391; R. and faith, 17.
Rebellion, The Great, III, 354.
 Reform, social, I, 445; R. and Christianity, 96; R. and infidelity, 98; R. and the clergy, 171; III, 437.
 Reformation, An effect of, I, 284; *The British R.*, II, 12; Essays on, III, 314.
 Refutation of Atheism, III, 577.
 Reid, Thomas, I, 406.
 Religion, is natural or from above, I, 424; R. and civilization not antagonistic, III, 446.
 Rely, James, I, 51.
 Reunion of the sects, I, 462.
 Revolution, Heroes of, I, 70.
 Rhett, R. Barnwell, Letters from, I, 325, 332, 338; III, 97.
 Rich and poor, Punishment of, I, 257.
 Rights and duties, II, 405.
 Righteousness, Imputed, I, 24.
 Ripley, George, I, 62, 101, 103, 110, 214, 305; II, 96; Letters from, I, 104, 110, 311; III, 132.
 Ripley, Mrs. George, II, 96.
 Roddan, John T., II, 267, 326, 441; Letter from, 148.
 Rohrbacher, René, Letter to, III, 147.
 Rosecrans, Sylvester H., II, 509, 550; III, 370; Letter from, II, 509.
 Rosecrans, Wm. S., III, 404, 408; Letter from, 406.
 Rosmini, Antonio, II, 219, 222.
 Rouge River, I, 20, 85.
 Rouquette, Adrien, Letter from, I, 566.
 Royalton, I, 4.
 Royer-Collard, I, 388.

 Sadlier, James, Letters from, II, 231, 234, 354; III, 542, 543, 545, 546.
 Sadlier, Mrs. James, II, 267.
 St. Bonnet, Blanc, II, 325, 329.
 St. Louis, II, 340, 525; III, 136.
 St. Simonians, I, 103, 294.
 Salvation, out of the church, II, 102.
 Santee, J. W., Letter from, III, 538.
 Schaff, Philip, II, 362, 393; Letter from, 361.
 Scholastics, III, 271; Arguments of, II, 5.
 Schools, District, I, 209.
 Scripture, Study of, III, 270.
 Secession, III, 343, 348.
 Sectarism, I, 50, 455, 466.
 Sects, Reunion of, I, 134, 461.
 Self-Education, I, 367.
 Semmes, Thomas J., Letter from, II, 608.
 Sensation, I, 404.
 Sensism, I, 387.
 Sermon, to the young people, I, 123; July 10, 1837, 153.
 Seton-Hall College, III, 548.
 Seward, Wm. H., II, 283.
Shandy Maguire, II, 153.
 Shaw, J. C., II, 63; Letter from, 64; Glover's letter to, 68.
 Shelley, Percy B., I, 238, 234.
 Sherman John, Letter to, III, 465.
 Sherman, W. T., Letter to, III, 469.
 Simpson, Richard, Letter to Hecker, II, 395.
 Skidmore, I, 45.
 Skinner, Dolphus, I, 34.
 Slavery, II, 205, 280, 328; III, 95; S. and wages, I, 241, 255; in Massachusetts, 174; S. and the Democratic party, III, 342; S. and the War, 355.
 Smarius, C. F., Letters from, III, 138, 203.
 Smith, Matthew Hale, II, 641.
 Smith, Reuben, I, 415; Letters from, 416, 417.
 Social Equality, I, 17, 169.
 Social Reform, I, 445.
 Socialism, II, 144, 175, 207, 225, 226.
 Sorin, Edward, III, 615; Letter from, 499.
 South, Reconstruction of, II, 607; III, 465.
 Sovereignty of the people, I, 356; III, 94.
 Spalding, Martin J., III, 177, 586; Letters from, II, 523; III, 85; his History of the Reformation, 311, 317; his reply to criticism, 312.
Spirit-Rapper, The, II, 526.
 Springwells, I, 20.
 Stanton, Edwin M., Letter from, III, 435.
 State Rights, and national integrity, III, 385.
 State and Church, Unity of, I, 252.
 Stockbridge, I, 3.
 Sturgis, Russell, I, 317.
 Sturgis, Wm., Letter from, I, 310.
 Suarez, Francisco, II, 408.

- Sub-treasury Bill, I, 318.
 Sullivan, John T., Letters from, III, 368, 584.
 Sumner, Charles, Letters from, III, 381, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 393, 394.
 Sumner, Henry, Letter from, II, 16.
 Syllabus (Dec. 8, 1864), III, 306.
- Tablet, The* (Dublin), Letter to, II, 386.
Tablet, The (N. Y.), III, 542.
 Tariff, I, 366.
 Taschereau, Elzear A., II, 232.
 Taxation, Direct, I, 366.
Telegraph, The Catholic, II, 157, 167, 509, 510, 560; Letter to, 503.
 Temperance, I, 91; II, 267; T. societies, I, 93.
 Teutons and Celts, III, 178; T. and freedom, 180.
 Thébaud, Aug. J., Letter from, II, 125.
 Theology, Discussion of, before the masses, II, 5.
 Thomas Aquinas, St., II, 408.
 Thoreau, Henry D., I, 204; Letter from, *ib.*
 Thornwell, James H., II, 15, 20; III, 370.
 Thought, Elements of, I, 391.
 Throop, E. T., I, 48.
Times, The (Boston), I, 268, 275.
 Timon, John, II, 183.
 Tinker, M. A., III, 607, and n.
 Tractarians, II, 29, 308.
 Trades Unions, I, 146.
 Tradition, II, 160, 161.
 Transcendentalists, I, 396.
 Trenton Falls, I, 62.
Tribune, The (N. Y.), III, 373, n.
 Triune, God is T. in essence, III, 501.
True Witness, The, II, 233, 235.
 Tucker, N. A., Letter from, II, 355.
 Turner, Edward, Letter from, I, 135.
 Tyler, John, I, 322, 323, 324,
 Tyler, R. A., Letter from, I, 220.
- Unitarian, The*, I, 95, 103.
 Unitarians, I, 51, 56, 88, 471.
 United States, Their Principle and Destiny, II, 109.
Univers, L', II, 415, 431, 433, 438, 446, 449, 450, 518.
 Universalists, I, 51, 478.
Universalist Qu. Review, The, III, 66.
- Use and Abuse of Reading*, III, 508.
 Utica, I, 34, 40, 64.
- Van Buren, Martin, I, 181, 362.
 Vatican Council, on developments, II, 397.
 Ventura de Raulica, II, 319.
 Vethake, Henry, I, 337.
 Veuillot, Louis, II, 326, 415, 447, III, 52, 174; Letter from, III, 53; Letter to, 54.
Vincent's Manual, St., II, 178, 230.
 Virtue, its reward, I, 32.
- Walker James, I, 120; Letters from, 120, 121, 386.
 Walker, John I, 63.
 Walpole, I, 85; Letter of W. Unitarians, 109.
 Walsh, John C., Letter from III, 103.
 Waltham, I, 96.
 Walworth, Clarence A., Letters from III, 126, 129.
Wants of the Times, I, 138, 141.
 War, in the Crimea, II, 622.
 Ward, Wm. G., *Philosophical Introduction*, III, 320, 323; Letter from, II, 41; Letter to 53.
 Washburne, Elihu B., Letter to, III, 452, n.
 Wayland, Francis, I, 379, 415.
 Webster, Daniel, I, 183, 300, 467; II, 108, 304, 307, 308, 419; his policy, 240; his letter to Hulsemann, 241, 242, 323; on Clay's resolution, 242; on the common law, 245; style, 245; oratory, 247.
 Weninger, F. X., II, 572; III, 611.
 Whelan, R. V., III, 584; Letter from, 368.
 Wheeler, J., Letters from I, 363, 380.
 Whelpley, James D., Letters from, II, 202, 204, 205.
 Whigs, I, 284.
 White, Blanco, I, 439.
 White, Charles I., II, 487; Letter from, 448.
 White, James W., III, 398, Letters from, 398, 399.
 Whitehall, I, 21.
 Whitman, Bernard, I, 95, Letters from, 100, 103.
 Whitman, Sarah H., I, 226; Letter from, 215.
 Whitmore, Thomas, I, 51.
 Wimmer, Lucas, Letter from, III, 182.

- Winnemisset Ferry, I, 137.
Wiseman, Nicholas, II, 28, 30, 290.
Woman, worship of, III, 592; Rights
of, *ib.*
Wood, J. F., III, 372; Letter from,
291; Letter to, 287.
- Wordsworth, Wm., I, 370, 371.
Workingmen's Party, I, 45, 170, 357.
Wright, Frances, I, 40.
Young, Josue M., Letter to Meline,
III, 370.

THE END.

O. A. BROWNSON'S WORKS

The Works of Orestes A. Brownson, Collected and Arranged by
Henry F. Brownson, 20 volumes. Cloth, per vol. - - - \$3.00
Half morocco, per vol. - - - - - 5.00

Also sold separately, bound in cloth :

THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC; ITS CONSTITUTION, TENDENCIES, AND DESTINY, - - - - -	\$1.00
THE SPIRIT-RAPPER; An Autobiography - - - - -	1.00
AN ESSAY IN REFUTATION OF ATHEISM - - - - -	0.60
THE TWO BROTHERS; or Why Are You a Protestant? - - - - -	0.60
UNCLE JACK AND HIS NEPHEW: Conversations of an Old Foggy with a Young American - - - - -	0.60

H. F. BROWNSON'S WORKS

ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S EARLY LIFE; 1803 to 1844.—Cloth	\$3.00
ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S MIDDLE LIFE; 1845 to 1855.—Cloth	3.00
ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S LATTER LIFE; 1856 to 1876.—Cloth	3.00
FAITH AND SCIENCE; or, How Revelation Agrees with Reason and Assists it. Cloth - - - - -	0.60
THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT CRAFT MASONRY. Paper. - - - - -	0.25
EQUALITY AND DEMOCRACY; A Lecture. Paper. - - - - -	0.10

TARDUCCI'S BIOGRAPHIES

Translated by HENRY F. BROWNSON.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS. Cloth - - - - -	\$2.00
JOHN AND SEBASTIAN CABOT. Cloth - - - - -	1.50


The above-named publications will be sent free of
postage on receipt of the price.

LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC, AND POLITICAL VIEWS of Orestes A. Brownson, selected from his Works, by Henry F. Brownson. At retail only. Postage 13 cents extra. Cloth - - - - -	\$1.25
--	--------

H. F. BROWNSON,

243 East Larned Street.

DETROIT, MICH.



1947

1947


GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY



8000851600

JERROLD NEDWICK
Aquarian Bookseller
Fairfax, CHICAGO, 18, Ill.





1917

1917

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY



8000851600

BERNOLD NEUWICK
1400 University Box 340
Chicago, ILL. 60607