

not meet the logic of Littré. His only answer was that if they did not admit these mysteries of reason, then they destroyed philosophy and reason. So that in a word the position was this: mysteries had disappeared from the teachings of Liberalism—mysteries of every order. At last they came to this, that Liberalism taught that man was nothing more than a well developed monkey, and that reason was nothing more than a well developed instinct of the beast. That was the position to which Liberalism had brought humanity, that is, that portion of humanity that had rendered itself subject to it. He (the lecturer) thought, therefore, they would see—though they might not accept all he put before them—that the expression he had made use of was not without reason, namely, that this Liberalism had led to the systematic brutalization of human reason. It had led to the denial of reason itself. In the second place, he maintained that Liberalism had led to the degradation of science. Here was a remarkable fact. No sooner had these men who called themselves philosophers succeeded in withdrawing philosophy from the guidance of faith, than philosophy ceased to be considered as a science, and the word became appropriated to the knowledge merely of the relation of numbers, and the laws of matter, so that the philosophers degraded the very idea of philosophy in withdrawing from it the title that it had for so many centuries, of science. This, to his mind, was a degradation. Well, having done this, the State at their bidding liberally endowed colleges, museums, &c., for the promotion of scientific knowledge. For more than half a century, science, if he might use a common expression, had its fling, it was triumphant, it had its own way. It was to have a great future. What did they find, as a matter of fact? On the 6th March, 1871, M. Saint Claire Deville presented a memorial to the Academy of Sciences which proved that Liberalism had been the ruin of science, and that to the progress and influence of Liberalism must be attributed the downfall of France, and its present lamentable condition. This memorial was discussed before the society, and there was no one to raise his voice in condemnation of these views. These statements were afterwards discussed by a committee presided over by the celebrated Guizot, and the report of that committee, presented to the Government, was that the University of France had been the destruction of scientific studies, and that centralisation had been an efficient instrument in working this degradation. There were many other testimonies to the same effect. The University of France was the creature of Liberalism, and had been emphatically its instrument. As to centralisation, wherever it took place, no matter in what order, they would find the Liberals applauding. They hailed with rapture the unification of Germany, the destruction of the liberties of the Provinces of Austria, the tyranny over the Catholic Cantons in Switzerland, the dethronement of the Princes of Italy, and the robbery of the Church. The Liberals had been applauders of centralism everywhere, and it was, he thought, strictly right to attribute this degradation of science to Liberalism, since it owed its origin to that creation of Liberalism—the French University. In the third place, he had stated that Liberalism had led to the decadence of literature and of the arts. In reference to literature, he might refer to the authority of Lacordaire, an ecclesiastic and churchman no doubt, but nevertheless a man of brilliant intellect, lofty genius, high cultivation, and abounding learning; a man who filled the first pulpits in France with *colat*, and who was acknowledged to be the first orator of the age. He was a man of high literary attainments, and his authority could not be considered as worthless. Then they had the authority of Montalembert, another man of high literary attainments. Not only this, but what was the lament of France at present? That the country could not produce a single author—and he did not except any order in the State, or any party in the State—who could be placed side by side with Bossuet, or Chateaubriand. Not to speak of the great men of the last century, there was not one equal to those who wrote after the restoration of the monarchy, which took place after the downfall of the first Empire. So much was this recognised as a fact, that the greatest difficulty is now experienced in France in finding men worthy to succeed to the vacant seats in the French Academy, and the Government was obliged, and the Academy itself was obliged, to cast about and accept as its members fourth and fifth-class literary men. Another proof might be adduced, and it was this: While it is extremely difficult to get sale for a really good book, and whilst authors of merit are on the verge of starvation, the proprietors of *Figaro* and *Le Petit Journal* are building palaces. This showed the taste of the people, and the taste of the people was always a good indication of the state of the nation's literature. Then, as to the fine arts, he would refer them to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. There the art critic—himself a Liberal, and a very staunch one—in reviewing the works at the last exhibition in Paris, confessed with deep regret the decadence of the fine arts. No work was produced above mediocrity, and hardly any attained even to that height. This was acknowledged by Liberalism itself, and he thought for his purpose any further proof was unnecessary. But, he might add that they could not expect anything else, because high literary merit and high art could never exist without high and noble principles and aspirations; and they could never have these except by faith. If men were taught by the philosophy of the day that man was no more than a well-developed beast, and reason no more than the well developed instinct of a mere brute, their minds would be rendered unfit for noble, lofty, and generous ideas, and how, therefore, could they have types for art, or have anything to inspire high literary genius. He had also said that Liberalism had led to the mutilation of the soul, and to the destruction of liberty of thought. With regard to the first, he would not say much, because the question was one that had been discussed largely of late, and no doubt would be discussed still more largely in the immediate future. When he spoke of the mutilation of the soul, what he meant was this: That the education established and patronised by Liberalism had led to a division in the soul; and whilst cultivating the least important powers, absolutely ignores

the higher and more important. The education of Liberalism was purely secular. It aimed—at all events it professed to do so—at the development of the intellect; the heart and feelings were left without culture under it. It was from the State that the schoolmaster was sent forth to teach, but this was illogical—unphilosophic. How could a man teach when he had no doctrine? Teaching and doctrine were correlatives, and the State having no doctrine could not teach. The State had nothing but an opinion, and it placed all opinions on a footing of equality. It knew nothing for certain, and how could it become a teacher? Again, Liberalism destroys all respect and love of truth. How was this? Liberalism placed truth and falsehood upon a perfect footing of equality; placed in its educational establishments men of all faiths and of all opinions or of no opinions, and placed them all on a footing of equality. What were the pupils brought up in such institutions to think? Could they have any respect for truth? He thought they could not. Their teachers had none, and the taught could have none. *A priori*, therefore, it was evident that this system of Liberalism could do nothing but destroy love of truth and respect for it; and they knew, as a matter of fact, that such had been the result, for those brought up in such schools—and he still alluded chiefly to France—were notorious for their want of steadiness in any cause, and for the levity of their character in every sense. He maintained also that Liberalism had actually destroyed liberty of thought. According to Liberalism, man was responsible to reason alone, and independent of all higher authority. This principle, therefore, constituted him a sovereign, and gave him a right to pronounce sovereignly upon each and every topic that might come before him. Would he forego that right? Would he be content to pronounce no opinion? Certainly not—because he was sovereign, and had the right to pronounce his opinion. Ninety-nine in every hundred men who professed Liberalism were perfectly incapable themselves of pronouncing any opinion on social and religious matters, without mentioning purely scientific subjects. Would the Liberal be content to pronounce no opinion? Certainly not—he will not forego his right. Would he be content to take his opinions from the Church? No; to do that would be to abandon his liberty. Therefore he would pronounce an opinion, and as he could not pronounce one for himself he has to take that of his newspaper. He thought, therefore, as his newspaper, or more correctly, he did not think at all. It is therefore by means of journalism that Liberalism has destroyed liberty of thought. The Liberal professed Free Thought, but none, or very little, actually existed among Liberals. This man must pronounce an opinion because he was determined to exercise his sovereign rights, but has no means of knowing the grounds on which the opinion ought to be pronounced. He took the newspaper, and he read it—there was his opinion—so that he had no freedom of thought. He only took the opinion of the paper he patronised, and he abandoned liberty of thought. They might think that all this was an exaggeration. But really it was not. Liberal newspapers themselves of high character acknowledged this. It was not long ago since an article appeared in the *Saturday Review*, which stated everything that he now said. In this article the writer stated that the reading of newspapers was really the destruction of freedom of thought. He said the reading of them corrupted the judgment, prevented the intellectual initiative, destroyed the mental powers, and that even among the cultivated classes this effect was produced, though not to the same extent as among the masses, and that a man who read nothing but the newspaper thought no more than a man putting on his clothes. They saw, therefore, that he did not exaggerate. What he perceived to be fact from his own reason and experience had been corroborated, and more than corroborated, by the acknowledgment of Liberals themselves. Then if they would consider the matter a little further, they would see what were the great evils that came from this. The writers for the newspapers—and he supposed they were all very worthy men—nevertheless must all write at a red heat. The public was inexorable in its demands, and must have its daily paper and its weekly, its monthly and its quarterly, no end of periodicals; and the exigency was that they must have profound and original articles on every given subject in heaven and earth! The newspapers must supply them with information on every conceivable topic. Men must write in a hurry, very little time for study or reflection, or weighing of arguments was given them. The article must be written by morning, and must be spicy. And these were the teachers of the masses of men! He need not state the consequences. They could see them themselves easily. But not only had Liberalism effected all he had stated, but even in the political and social order it had actually been the destruction of liberty. Here it attacked liberty on every side. It took away from it its essential guarantee by suppressing the very idea of duty. It destroyed authority which was its only efficacious protection, and it completed its ruin by the establishment of despotism. Now, let them ask themselves what did they mean by liberty in the social and political order? It is the right that he (the lecturer), for example, had of exercising his faculties and disposing of his goods without obstruction. That right imposed a correlative duty on every man to respect his (the lecturer's) liberty. For of what use would be his liberty if others were not bound to abstain from interfering with the exercise of it? Now, Liberalism withdrew the essential protection from this; its essential condition ceased the moment Liberalism was established, because Liberalism repudiated the intervention of God, and by doing so took away its essential guarantee, and destroyed the basis of right and duty. For how could duty bind the human will unless there be another will which had a right to impose upon it an obligation and to punish disobedience? But if a man be under his own reason alone, and not responsible to any higher authority, man then becomes a legislator to himself, and, like every other legislator, he might dispense with his own laws—with the laws he imposed on