

THE ANTI - REVOLUTIONARY

PRINCIPLE

by

Mr. Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer

Translated from the French
for the
Groen van Prinsterer Society
by

Mr. J. Faber

Fall - 1956

CONTENTS

Introduction	iii
I. What is the Revolution?.....	1
II. The history of the Revolution.....	2
III. Sophisms promoting Anarchy.....	7
IV. Evidence and Testimony from Past and Present..	8
V. Lessons from contemporary History.....	10
VI. Anti-Revolutionary Writers of our Day.....	13
VII. The Anti-Revolutionary Principle is but the Christian principle.....	20
VIII. Ultra-montanism unable to combat the Revolution successfully.....	23
IX. The Reformation alone able to overcome the Revolution by remaining faithful to the Gospel.....	28
X. False Conservatism.....	33
XI. Conservatism and Progress.....	34

INTRODUCTION

This essay is the third chapter of La Parti Anti-Revolutionnaire et Confessionnel dans l'Eglise Reformee des Pays Bas, a book written by Mr. Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer in 1860.

In it he defends his views and actions with regard to his public activities in the Netherlands, from accusations made by a Walloon minister in the Hague, Rev. Trottet.

Born in 1801, Groen grew up in a milieu where liberal ideas were prominent. During his stay in Brussels in the Belgian Revolt he was converted to Orthodox Christianity. From this time on he sees with increasing clarity the inroads which the spirit of the Enlightenment had made on the thinking and practice of his age and raises his voice as a witness against it. As a confessor of the gospel he begins the struggle against the forces of unbelief. His voice persistently urged the people to return to the Law and the Gospel in all domains of life. Nothing may be withdrawn from subjection to the authority of God's Word.

Courageously and with undivided heart he made his voice known in parliament in the face of an overwhelming opposition, testifying that only a return to the Gospel can be the cure of humanity's ills. We must again live out of faith in God's Word and not out of the principle of unbelief.

Therefore, Groen fought for the Christian school, for he had noticed that unbelief was swiftly infiltrating the educational system.

Therefore, he took part in reform-actions in the church, for he had seen that unbelief in the form of modernism had made its way into the pulpit.

He studied history, for it had become clear to him that unbelief falsified the presentation of history.

He entered the political arena, since here too he detected the influence of the principle of unbelief.

Groen wrote to awaken the people and to make them see what was at stake. He published a paper, wrote many pamphlets and a number of books.

In 1847 Groen had published his Ongeloof en Revolutie to show the inner relationship between unbelief and Revolution.

However, despite his publications, parliamentary speeches and other activities, he was often misunderstood. Even those of like spirit did not understand him. And those who did not have the same faith as Groen often misrepresented his views and actions, biased as they were by their liberal ideas.

In 1860 an article appeared in a Swiss paper written by a Walloon minister in the Hague. In this article the Confessional Party of Groen is accused of de-christianizing the public schools and the whole sphere of

public life by its constant demand for positive christian education.

The reaction of unbelief was said to be but the result of its narrow-mindedness, intolerance, outmoded viewpoint, the way in which it conducted its opposition and its confusion of politics and religion.

Then Groen took up his pen and published La Parti Anti-Revolutionnaire et Confessionnel to inform his friends in Switzerland, France and other countries about his position and to correct this misrepresentation.

Groen wrote in reply: "The true source of our weakness and misfortunes, the principal cause of the triumph of indifference and unbelief is to be found in the influence of the individualistic views which, as a curious and sad mixture of christian faith with the spirit and doctrines of the Revolution, aim at the dissolution of the religious and political institutions and interrupt the natural and historical development of society in its divine coherence." 1)

This is the note which rings through the whole book and is Groen's main contention.

The situation in the English-speaking world today is strikingly similar to that in which Groen lived. Of course, historical, national and cultural differences are to be found. But the decisions and solutions of our day also issue out of the principle of unbelief.

The issues in the field of economics, social relationships, and politics are decided on the basis of reason, without asking for the relevance of Scripture. As christians we may not be satisfied with this.

Therefore, we thought it well to translate the most important chapter of Groen's La Parti Anti-Revolutionnaire et Confessionnel, so that we all may increasingly become aware of what it means to be a christian, also in public life; so that we may also learn to discern the spirits, whether they are of God; so that Christianity may raise its witness for King Jesus in all spheres of life.

Groen did not harvest a great success. Again and again he had to cope with great disappointments. Throughout his lifetime he stood virtually alone. And even at his grave one of his friends testified: "Groen van Prinsterer was the last representative of an age which belongs to an irrevocable past."

Yet Groen's courage never abated. He did not look at the results, but humbly and trustingly obeyed his God, who gave him the strength and joy to persist in his witness.

After his death the fruit of what he had sown was harvested. God gives the increase in His own good time.

1) La Parti Anti-Revolutionnaire et Confessionnel, page 9.

A word yet about this chapter and its place in the original unit.

The chapter preceding it deals with the character and aim of the Confessional Party in its Dutch setting. The one following it treats of the action carried on by the Confessional Party in Parliament.

Our chapter deals with the Anti-Revolutionary principle, in its relation to the Gospel. Each chapter is quite an independent unit and so we thought it quite legitimate to translate this chapter and present it as an independent whole.

Mr. A Huls, Secretary
1030 Hall Street, S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan

The anti-revolutionary Principle

What is the revolution? - Its history - sophism promoting anarchy - evidence (testimony) from past and present - lessons from contemporary history - anti-revolutionary writers of our day - the anti-revolutionary principle is nothing but the Christian principle - ultramontaniam uable to combat the revolution successfully - the reformation alone able to conquer (over-come) the revolution by remaining faithful to the Gospel and thus laying claim to the formation of modern ideas - false conservatism - conservation and progress.

I

WHAT IS THE REVOLUTION?

The accusation, coming from the side of Christian friends, may (well) astonish us. The anti-revolutionary party, they say, harms both religion and politics, because it obstinately confuses that which ought to remain distinct and separated. However, how can they, fervently attached to the evangelical beliefs, forget that the spirit ruling at the time in which we still live, had its root and origin in the disdain for revealed truth, or that the overthrow of the religious, political and social orders - not a passing change, but a state, a revolutionary situation: the permanent Revolution - has been and remains the inevitable consequence of the denial of man's dependence on the God of nature, history, and the Gospels? Moreover, how can they forget that in order to dispel evil, it is not sufficient to attack the symptoms, but that the germ must be removed? Systematic unbelief has no antidote but faith. The anti-revolutionary principle, therefore, is nothing but the Christian, protestant principle, the principle of the Reformation; the only one which, in the name of revelation and of history, can successfully combat an anti-religious, anti-social principle, and thus realize (through the Gospel) whatever is true and salutary in the unattainable ideals of the Revolution for the benefit of state and church.

The simplest way to reveal the nature and full significance of the anti-revolutionary principle, therefore, is to ask: "What is the Revolution?" For by learning to know it, one will be able to conclude from its physiognomy, the distinctive traits of the principle which combats it.

It has been said recently, not without truth:

"The historical sciences seem called to replace the abstract scholarly philosophy for the solution of the problems which in our day preoccupy the human mind. The history of the human mind. The history of the human mind is the real philosophy of our times. Every question today degenerates of necessity into a historic debate; every exposition of principles becomes a 'history course'. Each one of us but what he is by virtue of the historical system, which he embraces."

Thus Mr. Eugene Renan expressed it. I do not hesitate to make even the last phrase my own, because for him the christian faith was only one more system among all different systems and I, too, therefore, am but what I am because of the historical system to which I adhere, having accepted the witness of the Scriptures to a living God. It is to history, in its

Christian sense, that I have constantly appealed in order to characterize the revolution - not to force it after preconceived opinions into an arbitrary framework, but to indicate, and cause to be recognized in the actual events, the manifestation and reflection of the dominant ideas, which are but facts of an immaterial, higher order, under whose rule the course of events and the fate of the nations are prepared and developed. Brought back to its actual source, the revolution is a unique and even important historical fact, namely: the conquest of the minds by the doctrine of man's absolute sovereignty which, by putting reason and the human will in the place of revelation and the divine law, makes him the source and centre of all truth. The Revolution is the story of the irreligious philosophy of the past century; it is (in source and exposition) the doctrine which, having developed freely, destroys church and state, society and family, causes disorder without ever founding liberty or re-establishing the moral order, and, with respect to religion, will inevitable lead its loyal supporters to atheism and despair. The Anti-revolutionary principle is exactly the contrary of the revolution; it is the Gospel and History which resist anarchy in the name of religion, justice, progress, and liberty. If even among several of our friends there still exist misconceptions in this respect, if I am suspected of desiring an outdated, narrow conservatism, it is not because I did not express myself often enough without beating around the bush. Thirty years ago I called attention to the revolutionary endeavor. Strictly personal circumstances enabled me to perceive the Key to the anarchy of the spirits and the endless reversals of our times, right through the stupefying atmosphere of a deceptive liberalism. That was back in 1829. A revolutionary crisis was imminent, both in France and the Netherlands. As king William the First's cabinet secretary I saw the storm gather; I was present at the deliberations in the Estates General which became progressively more violent; I read, nay devoured, newspapers and pamphlets; and witnessed the fierce struggle in the press. The growing dangers to my country impressed me deeply, and, realizing that danger, I wished to take part in the struggle. Worried about the course of events, worried especially about the calmness and indecision of the government and the indolence of the Dutch public which cannot be aroused but with great difficulty, I edited, without hiding the fact from the King and ready to sacrifice for it the advantages of my social position, some sort of political newspaper - soon the opposition paper - wherein I tried to draw the attention of my fellow countrymen to the nature of the complications of which we were the witnesses and victims. Thus I was unconsciously led to reflect on the principal causes of the general disorder. To me the European situation seems to be the result of false doctrines, the consequence of and punishment for the disrespect for the essential laws of humanity and the systematic overthrow of the social order; the fruit of the Revolution, in the most comprehensive and most exact use of the word.

II

THE HISTORY OF THE REVOLUTION

In 1831 my convictions about the peculiar character of our age stood firm. I tried at the time to combine them into a survey of the history since 1789, a presentation which I showed as the practical application of an unbelieving philosophy, as the revolutionary theory in action.

This is approximately how, glancing back on a half-century deplorable fertile with agitations and disasters, I tried to point out the 'conducting-wire' through this labyrinth.

The principle of the Revolution is the idolatrous cult of humanity; man

recognizing no sovereign but himself, no light but his own reason, no law but his will, worshipping himself while dethroning God. Destruction of all social ties, universal licence, an unheard of state of affairs which leads of necessity; by way of intermediate religious 'systems' to the final limits of doubt and, in politics, to the dissolution of society.

But there arise in man, because of his nature, demands which his errors and caprices are unable to shatter. He needs a God and finds refuge in deism; he has to live with his equals (fellow-men) and creates (for) himself an artificial society wherein he attempts to realize the final Utopia of the modern "staatsrecht", Rousseau's Contrat Social 1).

That, from a revolutionary viewpoint, is the only legitimate society. From the concourse of individual wishes is born the general will by the vote of the numerical majority. Every government, as the people's plenipotentiary, is responsible for the execution of her mandate. Limitless equality and liberty, universal democracy and fraternity - these constitute from now on, under all possible conditions, the code and ideal in political matters.

An admirable regime, provided that man is at the same time also freed from his passions and vices! Thus Rousseau who, in spite of the doubts which his own history and confessions should have caused to rise in him, persisted in taking the native goodness of man as his starting-point, wrote (with more truth than he apparently realized!).

"If there existed a nation of gods, it would govern itself democratically; such a perfect form of government does not suit man."

Elsewhere he expresses himself as follows,

"This is the great problem to be solved in politics: to find a form of government which places the Law above man. If such a form is nowhere to be found, (and I frankly admit that I believe so) I advise that we go to the other extreme, placing one man as far as possible above the Law and consequently establishing a despotism arbitrary to the highest degree. If only this despot were a God. In a word, I see no middle course between the most austere democracy and the most perfect Hobbism 2). For the conflict between men and laws which throws the state into a constant civil war, is the worst of all political states of affairs."

The natural course of this impious and fatal doctrine of which the eloquent sophist, in spite of repeated temptations to recant, was the most fervent apostle, could not have been rendered more adequately. Yes, without a doubt, a law has to be found which is above man; a law, therefore, which man has not made. But it is that law, revealed and divine, which you have abolished! That is why, having created disorder and anarchy, "bellum omnium contra omnes," you yourself come to proclaim that, as a result of your sublime efforts, you have no guarantee against a social cataclysm but arbitrariness and force.

This confession is prophetic; it is the abridged history of the revolution. It is the beam of light which clearly reveals the cause of its

- 1) 1762 - wherein Rousseau replaces sovereignty of the monarch by sovereignty of the people and sacrifices individual liberty to the tyranny of majority of votes.
- 2) Hobbes - 1588-1679 - English political philosopher advocate of despotism (cf. Leviathan).

miscellaneous relations and disasters. These are the natural fruits of the revolution. Its apparent triumph is but the perpetual denial of her fallacious promises. Its development has been logical and it has encountered oppositions only in its own circle.

What actually has happened? How did the battle start? Did people believe that the principle of the revolution ought to be combatted? To the contrary. Men vied with each other in paying homage to the doctrine in which men expected to salute the dawning of a new and beautiful day. It was not until all the public and private rights seemed to be endangered in France and Europe that the conflict arose between self-interest and conviction, between ardent fidelity and inconsequent moderation. As soon as it became a matter of realizing these speculative ideas, the discord manifested itself. For after all a foolish satisfaction with ghosts does not clear up the obstacles which nature, stronger than man, presents to those who fail to appreciate her. Rapidly they found themselves at the brink of the yawning abyss. Those among the revolutionaries who were not carried away by blind zeal or seized by mental derangement, at least stopped and refused to advance; the higher the speed, the more frantic the desperate resistance became. Here again, yes, especially here, excessive tyranny proceeds from excessive liberty. Agreeing about the theory, they yet debate about the mode, the degree, and fitness of the practical application. Thence we have constant oscillations between liberty which, knowing no boundary, is but licence, and law which, having no moral basis, is but despotism. Each time war breaks out anew, but it is always a civil war between the revolutionaries themselves, in the very circle of the revolution.

The revolutions of 1789, 1793 and 1830 are but different phases of a single phenomenon, different acts of the same drama, "revolutions within the Revolution." 1)

Shuddering at the remembrance, first of the Reign of Terror and Jacobine propaganda, next of the violence and conquests of the Empire, people believed that they could, by so-called wise concessions of a moderated liberalism, prevent the return of those dreadful disaster. Corollaries were taken for excesses. Passionate exaggeration and a criminal neglect of a salutary principle were seen in the various horrors and calamities which were but the consequences of a fatal principle that now is propelled, now is arrested in its characteristic development. Every concession was but a settlement; any policy based on moderation and the theory of the golden mean, far from ending the violent revolution, but prepared its return and accelerated its march.

Sometimes, tired of the moderate systems, people imagined that they could end the Revolution with a resistance which boldly sacrificed the interests of liberty to the demands of order. What happened then? By the slackening of its pace, its force was doubled, just as a dam - let us imagine the impossible - built across a river, would render the current, by its very resistance, irresistible, and would infallible succumb to the growing force of the raging water. They feed the evil which they would extinguish. "The spirit of reaction fans the spirit of the revolution." 2)

What is the true remedy in such a state of affairs? We must get at the root of the evil ('We must attack the evil in the root!'). We must renounce

1) Fievey

2) Guizot

completely this independent subjectivism which, taking into account neither God's sovereignty nor man's frailty and fall, undermines the foundation of all truth and is ever demolishing without ever being able to build (up). We must again seize upon the unchangeable truths, so long gone unappreciated, submit ourselves to the Divine authority, and return to the Christian principle.

Let us not be deceived by appearances. It is not a matter of material or national interest, nor of forms of government, nor of the differences between the spirit of conservation and the spirit of progress. It is a matter of (either) resisting or obeying the God of the Gospels, the living God. Abjure human pride, which recognizes no sovereignty but its own, (which) makes a religion and a society, after its own image, which obstinately attempts to destroy everything which it has not itself created or sanctioned; repudiate anarchistic sophisms, and you shall stand once more on the firm ground of history and reality.

But was there, then, no motive for the French revolution - better yet: for the European revolution? Was it necessary to perpetuate institutions already crumbling; to cling superstitiously to the forms and remnants of the feudal system; to resign oneself to all sorts of arbitrariness and, with passive indifference, submit to all the phases of decadence? Certainly not; for the situation in France and Europe called loudly for reform. But this situation did not make the opposite of reform desirable, nor even inevitable; a revolution in the fundamental ideas of the social order, an anti-religious revolution, overthrowing, in their so-called crusade against abuse, the most useful institutions, denying, under the pretence of dealing with prejudices, the most sacred principles.

Must we then renounce the hopes of 1789? Must we systematically disapprove of liberty, equality, fraternity, tolerance, humanity and progress? Is there no truth at all in these ideas? It would be absurd to suppose so. They (i.e. these expectations) represent, to a certain extent, the noblest aspirations and legitimate desires of the human heart; but, to ensure our happiness, it does not suffice widely to distribute beautiful maxims, divorced from that supreme truth which alone can render them effective. The Revolution which proclaims them, makes them sterile, or, to be more exact, degenerates them. As branches hewn from the evangelical tree (the tree of Scripture), these ideas poisoned by the revolutionary saps, bring forth nothing but deadly fruits. Serving (as it does) an anti-Christian philosophy, this cure of cures (panacea), instead of dispelling the disease, only aggravates it. *Corruptio optimi pessima.*

The mighty (grand) ideas of 1789, so passionately embraced, which, through their contrast with such narrowmindedness and immorality, gave that sadly memorable time an appearance of disinterestedness and grandeur, those ideas of 1789, irreproachable in themselves and in accordance with the source from which all truth proceeds, were, however, in their alliance to the unbelief ruling the minds, to become fatal. They were, precisely because of their relative goodness, to ignite a fanaticism which assumed the right to annihilate everything in order to arrive at the realization of her sublime concepts. Having brought forth the crimes of the Terror, by pursuit of chimerical projects, even with atrocious means, this bloody obstination was to be followed eventually by Bonaparte's arbitrary regime.

I have tried to point out the identity of the revolutionary principle behind all forms of government from 1789 to 1831 and the instability of any power that seeks, maxims, a basis (point d'appuy) for attacking it.

From 1789 to 1795 the Revolution develops; from 1795 to 1814 she reacts against herself - the Empire is the highest expression of this, just as the Terror is the zenith of the revolution. The Revolution was scarcely more than a change of persons, profiting an emancipated liberalism, a return of the former dynasty to continue the work of 1789; the government of the Bourbons called - for good or evil - to rule with (the) revolutionary institutions according to the liberal system, according to the word of Napoleon:

"I am the bookmark at the page where the revolution stopped; when I shall be no more, it (the Revolution) shall turn over the leaf (page) and march on."

The constitution, interpreted in the liberal sense, was still, just as in the Empire, the republic, the centralized democracy, sovereignty of the people, . . . under parliamentary forms abolished by Napoleon, which they, in good faith, wanted to vivify. (The) Liberalism had but to draw the logical consequences of the constitution thus considered to efface the throne or upset it.

We have seen, I said in 1831, it perform a comedy of 15 years' duration and arrive at a tragic denouement (conclusion). The monarchy of 1830 resumes, under circumstances still more difficult, the work of resistance rudely interrupted. The king-elect, the 'roi citoyen' (citizen King), the monarchy surrounded by republican institutions, the unrecognized right of the Bourbons to the throne, the legal opposition which changes its character and has upset the established order - everything aids in declaring the origin of the new government illegal. Casimir-Perier 1) finds the secret of his strength in a wholesome fear of radicalism; the more order shall be apparently consolidated, the more the impetuosity of the extreme party, invincible through its syllogism shall make the crisis & fall inevitable.

Finally I have pointed out a powerless Europe, burdened by a disease whose source was France, which adopted the principle, yet recoiled from the frightful manifestations of practice, applauding the via media which seemed to reconcile (self) interests and faith (belief) and was doomed, as a reward for its cooperation with revolutionary France, to submit alternatively to armed propaganda and feel the sword of the conqueror.

The Revolution (not a peculiarly French, a peculiarly Gallic fact, as M. Eugene Renan 2) thinks, but the most universal fact in the modern world), has created for France, in spite of common principles and tendencies, a situation fatally hostile to the other powers - for this one reason: that the movement which arose there and immediately revealed its aggressive and destructive character, found Europe to guard itself against such terrible attacks.

Such seemed to me the results of the first practical demonstration of the philosophy of the past century.

1) Casimir-Perier - 1812-1897 - P. M. under Louis Phillippe - fighter of insurrection and plot.

2) Ernest Renan - 1823-1892 - Prof. Semitic languages at Paris. Influenced by German philosophers he brode with all beliefs in a revealed truth, and became a determinist.

In 1847 I dealt with the same subject in more detail, in a work, the title of which expressed my opinion, Unbelief and Revolution. Unbelief, the seed; revolution, the fruit.

Where do the beautiful guarantees, which the revolution makes for the happiness of the human race, lead to? To a majority rule, obtained by various means; to the rule of force. What will eventually become of the promises of liberty? Legal, unlimited servitude. They will lead to that which is most dangerous to all liberty, absolutism, state omnipotence; to a central power, which will render all collective or individual resistance impossible and hides or denies all injustices and tyranny under the veil of promoting public welfare. Under the "Ancien Regime" administrative centralization existed in France, but the Revolution, while adapting its forms, gave it a totally different character. It is no longer a question of political method, but of social principle. Any government, whatsoever, personal or parliamentary, is the form in which the state, the voters, the sovereign people, the general will, the organized assembly of individual wishes, is concentrated. The saying: "L'etat, c'est Moi" (the state, that is I), acquires a much more alarming scope than was formerly thought possible. The government is the state, and the state is the realized social contract. The clauses thereof naturally "are reduced to one statement, namely, the complete union of each associate, with all his rights, to the whole community. The general will is always right. Whoever refuses to obey the general will, is compelled by the whole group, which means simply that he shall be forced to be free" (Rousseau). The liberty consists of being forced to do that which one does not want to do, because the law requires one to be willing. There are no rights against this right. The state is sovereign, and the will of him who represents the state, a will that is sovereign in all spheres including even the spheres of the family and of the conscience, breaks down all resistance by the unity of his caprices.

"The sovereignty of the people has two sides. In its formation it elevates all individuals by making them members of the sovereign people. In its application it crushes and destroys them. No one can assert his right if that opposes the right proceeding from all." (De Gasparin).

The regime of liberty is, in its revolutionary simplicity, the legal organization of the most perfect tyranny.

Against such a public and legalized order we need "Legitimacy", (legitimite), and the Divine Right.

Legitimacy, in its broadest and most incontestible sense: There are certain matters, sacred, inviolable, legitimate, which, resorting under the protection of justice universally recognized, never may be changed or be abandoned by any human power. That is the principle of legitimacy in its highest universality.

There exists no universally recognized; there is nothing sacred, inviolable, legitimate; all laws can be changed by the will of the sovereign, and the sovereign is that which is most powerful; all rights may be sacrificed to the common good and the common good is that which we please to call such. That is the principle of illegitimacy in all its gigantic grandeur.

The Divine Right; not like the theocracy of the Jews, or in the absurd sense of the Strarts, or according to the servile submission of Hobbes, or after the interpretation of Bonaparte; but the Divine Right, as until the beginning of the revolution it has been recognized as the basis of all government, republican or monarchistic, as it only can be the true foundation of all rights and all liberties.

"All true legislation comes from God, the eternal principle of order and power in the society of intelligent beings. Depart from this, and I only see arbitrarily derived wishes and the degrading tyranny of force; I only see men who insolently exercise power over other men, I only see slaves and tyrants. This all social truths evolve from this first and great truth, that all power is derived from God." 1)

A choice is inevitable. Deny this fundamental truth and you are forced to explain, by purely human conventions, the source (I don't say of the government powers, (machtsbevoegdheden); history furnishes enough examples of that), but also the notion of power itself. We must choose between the sovereignty of man and that of God. You do not want the sovereignty by the grace of God; you are left with rationalism. Without the Divine Right, no real authority, no royalty, no parliamentary government, no republic; nothing is indicated by those names but a revolutionary situation, wherein the power maintains or dethrones this or that party, which at the time is in power.

There is no other alternative. You will meet anarchy and servitude by applying the Social Contract, or you will find the source of all rights and liberties in the absolute, salutary authority of God again.

IV

EVIDENCE FROM PAST AND PRESENT

I have often been vigorously accused of attacking, with little respect, the generally accepted opinions, an attack which was thought strange and pre-emptuous. But, I answered, it concerns major truths here, with regard to which the very nature of faith excludes the possibility of hesitation or doubt. Besides, I allowed a host of witnesses to speak in order to condemn the revolutionary principle.

Among the ancients, subjectivism had no defending, except those without any recommendation, the sophists. Holy Writ and the Reformation, too, denied it; and, even though its triumph in the 18th century was made possible by an ever decreasing faith, it met, even then, with antagonists among the foremost men. Citing contemporary authorities I employed the historical "ecole" of Newbuhr 2) and Savigny 3), I revealed the many instructive and admirable

1) Lamennais.

2) B. J. Niebuhr - 1776-1834. German historian, violently opposed to the modern ideas about church and state, religion and politics. "Without the fall nothing is explained, with the fall everything is." F.K.

3) von Savigny - 1779-1861. German jurist, founder of historical "school" in the "jurisprudence." According to him justice is based on history.

things, in spite of "ultramontaines" ideas, in the writings of de Bonald 1), de Maistre 2), and no less perhaps in the writings of de Lamennais 3), although they were already a prelude to his complete apostasy. I especially tried to foster an appreciation in that remarkable book so little read, yet so widely denounced, Mr. de Haller's 4) On the political Restoration. The negative side, i.e., the refutation of liberalism, struck me. In this purely historical exposition the author shows how the right of hereditary, personal royalty is attacked and corrupted (denature) by the theories of a republican form of government, how later this revolutionary principle takes possession of this error, in order to make of it the social doctrine of the sovereignty of the people and universal democracy, and (how) finally all the rights and liberties disappear in the absolutism and omnipotence of the sovereign state. Just as Mr. Ancillon 5), a writer used to expressing himself very modestly, I found Mr. Haller admirable "when he in a forceful, destructive manner criticizes the errors and dangerous doctrines of the social contract and the sovereignty of the people." Suspected, as I was, of the similar sympathies, I was happy to cite also (even preferable) the most outspoken adversaries of the revolutionary tendencies - the greatest English statesmen. With joy I called attention to the perseverance of Wm. Pitt and his followers in combatting the Jacobine system, in its most varied appearances. I tried to show the contract between their loyalty to the essential, conservative principles and the conduct of the new Whigs, so disloyal to the noble traditions of 1688, who so ardently proclaim the maxims subverting all social order.

"England has seen them protect, in the name of liberty, imperial despotism; she has seen them break out in violent denunciation of war, when the war was obviously a national necessity; attack fiercely, condemned without distinction, made false assumptions, ever dominated and urged on by the position of their party." (Guizot).

In the meantime their adversaries remained unmoved, in spite of unforeseen disasters, causing the politics of Pitt to triumph, as formerly those of Wm. III (King Wm. I) against Louis XIV, long after his death. I did not grow tired of quoting Burke, "the Bossuet 6) of politics" (as the foremost of his adversaries, Fox, called his rival prophetically), the guide even of Pitt, who, when the French revolution, at the outset deceived all lovers of liberty

-
- 1) L. de Bonald - 1784-1840. French philosopher, defender of Christian, monarchical ideas.
 - 2) J. de Maistre - 1753-1821. French R. C. philosopher, adhering to the principle of government in religious and political spheres.
 - 3) De Lamennais - 1782-1854. French theologian and politician. First defended theocratic principle, later revolutionary.
 - 4) K. L. Haller - 1768-1857. Swiss professor of history, opposed to the revolutionary.
 - 5) J. P. Ancillon - 1767-1857. German preacher, professor of history and statesman, adhered to monarchical absolutism.
 - 6) Famous French orator (minister), 1627-1704.

realized the significance of this dangerous phenomenon; who by his example and influence demonstrated the fundamental difference between 1688 and 1789 and created the conservative Whigparty or conservative Tory-party, leader of the resistance, who stopped the revolution's progress in England and drove the spirit of conquest back to its den. "In everything we see and foresee," said Burke, "everything is extraordinary. The Revolution is a unique occurrence. It is a reversal of doctrines, the arrival of a new sect, a new religion, a religion which is nothing but irreligion, impiety, atheism, a systematized hatred of Christianity. Beginning at the most atrocious disorder, one shall end with the most violent despotism; the kings shall become tyrants for political reasons, when the subjects shall be rebels out of principle. War is inevitable. It is not a case of attacking; it is not a case of inconsiderately meddling with the French forms of government; it is a case of defending ourselves against belligerent doctrines; against the propagation of maxims intent on destroying all government, all society. We must in a civil war rush to the aid of the real France, in order to save her from the clutches of a faction which dominates it, intends to use it for sallies and as a basis, making it the "theatre," the centre of their experiments and projects; which strives for world domination and whose very existence is a declaration of war on humanity. A battle to death is being fought between the Christian civilization and this evil cosmopolitan spirit. Certain destruction shall be the reward of senseless princes, who think that they can dispose of war and peace, in an exceptional manner, in an ordinary way. The road which leads to safety is not a well-worn, blazed road. The most terrible war is, comparatively speaking, a boon; it will act as a preservative against infection and the development of false maxims and will give the Christian world a "breather."

I tried to make it felt, that these sentences and many similar ones so frequently occurring in his writings, although presented, it is true, in a somewhat shady, paradoxical manner, are not mysterious at all, but are true beams of light, revealing the secret of the mysterious crises of our century, whose accuracy has been proved by a series of unheard-of calamities. "The end of the revolution?" he exclaimed in 1798, when several people thought to end it with an imminent peace with France, "end the revolution! It has scarcely begun. Till now you have but heard the prologue; you are going to hear the actors; neither you, nor I, shall see the end of the drama." Burke knew, by studying the roots, how to appreciate the tree in its true worth and was able, with that sagacity which made him an incomparable politician, to predict the course of future events; and, although he erred in 1789 when he thought that the Revolution through the civil discord had totally destroyed France and wiped it from the map ("I see an abyss, therewhere France once lay"), he soon understood Mirabeau's answer, perhaps better than Mirabeau himself, "this abyss is a volcano."

V

LESSONS FROM CONTEMPORARY HISTORY

(The Revolution of 1848 of the same character as that of 1789)

In 1848 the revolutionary theory, in its most radical form, reappeared to give its practical demonstration. The quasi-legitimate royalty, sprung from popular sovereignty in action, the ever shaking work of 1830, died a sudden death, as a result of the hardly concealable malady, owing to its abnormal birth. Its fall was the signal for a repetition, on a smaller scale, of the first revolution, of which all the phases again pass before our eyes,

thought now with greater acceleration. It is needless to enumerate them. The Revolution, in its republican form has not yet been forgotten. Again it took flight; with one wing-beat it soared to the logical absurdities of communism and socialism, making itself ready to gulp down family and property in its workshops and tenement houses 1). This dreadful disorder was averted by the good sense of society, which, as chaos approached, horror-stricken came to its senses. Order was re-established by force of arms, the democratic state embraced and regulated by the military state: the 24th of February ended three years later in the 2nd of December, universal suffrage functioned in a grip of iron and the ephemeral republic made place for the revived Empire. Another coup d'etat, another Napoleon; the slogan In nepote rediimus became a truth in domestic as well as in diplomatic relations. In France the liberties of 1789 were pompously included in the programme made for a distant future; the most extreme centralization was placed in the immediate service of the will of one single man; the throne was surrounded by parliamentary decorations, and the daily press authorized to publish and write everything which would not displease the government. Peace was the slogan of the day - just as it was at the beginning of the Consulate -; the second Empire was peace-loving at heart: "the Empire is peace." Peace was proclaimed and perhaps sincerely desired, but soon interrupted, in the Crimea and Italy, by wars, such as Christendom, it was thought, would never see again. France's disease, and her disorders, proved again contagious. Europe was shaken by similar convulsions; the majority of the governments sought safety in measures now violent, now childish, and surpassed on account of envy, in deference and jumble towards imperial France, that which at the time of Napoleon I, was considered to be the lowest degree of abasement by monarchs and diplomats. Timidly they listened for the voice from Paris, to sink back into silence or echo approval. Finally with the advent of materialism the last sparks of enthusiasm chilled into an indifference for truth as well as error, an equal repugnance against anything which, through the fermentation of thought could endanger private interests and derange the public order; in a one-sided, passionate love for rest and security, whatever it be, which hastily sacrifices justice to well-being and, indifferent to everything else; knows of no dignity but that resulting from power and wealth, and no other cult but that of Mammon; which, according to the philosophy of "facts accomplis," sums up the spirit of the century, suppresses the notion of good and evil, associates indifferently with virtue or with crime, sanctions any success whatsoever and, in its admirable simplicity, after the most exact definition of this new legitimacy, is nothing but the right of the strongest, in its most barbaric sense, the norm for international and national law.

Let us first observe that this is still the sovereignty of the people, as in the time of Napoleon I, the first representative of the nation. Let us observe that the liberal principles still rule with their astonishing elasticity, just as when the Emperor, in 1810, had the alarming decree formulated about the suspension of individual liberty, insisted on this systematic apology: "We need two pages with considerations containing the liberal ideas." During the first Empire France had already seen "a government which, stronger and much more absolute than that which the Revolution had overthrown, once more seizes and concentrates all powers, suppresses all the so dearly paid-for liberties, replacing them with vain images; a government which calls popular sovereignty of the people the suffrage of voters who are unable to inform themselves, to discuss, or to choose; which calls the assent of a mute and servile audience a free vote on taxation and, while she robs the nation of the right of self-government, the principal guarantees of civil rights, freedom of thought, speech, and press,

1) A home for + 1600 likeminded persons, according to the system of the socialist Fourier.

in short the most precious and noblest of the conquests of 1889, yet adorns herself with this beautiful name (of Empire)." 1)

The fierceness of absolutism is proportional to the resistance which it meets. A long time ago Mr. De Chateaubriand 2) wrote: "Among the men in this country one can notice a certain lassitude, which may lead to acquiescence." When, reduced to impotence, one bows, resigns oneself, "one retires into a narrow individualism wherein all public virtue is smothered," the hardest yoke can have the appearance of sweetness. All the same, to appreciate its nature, we must not forget, even while enjoying its gentleness, that its power is unlimited, that its energy adjusts itself to the demands of the moment, and that which serves to crush its opponents.

The discouragement of our age is revealed in the character of its docility. The unrest of liberalism attests at any rate to "the impossibility of a Christian nation to support a purely human power, which finds its source in itself alone, and knows no norm but its own will." This noble repugnance has disappeared. They submit and resign themselves; but let us not forget that this obedience differs widely from that of our forefathers. "What matters is less the degree than the nature of the submission. It is important to guard against evaluating the baseness of men by the degree of their submission to a sovereign power; that would be using a faulty measure. However, much the people under the Ancien Régime were submissive, there was one kind of obedience unknown to them: they did not know what it meant to bow before an illegitimate or contested power, which receives little honour, but much scorn and derision; a power, to which one now willingly submits, because it can profit or harm. That degrading form of servitude was ever strange to them. They showed the sovereign at the same time the love which one has toward one's father, as well as the respect, which one owes only to God. When they submitted to the most arbitrary commandments, they yielded less to constraint than to love and thus it frequently happened that, even in the most extreme dependence, they kept their soul truly free. To them, constraint was the greatest evil of obedience; to us, the least. The worst evil lurks in the sentiment which enforces obedience. Let us not look down on our fathers; we do not have the right. Would to God that we could find back with their prejudices and faults a little of their grandeur." 3)

As long as the Revolution reigns, this absolutism this degrading servility, is inevitable. Alarmed by a systematic disorder, the nations will acclaim any power whatsoever which soothes them, even though it snuffs out all liberty. One wants to be saved at all costs. What a deliverance the coup d'état in November (1799) brings, when in that year the return of the Reign of Terror was feared! How enthusiastically the 2nd December 1848 is welcomed, after the menace of Communism! People scarcely ask how the triumph is obtained and what it implies - the sudden disappearance of the danger is the only thing thought of. In the path of the Revolution nothing better can be expected. Deliverance, at this price, will inevitably bring new disasters; oppression within, war without, as tyranny and conquest mutually support each other. But what should have been done? What other remedy was there for an unbearable situation? After the "nivellement" of society and the "coming to the throne" of the sovereign people, the power, precisely because according to law it is but an executive

1) De Tocqueville.

2) De Chateaubriand: 1768-1848, famous french writer and politician favoring the monarchy.

3) De Tocqueville.

power, must in reality be a despotic power; it must be irresistible in order not to be overthrown. After returning from the Russian campaign, Napoleon, foreseeing the awakening of liberalism, addressing the Council of State, expressed ideas which were certainly not lacking in truth and profundity.

"To the ideology, that shady metaphysics, which, by inquiring with subtlety into the first causes, wants to establish the legislation of the nations on its basis; to it all catastrophes of France must be attributed. She has brought the regime of the men of blood, has proclaimed the principle of insurrection as duty, has flattered the people by calling it to a sovereignty which it was incapable of exercising, and has destroyed the respect for and sanctity of the laws by making them dependent not on the sacred principles of justice, but only on the will of an assembly composed of men unacquainted with civil, criminal, administrative, political and military laws. When one is called to reform a state, one must follow principles exactly the opposite of these."

Mr. Thiers, faithful to his opinion in ascribing France's disasters to the excessive ambition of the conqueror alone, adds, after having cited the above philippic,

"Such is the effect of mistakes, especially of large mistakes! Besides all the evil which they bring with them from his good sense to such a degree, that in the agitation produced the genius himself appears but an angry child."

The words of Napoleon are doubtlessly senseless, where they apply to philosophy or representative government; but, where he refers to the Revolution, with its sovereignty of the reason and the people, with its disdain for civil rights and consequently for the traditional and historic rights, there he accuses liberalism; where he declares that these sad errors brought after terrorism and propaganda, of necessity tyranny and conquest, then the light of genius has never better illumined the history of the past. When liberal ideas dominate, Napoleonic ones arrive; the one abyss calls forth another. The system of Bonaparte is the direct and legitimate heir of the Jacobin system.

VI

ANTIREVOLUTIONARY WRITERS OF OUR DAY

(Ardent opponents of the spirit of the revolution in England, America, France and Germany).

Such political and social commotions have effected a considerable and advantageous change in the world of thought. This is not surprising. The elevated and salutary character of the Revolution, which for a long time appeared beyond doubt, has become questionable to say the least. When a once chosen road has evidently but two ways out, anarchy and tyranny, it is difficult to persuade oneself that the road is the right one.

"There are times when God, through remarkable events which are His lessons, enlightens the human race so clearly, that all minds would have been illumined and silenced, if our easy-going carelessness and proud obstinacy were not such formidable obstacles, We have lived and

now live in so solemn a time." 1)

Distinguished historians, witnessing so many upheavals and disasters, while dealing with past centuries, have not resisted the temptation, no, have not shirked the duty of combatting the fatal spirit of the Revolution with instructive and moving comparisons. This Mr. Ranke 2) did in his lucid writings, as well as Mr. Macaulay 3), in his "History of England," a beautiful commentary on Burke's theses, wherein he contrasts the Whigs who drew up the British constitution with the Whigs who admire the maxims which overthrow it— a striking contrast which Macaulay expresses in a single sentence, "Because we had a conservative Revolution in the 17th century, we were spared a destructive revolution in the 19th century." Thus too, Mr. Lothrop Motley, 4) a writer who has so admirably popularized in America and Europe the memories of great events which, under the auspices of a hero and a martyr, caused the birth of the Republic of the United Provinces, has pointed out the distinction between revolutions in the ordinary sense of the word and the Revolution in a more exclusive sense, between a reversal of principles and a transfer of authority. He shows how a similar love for national and historic liberties possessed William I, William III, and Washington. He places over and against the systematically anarchistic revolution the salutary and legitimate revolutions in the Netherlands, England and America (the 13 colonies).

The French revolution has become the object of more serious and more profound study, in its various stadia, but especially in its general ideas and universal tendencies.

The Memoirs of Mallet du Pan 5), collected and admirably put in order by Mr. Sayous, published in 1851, became as a result of the events of 1848, aside from their intrinsic value, of truly up-to-date importance. Each page of his correspondence reveals him as a profound thinker, a first rate publicist who, before becoming acquainted with the writings of Burke, judged and exposed the Revolution with the same sagacity, from the same elevated viewpoint. Unfortunately I must limit myself to one single passage which, however, bears the imprint of the correctness and profundity with which Mallet du Pan envisaged the various phases and the coherence of the grave period.

"That which never changes is the essence of the revolutionary doctrine. This antisocial theory is for all supporters of the Revolution, a veritable religion. The revolutionary system is applicable to all nations; it is based on philosophic maxims suitable for any climate and hostile to all governments. Their authors made allowances neither to the English nor an oriental government; with their sermons they have poisoned republics as well as monarchies. The fanaticism of irreligion, equality and propagandism is as lofty and a thousand times more atrocious in its methods than a thousand times

1) Guizot.

2) L. von Ranke, 1795-1886. German historian who wrote a.o. series of books on the history of the Netherlands.

3) Thos. Macaulay, English statesman and historian, who distinguished between forbidden and commanded revolt. (1800-1859)

4) J. Lothrop Motley, 1814-1877. American historian, author of 3 extensive works on the history of the Republic of the United Netherlands.

5) J. Mallet du Pan, 1749-1800. French publicist and secret agent of the French Court during the French Revolution.

more atrocious in its methods than religious fanaticism ever was. All regard France as the metropolis of their doctrine and centre of their unity. This redoubtable sect, like the Islam, used arms as well as the influencing of public opinion to unfold and propagate its doctrine; the one hand brandishes the sword, the other raises the rights of man."

Mallet du Pan died as early as 1802. Let us now deal with works published since 1848 by the authors themselves. Take, for example, the "History of the National Convention" by Mr. De Barante 1). What do we read in the preface? What we ought to remember, what we formerly almost always forgot, namely, that its very triumph condemns the Revolution; that, outside the revolutionary circle, there was no opposition; that the resistance was but the battle of personal interests against syllogisms; and that the Revolution bred its own opponents.

"No opposition rose against the revolutionaries, at least not outside of their own circle. The experiment was continued till the end. The opinions of the revolutionaries could have had their free course; nothing could have stopped them or turned them from their course. If the enterprise failed, we must blame the false principles and perverse passions."

Here Mr. de Barante is in perfect agreement with Mr. von Haller who wrote in 1816,

"All attempts to realize this philosophic system have completely failed. They failed because they were bound to fail, because the system itself is false, impracticable, contrary to reason and the all powerful force of nature opposed any attempt to put it into effect."

The History of the Revolution from 1789 to 1795, by Mr. von Sybel 2) is one of those rare works wherein the abundance of material, a vexation for the ordinary writer, is a perpetual challenge to the sagacity of the author. I do not pretend that he saw in the Revolution, the natural and necessary fruit of Irreligion, "that captivating force which sweeps aside all obstacles and has justly evoked the remark that the French revolution leads men rather than that men lead it." 3). According to him the revolution was not inevitable, even in 1789. If the king had boldly taken the initiative, if of his own accord he had doubled the representation of the Third Class and had ordered the union of the three classes in the National Assembly as well as the complete and definite abolition of the feudal system, many misfortunes could have been averted. If Mr. Necker 4) had acted wisely at the outset, the integrity of the monarch gaining a hold on an undecided assembly, could perhaps have ended the crisis by a reassertion of the royal power, as in the Danish revolution in 1660. Mr. Von Sybel forgets that by thus assaulting age-old privileges, they would have

1) G. P. de Barante, 1782-1866. French historian and statesman.

2) H. von Sybel, 1817-1895. German historian.

3) J. de Maistre.

4) J. Necker, 1732-1804. Swiss banker and financier and finance minister of France, opposed to Revolution. Seeing the treasury's deplorable condition he urged economy, drew up a plan for reform, which he did not effect. At the National Assembly neither he nor the King opened the accounts; both allowed the leadership of the Assembly to be taken away from them, through their weak bearing.

inaugurated the Revolution, instead of preventing it; that, when the passions, rushing to the aid of maxims long accredited, have attained the highest degree of excitement, a force is born which, sweeping everything along, against which nothing can bear up; that in 1789 it was impossible to stop the practical application of a doctrine, since long master of public opinion, and considered as the social gospel. Despite this error, Mr. Von Sybel justly points out the aspiration for the recognition of the rights of man and the sovereignty of the people which, through the weariness of anarchy, find the people which, through the weariness of anarchy, find consolation in despotism, and, aspiring to a utopian equality must necessarily have as its final result the abolishment of property and the establishment of the social republic. He points out in the parties which succeed each other, the inherent correspondence, the tie which unites them, the root from which they sprang, in short, the revolutionary tree in its branches and ramifications. With this detailed and dependable account, he destroys many false suppositions, which attribute to the Royalists and allies what are called the deviations and excesses of the Revolution. He proves that the assertions so lavishly and complacently made with respect to this, by Mr. Thiers, Mr. Mignet 1) and their numerous disciples, are but legendary tales, pure myths of which the history of the Revolution has too many.

To take another example, the offensive coalition of Pillnitz 2) is nothing but a wild fancy; that the war, the inevitable result of revolutionary propaganda, was the premeditated means of the Gironde to overthrow the throne; that the diplomatic documents clearly substantiate the testimony of the minister of foreign affairs, Delassart, who was silenced by the "September-murderers,"

"My defence will prove remarkable by revealing what happened at the foreign courts, by demonstrating that they did not wish to wage war against us, by the unassailable proof that it is we who have provoked it and turned Europe against us."

The Ancien Régime and foreign intervention were, in spite of the foolish hope which some "émigrés" nourished and the imprudences which the Allies committed, at bottom only the vain scarecrows which Jacobinism needed to justify and maintain itself.

It is a mistake to oppose me by appealing to Mr. de Tocqueville 3) and his magnificent work, "L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution." He proved that the Revolution, having accomplished its destructive work, in many respects did but return to the course which the Ancien Régime had taken long before. But the supremacy of the new principles reveals itself, despite likeness and identity of forms. Let us take an example.

"The first efforts of the Revolution had destroyed the administrative centralization, that great institution of the monarchy. It was restored in 1800. It were not, as has been said so many times, the principles of 1789 concerning public administration, which triumphed then and ever since, but to the contrary, those of the Ancien Régime which then came and remained in force."

1) F. A. M. Mignet - French historian, author of History of French Revolution, wherein he tries to demonstrate its natural development.

2) 1791 - Agreement between Emperor of Austria & King of Prussia, who both were threatened by revolutionary France.

3) D. T. 1805-1859 - French politician and author.

After the author's clear and abundant exposition there is nothing more evident but the return of the conditions which prevailed under the monarchy and the tireless efforts to strengthen the central government by repressing and neutralizing local, independent authorities by means of an administrative network. It is certainly true that the logic of the revolution, which causes all independent units to disappear into the unity of the State, lends to the centralization a degree of perfection which formerly never would have been achieved. It is true that Mr. de Tocqueville affirms "that the Revolution was not at all begun to destroy the sway of religious beliefs, as many believed, but that it was, in spite of all appearances, a social and political revolution." Yet he makes much of the influences which, according to us have led to the Revolution. In his opinion, the unbelief in the 18th century established itself first in the minds of those who themselves had the most personal and pressing interests to maintain the public order and popular obedience; they made impiety a sort of pastime in their idle existence. The French Church remained silent, the people who retained the old faith were afraid to be the only ones faithful to it, and fearing isolation more than error, joined the crowd without thinking like them. The general disrepute into which all religious beliefs had fallen at the end of the last century, exerted without a doubt the greatest influence on the whole Revolution. It determined its character, and contributed more than anything else to give its physiognomy that well-known expression of horror. Let us add to this remarkable passage a phrase with which Burke certainly would have agreed:

"The Revolution has become some sort of new religion, an imperfect religion, it is true, without God, without public worship, without an afterlife, but which nevertheless, like the Islam, has flooded the face of the earth, with its soldiers, apostles and martyrs."

Although a great admirer of 1789, Mr. de Tocqueville carefully distinguished two directions in the eighteenth century philosophy: "One direction contains all the newly revived views which concern the state of society and the principles of civil and political laws. These, so to speak, form the substance of the Revolution. The other contains the purely accidental irreligious tendency which, being born of conditions which the Revolution itself destroyed, found death in the triumph of the latter. The warfare against religious convictions from this point of view, was but incidental to the great revolution. It was a salient and yet passing trait of its physiognomy, a passing product of its ideas, of its passions, and of the particular events which preceded and prepared it - and not its essential characteristic." Thus he considers as accidental in the Revolution what is its essential nature. Mr. de Tocqueville did not yet see what Burke already saw in 1793:

"We cannot conceal from ourselves the true character of that terrible struggle. It is a religious war. That is its dominant feature. At the same time, undoubtedly all social interests are threatened."

I do not want to accumulate quotations; trusting reader's intelligence and insight and I limit myself to the testimony of Mr. de Montalembert 1), Mr Stahl and Guizot.

Mr. de Montalembert detest liberalism and the memorable date of its appearance. "Liberalism wants to date the world as beginning with 1789, and precisely in the name of the ideas and principles of 1789 it is silenced. The philosophers and liberals have ruled so well that twice in half a century their system ended in the abdication and total abolishment of all rights and freedom, under the applause of honest but frightened people! Yes, twice in 50 years the people, abused for a time by excessive evils, shocked by the disorders in the social machine, have thrown their shackled liberty at the feet of an ab-

1) Ch. de Montalembert, 1810-1870. One of chief French defenders of Catholicism.

solute Master. Such are at the present, in 1852, the conquests of 1789." This is how he defined the relation of the revolution to liberty:

"I don't speak of the revolution as a fact, an act, or a passing thunderstorm; I speak of the revolution as elevated to principle, dogma, idol; of that revolution which is not limited to one country, one period of time, but pretends to pervade the whole human mind, to take the place of religion and society, which preaches the legitimacy of insurrection everywhere and always, except against itself; which, under the name of democracy, is but the universal manifestation of pride, which insatiable and relentless as death, after having obtained everything, yet demands everything again. I say that this revolution not only is not liberty, but is its exact opposite. Whether victorious or conquered, the Revolution kills liberty: by suppressing it when triumphant, and causing it to be feared and hated by appealing to it when defeated. It is the Revolution which makes the people ripe for tyranny; makes them deserve it constrains them especially to resign themselves to it for fear of worse things."

It is difficult to make a choice from among the numerous and admirable writings of Mr. Stahl. To characterize them, it will suffice to give a sketch of his discourse: "What is the Revolution?", a brief summary of its origin, nature, course, and results. The Revolution is the political doctrine which, since 1789, has penetrated the thought of people and public institutions. It upsets legitimate and eternal relationship, makes man the creator and centre of a moral universe; proclaims the sovereignty of the people, unlimited freedom, equalization of social classes, abolition of traditional and historic laws, sacrifice of acquired rights to the demands of public welfare. It denounces property as theft and any independent authority as the minister and responsible servant of the people.

Mr. Guizot, the illustrious leader of the doctrinary liberals and until 1848 one of the great men in the liberal party, "who in our day has so brilliantly shown how knowledge and talent are to be applied to direct human affairs, the statesman whose mentality and character have had a most decisive influence on his country" 1), seems to recognize, since the overthrow of the July-monarchy, that the sovereignty of justice, of reason, and of right in daily practice gives way to the sovereignty of the people. For, as Mr. Berryer said, the ministers, as ambassadors of this sovereign reason are those whose authority is most often contested. For everyone considers himself the mouthpiece of reason and thus, through the conflict of individual opinions, the door is opened to an endless circle of disputes. Experience seems to have taught Mr. Guizot that authority must find its necessary basis outside of society, not in old and false theories, but in the submission of the people and the sovereign to Him, on Whom all authority depends and from whom all authority originates. Although Mr. Thiers perhaps still exclaims: "liberty has not yet come, but will come"; although Mr. Mignet perhaps is still waiting for a truly political freedom, the lingering fruit of the Revolution; although Mr. de Larartine 2) in his reveries constantly finds opportunities to glorify its faults and stifle his remorse; although Mr. Cousin 3) declares that the interest and consent of

1) E. Renan

2) A. de Lamartine: 1790-1869. French poet and statesman favoring democracy.

3) Victor Cousin: 1792-1867. French philosopher, eclectic, who endeavored to build a whole from the best of the divers systems.

the peoples is the sole foundation of legitimate authority; that the tragic experience of 1848, far from weakening, rather strengthened and affirmed his principles; that in the darkness which has fallen around us those principles still form the star which guides modern society and gives to its apparently most disordered movements a firm and wholesome purpose, that they dominate all forms of government and determine that form which suits France and Europe Best; although he does his best to prove that France failed neither in 1830, nor in 1848, and that not the liberal opinions, but people, through short-sighted resistance, have caused these disasters, Mr. Guizot is not afraid to admit that he erred in several respects, and explains with courageous frankness a long series of errors and disasters from the very nature of the Revolution! In his historical works, in his Memoirs, in his political brochures, one meets definite anti-revolutionary maxims, interspersed with noble confessions. A mention of two of his small works will suffice: "De la Democratie" of 1848 1), and "Nos mecomptes et nos esperances" of 1855 2). Public order was scarcely re-established when Mr. Guizot who, although returned to private life, but still on account of his talents, activity and influence a politician, expressed himself as follows:

"France needs to be morally lifted up and firmly re-established; she needs to regain faith in and attachment to immovable and generally avowed principles. But the revolutionary spirit is not fit for such a task; its appearance, summons, predictions, remembrances and language, would oppose and retard any such effort, rather than accomplish it."

The evil which Guizot then already pointed out, is the idolatry with respect to democracy. For revolutionary liberty and equality destroy all social relationships. "Today chaos hides itself behind the word "Democracy." This democratic ideal must be rooted out. Its reward will be social peace." He does not hesitate in 1855 to dispel his most cherished illusions, by pointing out the fatal error in the general movement of thought in 1789, which was to bring along so many errors and disasters. "Generally speaking, people in 1789 were convinced that by nature man is good, wills the good and would almost always do the good, if, instead of leaving him free, the vices of social institutions and abuses of the existent authority did not incessantly irritate, mislead or corrupt him." He ends by thus recapitulating the lessons of our present-day experiences:

"We have believed that we were better than we are; we have failed to recognize the evil inherent in our nature. We have believed that we were stronger than we are. Not only have we failed to recognize the limits of our power, but also the rights of the Sovereign Power who governs the world and ourselves. We have not taken account of the eternal laws which God has placed over us, and we have foolishly pretended to replace them everywhere by our own laws."

Here follows the significant phrase with which he finishes:

"Let us especially be quick to leave the rut into which the spirit of the revolution has thrown us. It would ever lead us into the same abyss."

The authority of Mr. Guizot and his equals should have saved us from the reproach, which they do not tire of bringing up, as if we would wish a form of

1) About the democracy.

2) Our disappointment and hopes.

government composed of the errors of the Middle Ages, the despotism of Louis XIV, and the ultra-orthodox opinions of Puritan sectarians.

V.11

THE ANTI-REVOLUTIONARY PRINCIPLE IS NO-
THING BUT THE CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE

Was I wrong in affirming that the Anti-Revolutionary principle is nothing but the Christian principle?

It is to be regretted that even today many Christians, deceived by the promises of liberalism, believe that by adopting its maxims, wholly or partly, they serve the cause of religion and of liberty; and that they have not discovered under the deceptive veil of apparent moderation the identity of the liberal principle with a radicalism, which strikes at the roots of religion and society; and that thus they have very often become the blind tools of "that hidden power which irresistibly calls forth the results from their principle, without even being aware that they aid its fatal development." 1)

The Revolution, or the modern philosophic theory, overthrows all laws for the life of the human race by overthrowing Christianity. That is the distinctive character of the present age.

Indeed, we are witnesses of one of the most terrible phases of that perpetual and mysterious war, to which Scripture only gives us the key. The Bible, which contains the history of the past, and of the future, relates or unveils the coherence of the destiny of mankind. The plan of a righteous and merciful God for the salvation of fallen man majestically unveils itself throughout the centuries. Under His all-powerful hand the events submit and direct themselves toward their common purpose: the formation of the chosen people, a spiritual people, a spiritual people, saved through the blood of the cross, and of the Church militant, here below, and the Church triumphant in heaven above. As the Revolution is but a systematic overthrowal of the church of Jesus Christ, so the truly anti-revolutionary opposition is the perpetual testimony of faith, in a form which suits our age: the Christian principle, in its legitimate, necessary, and required application.

The history of a Revolution whose point of departure is disdain for the revealed religion, which shall end in denial and doubt, could bear these words of Pascal 2) as an epitaph:

"All who seek God without Jesus find no light which satisfies or can truly be of use to them. For, either they do not come to recognize the existence of a God, or, if they come to such recognition, it is worthless to them, because they create themselves a mediator - less means of communication with a God whom they know - without a mediator. Thus they fall

1) Lamennais.

2) Blaise Pascal, 1623-1662. French mathematician, physicist and philosopher, one of the lords of Port Royal, centre of Jansenism. Fierce antagonist of Jesuits (in his *Lettres Provinciales*). His *Pensées*, from which is cited here, were meant as the building materials for a defence of the Christian Religion.

either into atheism or deism, two things which the Christian religion equally abhors. In Jesus Christ is all found, all our happiness; strength, life, light, and hope. Apart from Him there is nothing but vice, misery, darkness, despair, and do we see but darkness and confusion in God's as well as in our own nature."

And the same is true in the state and in society. Having once entered upon the pathway of an unbelieving philosophy, one finds but disintegration and chaos as its outcome.

Already in 1831 I said: "Liberalism can only be combatted successfully by Christianity." I was then reproached for allowing political considerations to degenerate into sermons and catechism lessons. At that time this scarcely surprised me; but, since so many frightening commotions have given their thundering answer to such warnings!), I admit that the tenacity of that prejudice astounds me.

You want the ideas of 1789. Very well; provided you firmly attach them to the Biblical principle.

You pretend that democracy is an irresistible force, which, far from combatting it, rather must be regulated. Granted; provided that, by accepting the situation as it now exists, you do not deduce from it a new sort of legitimacy and force us to kneel before the idol of democracy. Christianity accepts democracy, as any other form of government; but when democracy is imposed as a necessary and universal condition of the social order, and considered as a revolutionary dogma, opposed to the Divine Right whose eternal authority must be respected by whatever sovereign be it the people or the king, then the democracy of the social contract will always find the christian faith as its antagonist. The reign of such a democracy will always bring over society the consequences described in the destructive chapter (according to Mr. Vinet) wherein Mr. de Tocqueville reproaches democracy for having idealized despotism by creating the moral tyranny of the majority. "There will be no independence for either bourgeoisie or nobility, poor or rich, but only equal tyranny for all!"

Serious Roman Catholics and evangelical Protestants have for a long time vied with each other in pointing out this contradiction.

The Revolution, said Mr. de Bonald, began with the declaration of the rights of man; it will but end with the declaration of the rights of God.

"Lift high" said Lamennais, "the sacred torch of truth above the ruins of Christian civilization; let it burn before the eyes of all, and let its rays, while penetrating the clouds of error, gradually enlighten the minds still wandering the paths of error. Show the immutable principles of justice in all their aspects. Expound the eternal laws, the unshakable foundation of authority and liberty, until Reason, finally tired of its fruitless labors, realizes that apart from Christianity there is nor can be anything but error, disorder, calamity and servitude without remedy."

A long time ago this same idea, applied to the political and religious discord of the day, could be found in the "Journal hebdomadaire politique," and in the Berlin "Gazette Evangelique." And the teachings and noble effort of Mr. Stahl can be summarized in this sentence, which forms the end of a parliamentary speech of 1849: "The Revolution in Europe can only be halted by Christianity, through the Christian state and the Christian school."

2) Mr. Stahl, recalling in 1854 what he had written in 1829, adds: "Dieser Ruf meiner schwachen Stimme vor funf und zwanzig Jahren ist seitdem durch die Donnerstimme der Weltereignisse wiederholt worden."

Away with the so-called Christianity of modern philosophy and modern theology! We need positive Christianity, such as has been the mutual faith, with the characteristic traits of its history and its dogmas, of all Christian churches for the last 18 centuries. It is faith which Mr. Vinet demands, in some lines published in 1855 but written as early as 1832 - lines of prophetic import, so remarkably realized later on:

"For a nation without faith we see no rest, no respite except despotism. Liberty without faith has caused nations to collapse. If today there are free nations which are able to bear their liberty, enjoy it and constantly draw their strength from it, as they have nothing to fear from it, these are nations with faith. There is no assurance of stability or liberty in a country, where the masses vote, as the occasion will, for him who offers most or who is most cunning, for the anarchist or tyrant, and are inclined to lend to the one or the other (i.e. tyranny under two different names) the terrible sovereignty of force."

Let us now return to Mr. Guizot. - No one demonstrates with greater ability that between Christianity and the revolution there exists an opposition and contrast, no less than that between life and death. "If the Christian faith would be more powerful, communism and socialism would soon be little more than obscure follies. If communism and socialism prevailed, the Christian faith would perish." Mr. de Maistre had declared that "original sin explains everything, and without it nothing can be explained." Mr. Guizot does not hesitate to point out (in the dogma of the fall) the necessity of human laws and of an authority capable of demanding their observance.

"The truth concerning human nature is to be found in the Christian faith; it is in man himself that evil resides; he is inclined to evil. I do not want to become theological here, but I employ these terms, which are most exact and lucid, without hesitation. The dogma of original sin is the religious expression and explanation of a natural fact, man's innate inclination to disobedience and licence."

Men have often taken offense at hearing the spirit of the Revolution called anti-Christian. The following remark of Mr. de Maistre was thought the height of exaggeration:

"There is in the French revolution a satanic element which distinguishes it from anything seen before, and perhaps from anything ever to be seen."

Although he does justice to the grand and promising symptoms of our age, Mr Guizot writes:

"No one is more strongly convinced than I of the immense errors and fatal bewilderment of our times. No one fears and detests more strongly than I the sway of the spirit of the Revolution and the danger with which it threatens us, that incarnate Satan, at the same sceptical and fanatical, anarchical and tyrannical, which passionately seeks to deny and destroy, incapable of creating anything which is susceptible of life and yet not allowing that anything is made to live within its sight. I belong to those who think that it is absolutely necessary to overcome this fatal spirit and to restore to its place of honor and authority both the spirit of order and of faith, which is the spirit of life and of preservation."

Just as at the beginning of our history, the spirit of Satan has said to man:

eritis sicut Deus. That is why, as Mr. Guizot has said, our fathers of 1789 were condemned to pass from the prospects of Paradise to the scenes of hell.

"Not only is the 18th century a century of passionate sympathy for, but also an idolatrous adoration of humanity. For that reason especially it has ceased to be Christian." Constantly one is forced to recognize in the agitations of our age the revolt of human pride which defies itself and which boasting of its pretended independence, says of the living God: "We do not want Him to rule over us"; say to the God of revelation, history and nature: "I do not know thee at all." - "What is the basic question, religiously speaking, the supreme question which preoccupies the minds of today? It is the question put between those who recognize and those who do not recognize a supernatural order, unchangeable and sovereign, though incomprehensible to human reason. It is the question put between (to mention names) supernaturalism and rationalism. On the one hand you have the unbelievers, the pantheists, sceptics of all sorts, and pure rationalists; on the other hand the Christians. Among the first, the best - if I may use such an expression - leave the statue of God standing in the world and in the human heart, but only a statue, an image, a piece of marble. God Himself is there no longer. Only the Christians possess the living God." 1)

VIII WHAT WE MAY EXPECT FROM ROME IN THE STRUGGLE
AGAINST THE REVOLUTION, OR: ULTRAMONTANISM
UNABLE TO COMBAT THE REVOLUTION SUCCESSFULLY.

I have just called to your attention that, in the struggle against the Revolution, Christianity has found eloquent defenders among the Catholics. Is it therefore necessary to conclude that Rome is capable of resisting successfully the spirit of the age?

Certainly not; these apologists are only strong when, putting aside the distinctive traits of their Church, they appeal to the truly universal Christian church, remembering the saying: Christianus mihi nomen, catholicus cognomen.

Far be it from me to discount the inestimable services which a Christian Rome during the first centuries of the Middle Ages has rendered, either to religion, by propagating the Gospel, or to society, by erecting a moral barrier against tyranny and favoring the birth and the development of the European liberties. But the degenerated Rome, a Rome opposed to any evangelical rebirth, an incredulous and superstitious Rome, a Rome assuming a divine authority over the whole world, subordinating the temporal powers to the whims of a so-called vicar of Christ, a Rome, now preaching revolt to the nations, now entering into a profitable alliance with despotism, a Rome, enemy to liberty, toleration and knowledge, that Rome is far from being able to protect or cure Europe against the Revolution. To the contrary, twice already has Rome prepared the ground and opened the roads for the Revolution. The 15th century was the prelude of a universal upheaval, when the Reformation came to stop the revolutionary tendencies in their rapid progress. Three centuries later, when the enervation of the Protestant churches rendered them incapable of once more exercising their salutary influence, it was again Rome that, after violently uprooting or snuffing out the life and progress of the gospel in France, by the exile and oppression of Protestants and Jansenists 2), through her scandalous errors and vices,

1) Guizot

2) Jansenists: after Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, disciple of Augustine. Fought for reformation within the R. C. Church, and in his book about Augustine strongly opposed the Pelagians and Jesuits.

her intolerance and immorality, in a short time caused the new opinions to germinate and the Revolution of 1789 to burst out.

Let us not forget that most of the abuses in the Roman Catholic church are inseparable from her doctrine, and that her pretended infallibility renders her incorrigible. A change for her would mean self-condemnation and abdication. This essential character of hers makes it her duty to stereotype her errors and consider her falsest maxims as eternal principles. After an interregnum full of humiliations and disasters, she was seen to pursue the course of her ambitious projects, daringly proclaiming her pretensions, while waiting for the occasion and power to realize them. Always the same anti-evangelical doctrines, the same disdain for salvation by grace alone, the same exhibition of vain ceremonies, the same Mary-cultus, but of an increasingly idolatrous character; always essentially the same system of universal supremacy over peoples and kings; always the same abuse of the precept: "constrain them to enter," interpreted in the sense of inquisition and executions, which leads to a defence for the St. Bartholomew night, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, so called salutary, rigorous measures and religious "coups d'Etat," worthy examples for the present-day generations; always the same resistance against civil and political freedoms. Remember the Encyclical of 1832, which curses the absurd and false maxim, or as the Pope expressed it: the madness, that freedom of conscience must be assured and guaranteed to every man, and considers the freedom of the press a fatal liberty of which one cannot have enough horror.

But, you say, we have seen, and still do see, catholics, sincerely attached to their church, who profess liberal ideals.

Liberal ideas, without a doubt, but not principles of liberty. Observe, moreover, that this is done, not to combat the Revolution, but to employ its maxims for the benefit of the Ultramontane party.

Yet, such an inconsistency ought to astonish us. How can this phenomenon be explained?

We are not talking now about the Catholic who embraces liberalism with sincere and ardent conviction. Through the power of logic, he shall easily become like Lamennais, who yielded to the Zeltgeist and abandoned his church and faith, summarizing his apostacy in one antithesis: "On the one hand, the Popal power; on the other hand, the human race - that expresses everything."

Nor are we talking now about those who act from calculation and have only their particular interests at heart. In 1793 many a faithful Catholic may have paid for his devotion with death, but now clergy and laymen are seen to greet the rising sun in haste and to bend their knees in France before the Revolution, in its most diverse forms. This is the unsuspected witness of Mr. de Montalembert, which in a noble way shows how odious and ridiculous the ever increasingly stronger suction of the winning party is:

"In 1848, immediately after the February-revolutions, a large number of catholics, priests and laymen, were seen to greet, with their agreements and applaud, s.e. what they called a new eta. In 1852 constitutions, discussion, parliaments, control of the legislatures and assemblies excite but laughter and disdain."

What is, according to him, the secret of this astonishing change? No extraordinary perspicacity is necessary to discover it. "Ever again the highpriests of force, the singers of success, pretend that they, by adjusting themselves to

the events of the day, can also cause past and future to adjust to the caprices of their inconsistency."

Without stopping at the ever recurring base practices, of which the protestants are equally guilty, let us consider the question in itself and remember that, where the nature of catholic absolutism renders it unsuitable to combat the Revolution with success, an alliance between Ultramontanism and the Revolution is not at all strange. His tory furnishes proof that it can join itself to the Revolution, that it can to a certain point, assimilate itself into it, in the hope and with the purpose of dominating it. Formerly the Jesuits, preaching a radicalism to suit themselves, had grafted the Popal omnipotence in the permanent sovereignty of the people, a universal dogma, applicable to any form of society whatsoever. That already was the system of Rousseau 1), with the Pope as supreme moderator; he was the servant of God's servants, ruling the princes of the earth by way of the sovereign people. And in our day Lemennais, when he insisted on absolute separation of Church and state and revealed himself as an ardent defender of all possible sorts of liberty, thought that he had discovered the only means of really serving the cause of Rome and repairing its power which had everywhere diminished. He sought to bring it into direct communication with the peoples and, through anarchistic liberty, cause the majority of votes to triumph, thus by means of a handy detour to arrive at universal domination.

Ultramontanism can, as a last resort, temporarily resign itself to abandon its omnipotence and part with its right. Staying within the pale of its spiritual authority, it can by re-introducing the Mediaeval system modified to the exigencies of our age co-operate with the Revolution, by means of their own representatives and organs. It allies itself to the governments originating from the Revolution, to keep (by their mutual support) the peoples under the yoke of a double despotism.

In various circumstances it can silence its principles in order to realize its interests. It undergoes the influence of modern ideas, appreciated them as a necessary evil from which accidental advantages may result; however, as the slave of false maxims which tend to destroy liberty, it is essentially opposed to that which in the derangements of the spirit of the century, still conforms to the nautre and real, highest needs of the human spirit. It can hide this antipathy, but has neither the right nor the means to take over the truths, which though mixed with error, give to the deceptive theories of liberalism the "prestige qui entraine et seduit." I was happy to meet a spirit of freedom in the writings of, for example, Mr. de Radowitz 2) and Mr. de Montalembert. They belong, as Mr. Prevost-Paradol 3) has said, "to those eminent and courageous spirits which have conserved within the bosom of the Roman Catholic church the awareness of and love for the true liberty, although they failed to see these generally accepted." He adds, "The Roman Catholic church as a whole, especially when the spirit of her leaders is considered, appears to be animated with a contrary tendency and she considers complete freedom of worship and absolute independence from the State little worse than persecution of the Roman Catholic church." For this he gives the reason, "That is because the ideal of the Roman

1) J. J. Rousseau, French "philosophe", author of Le Contrat Social, the social contract between governed and their government, whereby each contractor transfers his freedom to the community and is bound to follow the expression of the common will. After the sarcastic Voltaire had destroyed all authority in Church and States, Rousseau came with constructive revolutionary writings for the reformation of education, state and society.

2) J. H. de Radowitz, 1797-1853. Prussian general and Statesman.

3) L. A. Prevost-Paradol, 1829-1870. French man of letters and Statesman.

Catholic church, in its relation with the State, is not one of independence, but domination, not one of liberty, but absolute rule." Indeed, according to the principles of the Roman Catholic church, she is insulted and pretends to sigh in the Babylonian captivity, if she is not free to reign and free to persecute. In his treatise, Des interets catholiques au 19^e siecle, 1852, Mr de Montalembert violently reproaches religious authors for betraying, in the name of their church, the cause of freedom, for making themselves advocates and panegyrists of absolute power, and imprudently sending the protestans their defense for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, thus furnishing them with the arguments for their daily repeated thesis of the incompatibility of the catholic influence with the maintenance of a free government. I take it that Mr. de Montalembert has no intention of veiling his principles to serve his interests, and that, dreaming of Rome's alliance with true liberty, he shares the illusions which he gives birth to; but, as I am convinced in this apparent alliance with liberalism, tendencies, very dangerous for us are hiding. I prefer the enemy himself to see and point out to me the connection between the results which I dread and the premisses which I combat; I prefer the sincerity, the logic, the violent and careless statements of Mr. Veillot 1) to the assurance of Mr. de Montalembert.

I know that protestant Christians to whose authority I usually submit myself with respect, that Mr. Guizot and Mr. Stahl do not share my views and do not consider the opposition to the ideas of freedom, tolerance, and progress as inherent in Catholicism.

From a recapitulation of the history of Europe during the last three centuries, Mr. Guizot deduces severe conclusions against the Ultramontanistic system.

"There where catholic absolutism has dominated, it has arrested and frozen social life; it has struck the nations with sterility; and, by extinguishing the torch of freedom, it has but established an order without solidity and real strength, which has not been able to prevent the arrival of the days of severe visitations and which, when those days came, stood powerless against their violence and was almost as incapable of reforming as of maintaining itself."

But, when he discusses the gravest difficulties for the true pacification of the great intellectual powers, to wit the nature of Catholicism and the conditions of her harmony with the new society, Mr. Guizot supposes that the catholic church can sincerely and completely accept, respect, and practice the principles of the separation of spiritual and temporal powers, separation of church and state ("l'etat religieux et l'etat civil."). According to him the obstacle, more of a historical than logical character, arises from past events and the former manifestation of two powers rather than from their essential principles and their present-day relations. There can be a development of moral activity, of social power, of public prosperity, there, where, says he, "a careful and intelligent catholicism prevails which allows itself neither to become the instrument nor the ruler of civil power - as in France, Belgium, and a part of Germany." 2). What is this careful and intelligent Catholicism? Is it a con-

1) L. Veillot. 1813-1833. French Roman Catholic writer, defender of Ultramontan-
nism.

2) Introduction a l'Histoire de la Fondation de la Republique des Provinces-
Unis, by Mr. Lothrop Motley. Cf., in the Etudes morales, the writings
of Mr. Guizot du Catholicisme, du Protestantisme et de la Philosophie
en France.

sistent and logical catholicism? With Rome driven to compromise (reduite a transiger), various accommodations are possible; but will the flexibility of feebleness persist when Rome, seeing a means of recapturing power, considers it no longer necessary? If the exception required by circumstance, to which one gladly resigns oneself in times of peril, becomes the rule, what then must be seen as the Roman Catholic principles: e.g. the conduct of the Belgian clergy in 1830, which joining force with the Revolution, profits of the freedoms, or the Encyclical of 1831 which condemns these same liberties?

As for Mr. Stahl, he affirms that neither the temporal supremacy of the Pope, nor the persecution of heretics by to which Rome has exercised her pretense of infallibility. They are less important maxims, with which Rome can, according to him, well part. I appreciate the spirit of justice and impartiality towards the Roman Catholic church, which is evident herein, but hesitate to go that far.

If Rome comes to recognize, in principle, the independence and integrity of the temporal power; if she renounces the universal supremacy of the Pope; if she no more assumes for herself the right of neither deposing a heretical king nor of deposing him from succession to the throne, nor of releasing the subjects of their oath; if the bull of Boniface VIII proclaiming that the spiritual and material swords are both in the hands of the Church, that the latter ought to be employed for the Church and the latter by the Church, is no longer the authentic epitome of the omnipotence to which Rome aspires; if Rome, adjusting herself to the exigencies of the modern "droit des gens" revokes the arrangements which nullify in the Treaty of Westphalia all that which deals with tolerance towards Protestants-- a tolerance which during the congress of Vienna, in 1815, was called impious and criminal; if the Catholic church, after the hopes of Mr. Guizot, limits herself to maintain her infallibility in the religious sphere, i.e. limits it to the relation between the spiritual power and the faithful; if she disavows those who, in our days yet considered her most zealous and sincere organs, declare that, in spite of the course of events and ideas, the right of Christ's representative on earth is still the same, that the subordination of all and everything to the Pope is the normal state and the independence of sovereign is a rebellion, and liberty and equality of religion a reversal of the divine order; if Rome, in short, adopts what it formerly cursed, then doubtlessly we shall be disposed to recognize that the regenerated Catholicism is able to join us, in order to combat with success and to the advantage of Christian civilization, the errors of the Revolution. But, as long as Rome has not thus pronounced her own death sentence, let us not beguile ourselves with an unfounded hope. When she needs our help, she can offer us her hand; but, when chances become favorable, it is her duty to extirpate us. When the Revolution, treating all positive religious convictions with the same disdain, or even, considering them as the greatest obstacle to human development, menaces and persecutes them with an equal hatred-- then, in such a danger, without a doubt, the distinctions between christians vanish. "Sound sense tells them that they are all facing the same enemy, much more dangerous for them than they can be for each other; for, if it triumphs (i.e., The Revolution), it would crush them all with one blow. They shall need all their re-united forces and all their efforts to triumph eventually in this war, and save at the same time Christianity and society." The necessity of a common resistance can give birth to some sort of temporal union. But Mr. Guizot does not seem to have sufficiently taken into account that in Catholicism's very nature there are insurmountable obstacles to a real and permanent alliance. Catholicism sees in the Reformation the germ of the Revolution. And from her point of view she is right; and observe well, she is right, not only with regard to a pseudo Protestantism, which is indeed nothing but the Revolution in the bud, but also with regard to Evangelical Protestantism. As

the Roman Catholic church identifies herself with the divine truth and divine authority, calls herself the official interpreter of God's word, admits of no operation of the Holy Spirit but without her own boundaries, she invariably confuses the sovereignty of the scripture, studied under the invocation of heavenly light, with the sovereignty of individual reason, brands obedience to God as revolt against his so-called vicar, and pretends that, if it is allowed to insinuate that atheism is logical rationalism, it is still more permitted to say that Protestantism is nothing but inconsistent rationalism. The Reformation on the other hand, can not forget what is false and fatal in real, ultramontanistic catholicism, (Papism). Here, too, man has been put in the place of God. It is at the sovereignty of man, proudly proclaimed or articially dissimulated, that Rome and the Revolution both arrive, be it along different roads. Against this double opposition, against a system which both in Church and State, is nothing but organized resistance, the Reformation comes to re-establish the principle of true authority and of true liberty; comes to build on eternal foundations the empire of modern ideas; comes to bring low man's pride and satisfy his legitimate disires, by proclaiming, as the source of man's duties and the guarantee for his rights, the sovereignty of God, the Divine Right.

IX THE REFORMATION ALONE IS ABLE TO OVERCOME
THE REVOLUTION BY REMAINING FAITHFUL TO
THE GOSPEL AND THUS LAYING CLAIM TO THE
FORMATION OF MODERN IDEAS. INFLUENCE OF
THE REFORMATION ON POLITICS.

Certainly, "to whichever church they may belong, all Christians have today a common cause. They must defend the Christian faith and the Christian law against impiety and anarchy." 1) But, to accomplish this task, nothing less is needed than the Christian truth, in its original simplicity, purity, and power; the Biblical, evangelical, apostolical christianity, the faith of the Churchfathers, of the Reformers, of all those who have desired to know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified, nothing but salvation by grace through the blood of the cross. The Gospel alone, freed from all fetters, freed from the superstitions in which Rome holds and degenerates it, can triumph over the Revolution. The truly Anti-revolutionary principle is the Gospel which remains ever the same, the sun of justice which always, after the night of errors, dissipates the shadows and re-arrises on the horizon. It destroys the Revolution in its root, silences its deceptive reasoning, and thus removes the very obstacles by which the character of liberalism itself makes the realization of its promises impossible. The rights of man, in so far as they are true and salutary, the improvements, the advantages which, under the revolution's influence, remain "Utopias," become realities through the development of Evangelical maxims.

Freed from a fatal alloying (fr. "alliage"), the modern ideas become evangelical ideas. Rome combats them, but they are found back in a positive, a scriptural Christianity. There is but one road to obtain the benefits which the Revolution promises: take up and pursue the work of the Reformation again. This is the true

1) Guizot

and only means of stripping the Revolution of its prestige and power, of taking away its reason for existence, and of exterminating it in men's minds.

To that end we must openly repudiate the false Protestantism which is the natural ally of the Revolution. The motives, nature, point of departure, development and results of the Reformation must be recalled. In 1841 I wrote: "It is essential to characterize the great and holy quarrel which for 150 years has dominated Modern History. This necessity becomes doubly felt at a time when Roman Catholicism on the one hand, a degenerate and unbelieving Protestantism on the other, vie with each other in attempting to corrupt and render unrecognizable the principal traits of this Christian regeneration and make a simple political or social movement. Instead of possessing things in common with revolutionary elements, the Reformation by nature rejects them. It is not enough to recognize that it could have never brought about a social change by itself, as it condemns the use of violence in all things. I must add that by causing the Christian principle to prevail - i. e. obedience proceeding from love to God, shown to the servant of God - by subordinating in all things the human authority to the divine authority, it has reaffirmed the power by replacing it on its true base; it has neutralized and killed many germs of rebellion produces especially towards the end of the Middle Ages, whether by a false application of the "Droit Romain," or by a hasty enthusiasm for the republican recollections of antiquity." At the time many Protestants, even those sincerely attached to the Gospel, though ignorant of the true nature of liberalism and failing to see in the revolutionary upheavals anything but excesses inseparable from a battle, considered it an honor to establish connections and resemblances between the Revolution and the Reformation. I, however, insisted on the contrast. "People often speak about analogies between the Revolution and the Reformation; let us try to give a resume of that. The Revolution takes its starting point in the sovereignty of man; the Reformation in the sovereignty of God. The one judges revelation by reason, the other submits reason to revealed truths. The former gives free reign to individual opinions, the latter brings unity of faith. The former loosens all social, yea, even domestic ties, the latter draws them tighter and sanctifies them. The Reformation triumphs through the death of many martyrs, the Revolution maintains itself through massacres. The Revolution comes up from the abyss, the Reformation descends from heaven."

I dared to hope that these preconceived opinions would disappear in the face of a serious examination.

"Many are the means," I added, "for rectifying such errors today. Mr. Merle d'Aubigne publishes his Histoire de la Reforme, so well-suited to dissipate by its simplicity and the details of the story, the prejudices of an often complete ignorance. Mr. Ranke profusely spreads the treasures of science in works where one finds everywhere a conscientious exposition of the facts. In Germany and elsewhere men turn with renewed enthusiasm to the study of the past. Let us therefore be confident; we only need a critical and honest examination." 1)

This confidence was not disappointed. The historical studies have considerably modified the judgments of critical men. They vie with each other in proclaiming that, unjustly, only the negative side of the Reformation has been seen. As an example I cite Mr. Guizot, who, after having formerly said, in his Cours d'Histoire Moderne:

"The crisis of the 16th century was not simply of a reformatory nature; it was essentially revolutionary."

1) Archives de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau, 1st Series, T.E. (2nd Edition) - Prolegom.

It is impossible to take from it this character, these merits and vices," recently affirmed, "It was not only to throw off a yoke, but also to profess and practise a faith, that the Reformation began and was carried on with perseverance; the movement was in principle, essentially religious."

A similar opinion has been expressed by a Catholic writer, Mr. de Ramusat 1):

"The principle of the Reformation is not a certain theory about the constitution of the church, nor in some doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper and the other sacraments, nor in hatred of the Pope's excessive power; even less is it a general spirit for innovation, a general desire for resisting oppression; even less, if this is possible, is it the idea of opposing reason to faith, or even investigation to authority. The principle of this religious revolution is religious, nor revolutionary. It is the principle of justification by faith, and only by faith."

In the field of religion the Reformation has been a Reveil" (Awakening), which has called into being the Evangelical churches and has even exerted a salutary influence on the Catholic church. Let us see once more how, in the political sphere, it has become the foundation (ground) for the many ideas which have wrongly been considered as discoveries and conquests of the Revolution.

Protestantism, it is often said, has spirit of liberty, catholicism the spirit of authority. This is a misconception. Thus one fails to appreciate the basis, the character and the work of the Reformation. It has not put liberty over and against authority; it has dethroned an arbitrary and illegitimate authority, by re-establishing the authority of God's Word and the Holy Spirit. That is precisely why, standing on this immovable basis, it has been able, without fear, to allow the principle of a liberty whose source, rule and limit was obedience to God, to work through. It has thus, in a large measure, given the rights and liberties, where of the Revolution has merely unfolded the magnificent program.

It is the Reformation which, against the pretensions of Rome, has founded the independence of civil government not on the caprices of monarchs but on the order desired by divine law - not, to legalize an arbitrary power, but to remind, whoever exercises power, of his dependence upon God, who entrusts that power to him and will demand on account for it. The sovereign thus becomes, from papal subordinate, God's minister. Sovereignty by the grace of God, the Divine Right, standing against ecclesiastical pretensions and the arbitrariness of the majority of votes under all forms of government, be it monarchical or republican, is the foundation of the responsibility of every sovereign to the King of kings and of the submission of the subjects to the authority, out of love to Him from Whom that authority proceeds. Therefore, separation of the spiritual and temporal powers, distinction between Church and State, not in order to make of despotism the fundamental law; not, as has been said 2), in order to deny the eternal charter of rights and duties against which all arbitrary and unbounded power is crushed, but on the contrary, in order to submit Church and State, each in its own sphere, to the immediate authority of H.m to Whom has been given all power in heaven and on earth, in order to establish, not the atheistic State, but the State withdrawn from the influence of the clergy (l'Etat laique), not the absolutism of the State, but the State subordinate to the divine will, the Christian State.

It is the Reformation which, through the nature of its precepts and the sacrifice of its martyrs, has caused the rights of the individual to prevail.

1) Ch. de Ramusat: 1797-1875 - French Statesman

2) Lamennais.

When the power had finally found back its foundation, "the principle of individuality," says Mr. Vinet, "received from the hands of the reformers, not an explicit confirmation, but irrefutable proofs of its right." The Reformation safeguards the most intimate and most sacred essence of liberty from every sort of socialism, be it catholic, ancient, or contemporary. It safeguards it from the revolutionary idea that the State is the organ of the general will, before whose omnipotence all public and private rights vanish.

It is the Reformation which, by preaching and practicing absolute submission to the divine will, obedience to men for the sake of obedience to God, resistance to human law as soon as it becomes contrary to the Divine Law, and which by revindicating personal responsibility and independence has prepared the road for freedom of conscience and freedom of investigation.

All truths, all liberties, are related to each other. They proceed from the same principle and are but the various applications of it. It should not be difficult to trace and bring back to their common origin such things as equality before the law which is the true system for the welfare of all humanity, fraternal love and nationality. On the bases of the Reformation a constitutional law could be worked out, which would be but the simultaneous and harmonious development of order and liberty.

Indirectly and through natural connections the Reformation has exercised an incalculable influence upon legislative and political development, upon the forms of government and the guarantees of liberty. This sympathetic bond has been clarified by Mr. Guizot, in a passage which, although more directly related to the history of England, is equally applicable to protestantism in general:

"The energetically working conscience created audacious ideas and plans; religious beliefs were in need of political rights; men began to reflect why they did not enjoy them any longer. Who was usurping them, on what grounds, and what needed to be done to regain them? The thoughts of the middle-class man, even of the peasant, extended well beyond that of his own condition. He was a Christian. With his friends he probed the mysteries of the divine power; what earthly power was so lofty that it need no longer consider it! In the Holy Scriptures he read the laws of God. To obey them he was forced to violate others. He had to consider when the latter had to be discarded. He, who inquires into the limits of the rights of a master, will soon be looking for their origin."

When awakened in matters of religion, the spirit of investigation soon spread to all spheres of intellectual activity. In reminding man of the dignity of his origin and destiny the Reformation made the despicable character of a dull resignation and the intolerable character of an oppressive yoke keenly felt. It taught appreciation for the privilege of the voluntary obedience of the people, of their participation in the management of the affairs of the community. By it the Reformation prepared and determined the progress by which the modern state has become or strives to become a public concern instead of a government of some individuals.

As Reformed Christians in the Netherlands, we have the more reason to call home these benefits. More than any other church has the Reformed Church founded model governments, wherein liberty, far from dealing power a staggering blow, has established it on solid foundations. One can enumerate the extravagancies and faults of an excessive and passionate Puritanism. Nevertheless, it remains true that the great social improvements effected protestantism, are a result of the Reformation. It was the result not of an "uncertain, servile

Reformation more attached to temporal interests than beliefs, which alarmed by the movement which had given birth to it, tried to borrow from Catholicism everything that it could possibly take along when they separated. It was the outcome of a spontaneous, ardent Reformation, disregarding mundane considerations, accepting the consequences of its principles. In short it was a spiritual revolution begun in the name and with the passion of faith."1) Consider England; consider America. An unimpeachable witness, Macaulay, attests; Especially to the Reformation does England owe her political and intellectual freedom and all the blessings which flow from it." A writer whose judgment with regard to the U.S.A. has equal authority, Mr. Bancroft 2), recalls, giving the same testimony, that it is scrupulously Biblical protestantism transplanted to an other hemisphere which has produced there, as in Europe, splendid results: "The English people have become protestant through the Puritans." This is also the case in my country. The more one studies the history of the United Provinces, the more one is forced to recognize that the Reformation, completely and rigorously carried out, (bold towards men because of humble and complete submission to the Word of God), that the pious inflexibility of the evangelical protestants has been the cause of our popular liberties, our national independence, and our prosperity. Liberty flourishes under the shield of faith. Hac nitimur hanc tuemur: leaning on the Bible, we maintain our liberty. 3) That was the motto and history of the Republic.

"It was England's fortune," writes Mr. Guizot, "that in the 17th century the spirit of religious faith and of political liberty held their sway side by side. The pioneers of faith had an anchor to which they clung, a compass which they trusted. The Gospel was their Magna Charta. Despite their pride they humbled themselves before this law, which they did not make."

And, passing to the American revolution, he adds:

"The moral gravity and good practical sense of the old Puritans persisted among most American admirers of the French 'philosophes'. By far the greater part of the American people remained deeply religious, as strongly attached to their dogmas as to their liberties."

The Gospel can claim an abundance of happy results, but the Revolution will always end in disappointments. Why was the English Revolution successful? This is the title of a discourse of Mr. Guizot. It is a title with a two-fold meaning, for it contains and silently presumes another one: Why did the French and European revolution fail? With respect to our future, the problem is of immense interest. The author presents the question as follows:

"The English Revolution has succeeded twice. I should like to ask what the causes are which brought in England to the constitutional monarchy and in British America to the republic, that lasting success which France and Europe until now pursue in vain, present, through the mysterious trials of the Revolution, which well or ill received, will make the nations great or cause them to err for centuries."

The contrast is mysterious only in appearance. The ephemeral construction, the perpetual set-backs of the spirit of the Revolution are the inevitable re-

1) Guizot

2) G. Bancroft. 1800-1891. American author and statesman.

3) Legend near the image of the virgin leaning on the Bible, carrying the lance of freedom; on the "coins" A.D. 1590, 1615, as slogan of the United Netherlands. Later, from 1681-1800 legend of the f3,-, fl,-, f0.50 and f0.25 coins.

suits of the weakness and impotence of the man who turns his back upon his Creator.

"Except Jehovah build the house, they labour in vain that build it. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Men take counsel together against Jehovah, and against His Anointed, saying, 'Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their cords from us.' He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh. The Lord will have them in derision."

Before political liberty will triumph, the Revolution, systematically rebellious against the divine order, will have to make room for the Gospel. Nothing is in store for that Revolution but a constantly renewed Tantalus-torment and Sisiphus-labor. It will ever desire unattainable fruits and ever see the stone, which it laboriously rolled up the inaccessible summit, tumble downward.

X

FALSE CONSERVATISM

(Is Antirevolutionary the same as Conservatism?)

The Anti-Revolutionary principle is no other than the Christian principle, the principle of the Reformation. It is but the faith in the living God.

The religious question is the first and most important question and controls and contains the political question.

It is a matter of returning to the eternal truths. No more, no less. In my opinion, the anti-revolutionary party is "the party of the Christians, a party distinct from all the others in that, properly speaking, it is not a party, i.e., a party which will never allow itself to be incorporated, neither with the ministry, whatever it may do, nor with the opposition, whatever it may desire, but which, in accordance with justice, will now join the ministry, now the opposition, and if necessary, will distantiate itself from both." 1)

There is for man but one salutary and legitimate course: the one of faith and obedience to the Divine Revelation and the Divine Authority. One must return to it, if one has had the misfortune of having strayed from it. This spirit of conservation which preserves the foundations which protect society is for that very reason the spirit of true progress. We desire no other return, no other conservatism, no other reaction.

There are two kinds of conservatism which we reject with equal firmness:

First, the conservatism which proposes to revive the past, not understanding that "any attempt in this direction will soon end in a hideous caricature; that one cannot at will call the past into being again and that, if this is attempted, nothing but empty form will result." 2) This conservatism which shows a ridiculous and fatal attachment to everything that is old and obsolete, which forgets that life is only preserved by growth, that all that lives is subject to change, that existence is revealed by movement and progress, would even be inclined to revive the abuses which the Revolution has done away with. It would be willing

1) Vinet.

2) Fiegee.

to undo the conquests of the modern mind and the improvements which, in spite of the revolutionary spirit, have been the good and laudable results of the social commotions: the freedom of religion, abolition of the excessive privileges of nobility and clergy, equality before the law, reformation of the penal laws, unity of the civil right, political centralisation and the regular intervention of the nations in the government of their affairs.

Second, the revolutionary conservations which frightened by the consequences of the principle which it adopts, rejects the consequences, but persists in its errors. It stops, not to depart from its course, but in order not to be dragged along any further; which, all things considered, is but a status quo, a station, a halt, from which the chariot, after a forced rest, breaks down the barrier and rolls on with frightening speed. A conservatism which, in governmental forms and exceptional laws behind which it conceals itself, offers only short-lived guarantees, which disappear in the moment of peril, which everytime by a new experiment demonstrates that material force and violence yield to logic. We scorn this precarious and dangerous assistance. We, too, do not want the contra-revolution, but the opposite of the Revolution.

Often have I been reproached for a statement which I did not make accidentally, but which I used after mature deliberation: "Our isolation is our strength." What does this mean? It means that we are not a nuance, blending with other nuances, into one and the same party; that we are a distinct party bound to the eternal and unrecognized truths, to a principle which is opposed by many opinions which, however different they may be or appear to be, entertain the same disdain for that which in our opinion is the indispensable condition for the social order.

Separation is required here. At least, if we join other parties, we must carefully see to it that we are not assimilated by them. One so easily runs the danger of remaining in the background, of humiliating oneself, of being swallowed up. Moreover, we must stand outside the revolutionary current and have an unshakeable basis in the authority of the divine laws, in order not to be swept along by the wide-spread enthusiasm.

XI

CONSERVATISM AND PROGRESS

(Does the Anti-Revolutionary Principle confuse Religion with Politics?)

Thus to defend the anti-revolutionary principle, the objective truth, the historic continuity, in the Church as well as in the State, is that confusing religion and politics?

Certainly not; for the principles, the interests, and the dangers are the same.

"The interests of the civil authority and of the Christian religion are obviously the same; the divine and human orders, Church and State, face the same dangers and the same enemies," 1)

In the higher regions of the general principles it is absurd to wish for a division of religious and political truth. On that level war is waged against the same doctrine, equally destructive of Church and State, morality and jus-

1) Guizot

tice. When attention is paid to that connection and this indissoluble bond is not broken, religion is no more sacrificed to politics than politics to religion. Neither are the live and regenerative forces in society paralysed or is the spirit of improvement and progress opposed. To the contrary. Thus religion is assured of her legitimate influence. Thus a new impetus is given to an illuminated politics. Thus the road to real reforms is opened. That which renders them impracticable is put out of the way, by banishing the pernicious and detrimental principle of the Revolution.

Oft have I been accused of not wanting progress. If this is to say that I have not wanted to keep a course which seems dangerous and wrong, I fully accept the reproach. To renounce error is the initial and most important progress on the road of truth. Above all the doctrines which result in so many errors and disasters must be repudiated and the traditional rights must be restored as they were formed, and, so to say, crystallized through the free acts of men and under control of God's eternal laws.

Loyal to this precept of an intelligent polemic, I have constantly declared myself opposed to the anarchistic principle and the maxims in which it incorporates and reveals itself.

"Opposed to the pre-eminently revolutionary inclination and sin, inclination toward and sin of destruction to give himself the proud pleasure of creating. Against the malady which leads man to consider everything perceivable, persons and things, rights and facts, past and present, as an inert mass which can be disposed of at will and be moulded into any desired fashion. Against the error which, though preaching the sovereignty of the people, considers the people an immense aggregate of individuals - so many thousands, so many millions counted in a certain territory, contained in and represented by one single number which is now called King, now Assembly." 2)

* Against the absolutism of the majority. Against that false and tyrannical unity which in the name of the sovereign people, under a centralizing and administrative yoke, forces men into a passive obedience - even in the restricted circle of local interests. Against the destruction of the influence of gifted minds, against the abolishment of social distinctions after which despotism remains society's only refuge.

But, although I thus wanted to remove every germ of trouble and dissolution, confident in the excellence of the principles which I profess, and led by them, I did not hesitate to declare myself a zealous advocate of all useful reforms, of all real and lawful progress, of all that which, be it opposed to the ambition of the Zeitgeist or in conformance to it, leads man on in the course of a Christian civilization. I have applauded the slow, steady, transformation of the personal power into power of the state and the influence of the republican sentiment on the monarchy in general, and on ours in particular. I applauded the participation of the people in the legislative affairs the constitutional regime, not in the sense of the modern reformers as having no basis except their chimerical theories, but in accordance with the nature of man, with the history and institutions of the country, i.e., the written constitutions, not those which exist on paper only, but those laws which sum up, coordinate and perfect the national and traditional rights.

There is no one who more fervently than I has wished for the reality of re- 1)

1) Guizot

2) Guizot

3) Cf. Adviezen, 1840, p. 116.

representative government - the natural development of my country's glorious history. For me the sovereignty of the House of Orange, the final award for an age-old struggle for national independence and the people's rights, has always been indissolubly bound up with the constitution as it is loyally applied and inviolable even in the most threatening crises. But, without denying the importance of constitutional guarantees, I have above all sought the strength of the government in the sympathies of the people, in the memories of its past, in the popularity of the dynasty, in the energy, the morality and piety which formerly founded and consolidated the authority of the Republic. Nobody, in word or deed, has been more zealous for publicity, for the freedom of the press in general and of the periodical conservatism which, whether prompted by personal interest or by fear, sometimes remains indifferent and inactive, sometimes abandons itself to violent excesses which most often are due to its excessive fears and terrors. Nobody has shown himself a greater enemy of bureaucracy, autocracy, parliamentary or royal arbitrariness. But, in spite of my sincere desire to cooperate with regard to political betterment, I was deeply convinced that no form of government and constitution is of any effect, unless they are rooted in the historic and divine right.

As early as the memorable years 1829 and 1830, when the diplomatic arrangements 1815 and the attempts to eliminate national differences through an artificial unity and amalgamation of the governments ended, for the Kingdom of the Netherlands, in an inevitable schism, I attempted to demonstrate both the advantages and insufficiencies of the constitutional government. There are advantages, provided such a form of government is considered and used, not as an obstacle, but as the surest means of establishing desirable relations and a mutual support between government and nation. I did not cease to point out the danger of such a personal government with which the King was then so pleased, the necessity of replacing ministers who were tools of the King's will, with a true ministry, an intelligent body independent of the sovereign, responsible to throne and nation. Even at that time I thought that, not by giving in to the current opinions or by relying on the administrative and material forces, but by taking into account the real needs, lawful complaints, national sentiments, religious beliefs, and acquired rights, we could rally all men of good will, disarm the agitators and avert grave perils. And when the King, who loved to listen to the most divergent opinions, sometimes also condescended to ask mine, I allowed myself to add on every occasion with a respectful frankness that without a change of principles there was no possibility of success. Incessantly I added:

"One condition must first be fulfilled; for nothing that should be done, can be done; nothing will suffice, nothing will be truly useful, if you, Sir, do not renounce liberalism, whose idol you have been and whose victim you shall be; if you do not know how to distinguish between the spirit of the Revolution and the truly constitutional and national spirit, and thus turn against itself the forces with which it threatens you now; if you do not fully succeed in distinguishing the nation from a faction led astray by false doctrines; if you do not abjure the theories which you believed you could use, hoping to mod the distinctive traits of the most diverse populations into a homogenous whole. Unless the constitutional government frankly and resolutely embarks on this new course, it will, far from serving as a tool for your purposes and governed by an anarchistic faction, become the means of a then inevitable dissolution of the Kingdom."

I especially tried to make him realize that the Revolution could not be resisted unless men conquered the irreligious principle of which the Revolution is but the logical development and that in order to combat the tendencies of an irreligious radicalism, politics must have faith to support it. Not a faith which is hastily formed under the pressure of a threatening crisis, but that faith which comes from the heart; not the faith which serves us, but that faith which dominates us.

When in 1833, I voluntarily withdrew from public life, I believed that henceforth I had to continue the battle in another sphere. Liberalism had already dominated public opinion for a long time, held sway over the upper classes of society, and counted almost all of the politicians, preachers, scholars and men of letters among its adherents. I thought it essential to return to the source of the evil and to combat the prejudices and errors by publishing sound studies of History and Constitutional Law. Nevertheless, I did not always want to withdraw myself from a more direct and practical activity. Called in 1840 to take part in the deliberations of the Estates General concerning the revision of the Constitution, I again was quick to stress the necessity of a principal, not solely a formal, change. To me a new garment did not seem sufficient proof of recovery. And in the long years when I was free from the work and cares which always accompany political participation, I was allowed to dispose freely of my time and energy, I was happy to aid the attempts of my friends to remove the obstacles which a timorous liberalism placed in the way of the evangelical awakening in Church and school. There, only there, I thought, could be found the guarantees for a better future. By confronting irreligious philosophy with the one holy Catholic faith, I tried to throw light on the advantages which evangelical Protestantism has to establish and reconcile power and liberty. History, which provides us with numerous proofs of this, furnishes a striking example of that in our own country. The course of it is a practical elucidation of the Saviour's words: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." How can we despair of the future when we recall the past! In the midst of grievous disappointments, the faith and life which reappeared in the Reformed Church seemed to foretell better times. In my opinion this regenerated Church should not be regarded as a lever for any political party, but as a leaven which, as the parable expresses it, is the only true method of extending God's rule over every sphere of life.

By thus, for the preservation of our opinion, defending the anti-revolutionary principle, I have not yet, I think, finished my task. "You have not yet answered the reproach of your friends at all," men are sure to say to me. For evidently several of their number do not fight the principle as such; they only disapprove of the application which you have made, as soon as you, as a regular member of parliament, were in a position to influence the public course of events. By attempting, with the aid of the new institutions, to give ascendancy to a religious party, by introducing unseasonably the Christian principles into parliamentary discussions, by the testing all questions to the viewpoint of your religious zeal, you have contributed to the secularization of the Gospel and the provocation of a clearly visible hostility towards religion which through this pernicious disorder is brought to danger and discredit. You almost forced the Liberals to become or seem adversaries of Christianity - forced them to class you and your supporters with the enemies of the modern state. Thus the deplorable obstinacy with which you have transported religious ideas to the political sphere, has occasioned endless misunderstanding, useless debates, and has made all your labor fruitless.

Let us see if our parliamentary conduct wholly or partly justifies such a grave accusation.