

mennais, he founded in 1830 a Catholic organ, *L'Avenir*, which had extraordinary success. It took for its device "God and Liberty"; its aim was to reconcile Catholicism with democracy. It went so far as to demand the separation of Church and State in order to secure complete independence for the Church. Some of its doctrines frightened the bishops, who felt themselves sufficiently protected by the Concordat signed by Napoleon and the Pope. They brought some of the doctrines of the *Avenir* before Gregory XVI. Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert went in person to Rome to defend themselves; after some delays, the journal was condemned and disappeared in 1832.

Montalembert's reputation was made. Although he bowed before the decision of Rome, he continued to defend such doctrines of the *Avenir* as had not been specifically condemned, and chiefly engaged in the defence of the liberty of teaching, which he believed to be one of the "necessary liberties," to use an expression of Thiers. We find, in a letter written on the 8th of April, 1839, to a friend of his, the Abbé Delor:

"The liberty of teaching which so justly preoccupies you is the object of my constant wishes; under its banner I entered public life when I had hardly emerged from infancy [Montalembert entered the House of Peers when he came of age], and I will never desert it. But I have little hope as long as the bishops, the clergy, and the Catholic heads of families follow the present system—that is to say, as long as they keep aloof, isolated from the social movement and the political habits of the country, expecting the return of an order of things which I believe is gone for ever; instead of descending into the arena. . . . There is nothing to hope. The Government will maintain a monopoly which it thinks precious; false liberalism will not claim a liberty which would be profitable only to Catholicism, and the isolated voice of a few royalistic Peers or Deputies will be lost in the storm of egoistic and noisy passions which dominate the Chambers. The question of the liberty of teaching is entirely in the hands of the bishops."

The Abbé Delor, to whom this letter was addressed, lived at Limoges; he died only in 1899, at the age of ninety years. The letters which Montalembert addressed to him during a long period have just been published. In 1841, M. Villemain, who was then Minister of Public Instruction, presented to the Chambers an Education bill. It authorized the opening of free schools, independent of the University, under certain guarantees of culture and morality. The masters were to have diplomas, conferred after examination. The law applied to the seminaries where the young priests were educated and were so far under the control solely of the bishops. This last clause provoked the opposition of the episcopate, and, after long discussions, the bill was withdrawn. Montalembert took a prominent part in the discussion, and his letters to the Abbé Delor bear traces of it. We also find allusions to an affair which made much noise in 1844. A certain Made-moiselle C—— of Tulle had entered a Carmelite convent against the will of her parents. The municipal council asked the Government to close the convent, and the Prefect of the Corrèze was inclined to use violence and to disperse the Carmelites forcibly. The Bishop, Monseigneur Bertheaud, wrote to the Minister of the Interior, Martin du Nord: "You have the power to do so; but the doors will not open themselves—

you will have to break them in, and you will find me behind them in my sacerdotal robes."

Montalembert was Deputy after the Revolution of 1848. Under the Republic, as under the monarchy, he remained at the head of the party which placed religious interests above political. He writes to his friend: "The Catholics, like all other Frenchmen, adore success. After having saluted, with a haste as servile as it is inexplicable, the advent of the Republic, many are tempted to look with distrust on the soldier who, faithful to his device and to his habit, tells the truth to the new powers as he spoke it to the fallen powers, without fear and without hope." He had not identified religion with royalty; he no more wished to identify it with democracy.

M. de Montalembert took a very active part in the discussion of the law still known under the name of "the Falloux law," from the Minister who proposed it. It established freedom of secondary instruction. The Catholic paper, the *Univers*, attacked M. de Falloux's bill, which the editor, Louis Veuillot, did not consider of a nature to satisfy the Catholics completely. From that date there arose a constant state of opposition between Montalembert and Veuillot. Montalembert represented what may be called the liberal wing of the Catholic party; Veuillot was hostile to all liberalism. In 1852 Montalembert wrote to his friend:

"I have remained what I was, the humble soldier of the Church, but also the firm friend of Liberty. It is under her shield and that of Truth that I have so resolutely struggled since 1847 against the wretches who, under cover of her name, have propagated the democratic and social revolution. But now I see that the Catholics who follow the *Univers* don't want any more of Liberty, which has helped them to so many successes [the Falloux law]; they bow to force and victory. . . . I want to remain erect, and I have ceased to be the man of the present movement."

By this he means the reaction which culminated in the establishment of the Empire. Montalembert did not refuse support to Prince Louis Napoleon when he was elected by the vote of the people; he hoped to enlist him among the supporters of his views. The Prince had seen him many times, and had given him hopes which were bitterly disappointed. The anger of Montalembert, who was of a very passionate disposition, was equal to the sympathy which he had felt for a time. He is very bitter, after the proclamation of the Empire, against "the mean Catholics who burned their incense before Liberty, when they believed her triumphant, and who now sacrifice her without remorse or embarrassment to the new influences and to the fashion of the day." He speaks of himself as "shipwrecked."

Montalembert, thus hostile to the Empire, was in opposition to L. Veuillot, who continued to support the Empire till the Italian policy of Napoleon alarmed him for the temporal power of the Papacy. The Catholic world was divided till the Roman question was opened. In 1860 the Romagna was detached from the States of the Church, and some French bishops, who had long been silent, entered a protest against this curtailing of the Papal territory. Montalembert applauded their efforts loudly.

"Nantes," said he, "Poitiers and Perpi-

gnan [meaning the bishops of these towns], and others, have been admirable. They have said things which cannot be surpassed; but the accent of Tulle has been supplied by nobody else. A little thunder and lightning was necessary. . . . I am in anguish, in desolation, in all the bitterness of powerless wrath; what despicable blindness everywhere! I long thought that when their houses should burn, people would see. They are burning, and people won't see."

The houses did burn, and the temporal power found few defenders. In 1860 Montalembert asked M. de Persigny for permission to found a paper, in which he meant to defend the temporal power; but it was refused. "The Minister," he said, "tried to reassure me as to the designs of the Government; he did not succeed—far from it. How ignorant they are, how blinded by pride, how entangled in their own nets!"

Montalembert wrote a curious letter to his friend the Abbé Delor, who had expressed to him the hope of seeing some day on the throne in France a friend of the Church of Rome:

"You see the salvation of the Church and of society in I don't know what kind of orthodox Cæsar. This dream is completely foreign to the spirit which presided over the Catholic movement of 1830 and of 1850—a liberal spirit to which I remained faithful, and which will not seek in Utopias for the solution of present difficulties. I know in the history of France but two orthodox Cæsars, Charlemagne and Cæsar. Charlemagne left behind him only the pitiful race of the Carolingians, reduced to a happy impotence by the liberal spirit of the Germanic races: Saint Louis had for his grandson Philippe le Bel, whose fatal germ survived in all his successors."

In 1863, Montalembert was a candidate for the Legislature, but he was attacked by the Government and defeated. He had stood only with reluctance, and he writes to his friend: "I have encountered so much treachery and meanness in contemporary France, especially among the Catholics, that I have no great desire to enter again into public life." He adds: "I should like enlightened and sincere priests like yourself to ask themselves, How is it that the French clergy, which, in 1848 and 1849, succeeded in having 180 Catholic Representatives elected, could not have a single one in 1863? How are we to explain this incredible political and social diminution of influence?" He attributes it himself to the set of Catholic journalists whose tactics have set the nation against them. He denounces their defamation of the vanquished and the weak, their adulation of the strong, their constant and systematic denunciation and proscription of reason and of liberty. He has eloquent words against the influence exercised over the clergy of France by the Catholic press proclaiming itself the only interpreter of Catholic truth.

These letters of Montalembert's deserve to be read, and I have read them with melancholy; the past throws its light over the present, and the present has much to learn from the past.

## Correspondence.

### THE STUDY OF HISTORY IN THE SOUTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Dr. Dodd has done a real service to the South in showing how greatly the

teaching of history has been neglected there. His statement may surprise many people, but it is not materially erroneous. It would perhaps be valuable if the discussion were carried further and the whole subject given a thorough examination. Many Southerners would be glad to see such a discussion, and it could not fail to bring up in a variety of views much real truth.

The South has had too few of the benefits of full discussion. The fathers of most of us were Confederate soldiers, but that does not mean that we ought to believe that their political views were correct. The mere acceptance of their views as an act of loyalty stands for an impoverished state of thought on the part of the children. Tradition weakens thought. If the *Nation* can, therefore, make itself a means of bringing out counter opinions on this subject, it will deserve the thanks of all right-minded people. It will also strengthen the group of independent investigators to which Dr. Dodd has referred.

The most conservative force in Southern history is the politician. In this part of the Union he has always had great influence. He dominated most phases of thought. It has suited his purposes to glorify the men of the past and to flatter those of the present. He has created in the popular mind an unreal historical spirit. He is not necessarily insincere. He got his views of history in the same school in which he has taught them, and they frequently seem to be honestly held. But whether he is sincere or not, he is sagacious enough to see that if, through independent historical research, men should come to modify their views of politics, his own chances of success would be lessened. He has, therefore, defended the old ideas. Any attempt to introduce new notions will arouse his opposition; and his influence is such over public opinion that conditions may become very uncomfortable for the apostles of new ideas.

This condition of affairs has a vital relation to Southern institutions of learning. Most of these institutions depend for their success directly on public opinion. They must have either legislative appropriations, or popular contributions, or tuition fees. They are, accordingly, very prone to be conservative. It suits them to have history taught in a colorless and nerveless manner. The real secret of the spirit of independence at Trinity College is the fact that it has received liberal donations of equipment and endowment, and is liberated from the power of existing public opinion. It has thus been able to take its own course and to develop a new spirit in its own community. Other institutions will doubtless do the same thing as soon as they are financially able.—Very truly,

JOHN S. BASSETT.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DURHAM, N. C.,  
August 23, 1902.

#### MARGARET FULLER AND "THE DIAL."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you kindly pardon me for giving you a little word of information? In your paper of August 7 you have an article on that book of Thoreau which has lately been published. You say something about Margaret Fuller, "then one of the editors of the *Dial*," and about Emerson as the as-

sociate editor. Now, by reference to T. W. Higginson, Kenyon West, and others who have written about Margaret Fuller, as well as by reference to the biographies by Clarke, Channing, and Emerson, you will see that, during the four years of the *Dial's* existence, Margaret Fuller was its only editor for two years. She was its first editor, receiving no help from Emerson except as he was contributor, the same as Alcott and others. When she finally gave up the editing, it was because she had been overtaxed, had many burdens, and had received no pay. We must be just to the memory of the noblest woman of letters that America has yet produced.—Sincerely yours,

F. L. H.

DARK HARBOR, ME., August 17, 1902.

#### PROPERTY IN LETTERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have recently had my attention called to what is perhaps an isolated case of a breach of academic ethics, and one which is not, I hope, likely to become general.

The case is that of a young man who was an unsuccessful candidate for an academic appointment in one of the larger universities. He sent in with his application such testimonials as to character and ability as he had himself received from friends and instructors, and requested others to write to the President of the university direct in his behalf. In such cases the candidate is entitled to receive again all the papers he has sent in, but in this case—and here comes my point—he received not only his own letters, but those addressed to the university President in his behalf. Perhaps the notion that a letter is the private and exclusive property of the one to whom it is addressed and the writer of the letter, is old-fashioned and out of date, but all honor to those who believe they have no right to make public the contents of a letter without the consent of the writer.—Most truly yours,

LOUIS N. WILSON, Librarian.

CLARK UNIVERSITY, WORCESTER, MASS.,  
August 15, 1902.

#### THE "SWEAT BOX."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a Chicago paper of recent date we read:

"The attempt to wring a confession from the prisoner by putting him in the 'sweat box,' it is expected, will result," etc.

And again:

"The prisoner has become almost a physical wreck under the 'sweat box' ordeal, and appears as if he might break down at any time."

Much outcry is being made, and justly, against the cruelty and barbarism of the "water cure" and other atrocities practised by our army upon the benighted Filipinos; yet here at home, in our own Christian land, under the shadow of church spires and university domes, we tolerate the unlawful and inhuman custom of torturing persons arrested on suspicion of being principals in or accessories to a crime. This torture is inflicted without sanction or authority of law, and in conflict with all Constitutional rights and guaranties. It is done for the purpose of extorting confessions of guilt from the suspected persons. As "no person shall be compelled, in any

criminal case, to be a witness against himself," these extorted confessions cannot be used as evidence against him. The ruse is, however, to introduce them as "voluntary" confessions; and thus, by an abuse of authority and disregard for law and right, by means of duress and torture, a prisoner under the law is forced to renounce the protection of the law, and, contrary to his constitutional right, is compelled to give incriminating testimony against himself.

And by whom is this illegal process conducted? By the most petty and subordinate officers of the law—policemen and jailors; men whose only recommendation to the offices they hold is, frequently, their brutality. What right have these men to "try" or in any way interfere with prisoners? The person held by them is entitled to "a trial by jury," and what man can deprive him of that right? The duty of a policeman is merely to bring the person "by lawful authority" into the custody of the law; and a jailor's business is to "keep him safely" until a "speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury," shall be had.

As you would abolish lynch law and all other relics of barbarism from our system of jurisprudence, I beg of you to help abolish also the unlawful, inhuman physical tortures administered by means of the "sweat box" or "third degree."

MARGARET IRVING HAMILTON.

AUGUST 16, 1902

#### Notes.

Fisher Unwin will soon bring out 'Lombard Studies,' by Countess Evelyn Martinengo Cesaresco, whose 'Italian Characters,' 'The Liberation of Italy,' and 'Cavour' are well known.

Thomas Whittaker's autumn list will embrace 'Makers of Modern Fiction,' by W. J. Dawson; 'Cameos from Nature,' by Mrs. J. T. Gumersall; 'The Church and its Social Mission,' by Dr. J. Marshall Lang, Principal of the University of Aberdeen; 'The Story of Catherine of Siena,' by Florence Witts; 'Up and Down the Pantiles,' by Emma Marshall; and a 'Robert Browning Birthday Book.'

From Scribners we are to have a posthumous volume from the pen of Frank R. Stockton, 'John Gayther's Garden and the Stories Told Therein'; and 'Views and Reviews, Essays in Appreciation—Art,' by W. E. Henley.

'Recollections of a Player,' by James H. Stoddart, is in the press of the Century Co., together with a Bible for children edited by the Rev. Francis Brown, D.D., of the Union Theological Seminary.

The Outlook Co. are to publish 'The Tragedy of Pelée,' by George Kennan, illustrated.

'The Philosophy of Despair,' the reply of Science to pessimism, by President David Starr Jordan, is announced by Elder & Shepard, San Francisco.

The Baker & Taylor Co. have in preparation a compilation of coffee history, coffee anecdote, and coffee verse, by Arthur H. Gray, with 'recipes for the making of coffee from the leading chefs of the country.'

We have received from the office of the *Publishers' Weekly* the two volumes of the 'Reference Catalogue of Current Literature,' the British analogue of our 'American