

seems to be subject to the same fluctuations as every thing else belonging to man, and may be divided into epochs. Epochs of intelligence seem to add little to the sum of their successors. Our epoch has derived little from that, the last glimmering of which shone so brilliantly on Egypt. We cannot conclude that that intelligence was confined to Egypt alone, but probably it died out earlier in other countries.

Since then nothing seems fixed, but everything in motion; since man seems doomed, like Sisypus, to roll his stone to the top of the mountain only to find that he has to commence at the bottom again, and since, above all, human nature is the same now as it ever was, still governed by the same passions and influenced by the same fears, history must in all cases be beneficial, not as furnishing particular facts, for as such it is useless, but as presenting those things which accelerated national greatness, and delayed national extinction, and elevated or degraded the race as a whole.

Now, looking at the Science of Government through history in this light, what seems to be the governing influence? The opinions of historians seem unreliable. This one will say truth and justice, the other corruption. The most impartial are biased, and given to hero worship. This one worships force, that one tact, the other magnificence. Each one forms an idea or a theory, and facts are warped to suit that idea or theory. Historians claim to be indifferent, but ideas and theories in civilized communities grow with the growth of men, and unconsciously affect their judgment. Impartial history is an impossibility, so long as religious belief is in its present position. History at present is but the abuse of the rival sects. As sectarianism is at the present time prevented from doing any thing worse than railing by public opinion, it seeks to perpetuate itself by mutual abuse and rancor. Facts are right and wrong, constitutional and unconstitutional, as they support or defeat certain principles. The massacre of St. Bartholomew is the disgrace or the glory of France, as if it were possible to form two opinions