

### Communications.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—The Editors are not responsible for the views of correspondents. No attention is paid to anonymous communications. Under no circumstances can we undertake to preserve or return unused manuscripts.

Geneva, New York, January 22d, A. D. 1875.

The Secretary of the House of Deputies would respectfully beg that clergymen and others who may chance to have copies of the General Convention Journals, 1838 to 1865 inclusive, which they do not care to keep, will kindly forward them to him by mail or express at his expense, for the purpose of enabling him to place in our larger libraries, and to furnish to the various Synodical and Convocational bodies of the Church abroad, with which we are in communion, copies of our Convention proceedings. By means of such gifts, supplementing as they will the recent reprint of the early Journals in three volumes, 1785-1835 inclusive, he will be able to meet the many requests for these documents of our legislation which he has already on file from, for instance, the Primus of the Church in Scotland, the Convocation of Canterbury, and several of the Synods of the Dominion of Canada, besides many prominent American and foreign libraries. The Secretary has already exhausted his own collections in his ready response to earlier requests, and he trusts that his appeal for these Journals in larger or smaller numbers may be promptly and willingly met. If those who send by mail will enclose their card, the postal charges will be returned with thanks. Those who can give several copies, will doubtless send at his cost, by express. Address the Rev. Dr. Perry, Geneva, New York.

Church papers willing to further this effort, will please copy.

To the Editors of The Church Journal:

The Rev. Thos. A. Jagger has been chosen for the Bishop's office in Southern Ohio—a man in many respects of most attractive qualities. The Rev. Dr. Seymour was rejected by the House of Deputies, because of the impression and feeling that he had been very friendly with Ritualists. As his opponents expressed it, "he had been in bad company."

Now, June 3, 1871, after the Rev. Mr. Cheney had been tried and convicted, a letter appeared in the Chicago *Evening Post*, copied afterwards in THE CHURCH JOURNAL, the signers of which set at defiance the authority of the Church, and mocked at the act and exercise of its discipline. They expressed their approval of what Mr. Cheney had done, and his right to do it—that is his right to violate his Ordination vow, by mutilating the appointed office for baptism, and by refusing obedience to his Bishop's godly counsel, and by persisting to officiate, after the sentence had forbidden him. They say, "Accordingly, we maintain your right to such decision and action, as that for which you have been punished." "Praying that God may guide and comfort you in your perplexities and sorrows, and that your ministry for Christ may ever be as blessed as it has hitherto been, (!!!) we remain, yours fraternally, —."

And among the names are those of Geo. E. Thrall, Wm. T. Sabine, B. B. Leacock, W. M. Postlethwaite, and T. A. Jagger.

Will the Church confirm the election of a man thus declaring himself a sympathizer with rebellion and schism? Remember what severity of scrutiny was lately demanded, and let the Church decide whether one who thus owns himself a sympathizer with schismatics, is a man to be trusted with the Bishopric. LOYALTY.

For the Church Journal and Messenger.

### WHO SHALL TEACH THE TEACHERS?

Messrs. Editors: Some time since I sought to call attention through the columns of the *American Churchman*, to the introduction into American education, of the corrupting, the destructive system of Positivism, under the fascinating masque of literary criticism. I did not succeed.

But the facts are these: Not only is Taine's History of Literature widely circulated and commended by American teachers, but in a condensed form it is introduced among us—its poisonous fang retained—as a text-book in instruction. What can more sap the very foundations of morality among us than the theory that moral character, *e. g.*, in Byron or Shelley, is wholly the result of circumstances and antecedents. A very comfortable doctrine for the young man just awaking to feel the power of the mighty struggle between good and evil around him, and within him, and ready to yield to the seductions of immediate pleasure, against conscience, religion, and God! But this is Positivism, and this is set forth with all the bewitching brilliancy of the French sophist as literary criticism.

How wide spread is this corruption of public instruction, none can know except those whose attention is specially called to the subject. Who else can tell us by how many hundreds of copies *Duckle* has been circulated among our public schools and the higher grade?

And just now appears from one of our most respecta-

ble publishers of school and college text books, a History of Literature bearing the name of a professor at Vassar College, whose only reference in the History of Philosophy is Lewes the Positivist, while Taine is once more a favorite reference for Literature proper. *Quis custodiet custodiet?* FROM ELDEN.

Oak Cliff, Jan. 18<sup>th</sup>.

[Translated from the Kirchenblatt for The Church Journal.]

### EXAMINATION INTO THE STATE OF THE CHURCH IN GERMANY AND ENGLAND.

The German press still continues to regard the religious controversy now pending in Germany, as a conflict between State and Church. Rome naturally is interested in having it reported that the Church of Christ as such is attacked, and it can be readily understood that the anti-Christian and infidel masses and their mouthpieces should be desirous of accepting this view of the controversy; but when Christian men express this opinion, they aid in propagating among Christians, erroneous ideas which must produce the most disastrous consequences. We propose to examine the contending parties a little closer at hand. Rome, to a sound Churchman represents neither the *una sancta Catholica*, nor western Christendom, nor the Latin Church per se, but simply a clerical State, not in the possession, it is true, of universal civil power, but claiming it. Bismarck struck the nail on the head when he told the Ultramontane party in Germany, that the designs of Rome were of such a nature that they could not possibly be carried out in a Protestant State or in a State of divided beliefs, and not even in a purely Catholic community still adhering to the principle of civil power; they could be received alone in universal clerical State.

Holy W. teaches us that civil authority as such is decreed by God. It matters little whether such authority be that of an emperor or a king, of a free State or a free City, of a subordinate prince or ruler-in-chief. Civil authority was recognized by the old undivided Church; this is demonstrated by the position the Church held toward the Roman Empire of the East and of the West. In the Middle Ages we find the principle of the independent power of the sword of this earth still upheld there, while the Western Church is being slowly but surely Romanized. This idea is the main principle of the Empire of Charlemagne and of the reigns of the great emperors of the houses of Saxony and Franconia. It met its deathblow under Henry IV. and the last of the Hohenstauffens. As soon as the German anti-Imperialists, through whose assistance the universal monarch of Rome crushed the imperial power, were sufficiently strong to give the go-by to the Ultramontane alliance, civil power raised its head anew and asserted its right. The diet of the empire and the emperors themselves, notwithstanding they were divided by a difference of faith, from the time of the Council of Constance until far into the days of the Reformation, were one in the assertion that their authority over their respective dominions was derived from God alone. Not only was this the case in Germany, but in France and in England the idea exists as an active principle in the policy of the National Church, and in that of the State, and this, not only during the Reformation, but long prior and subsequent to that time.

It must not be overlooked, however, that it is only among Lutherans and Anglicans that the independence and authority of civil power have met with a full and willing recognition; the cause of this is not a chance one. The ascetic Calvinist, in common with the Romanist, blends the principles of the Old and New Testaments, and confounds civil and spiritual law; and the result is, that whenever the opportunity offers, he seeks to establish a theocracy. The only difference between the Calvinistic and Roman theocracies is this: Rome founds hers upon a hierarchy, and Calvin founds his upon the principle of a priestly and sovereign people forming a holy community of the elect. The Puritan institutions of America, the Scotch Covenant and Calvin's Geneva code claimed, as earnestly as Rome ever did, that civil power should simply accept the dictates of the Church, and that the revealed law of the Church should become the law of the State. The power to carry out these principles was of course often at fault, but the claim was put forward as long as sectarianism retained vitality, and to this day it occasionally crops out.

Lutherans and Anglicans follow a very different course *ab initio*. Civil and spiritual authority with them held side by side positions of independent dignity, and were both looked upon as of divine origin; the result was that civil authority was regarded as invested with the independent duty of lawgiving, and of being able on its own responsibility to discover what was right, and of causing it to be respected. With them the Church is not a lawgiver to the State, but an Evangelical expounder of the law to governors and governed. From the Faith which the Church plants in the hearts of her children, high and low, there grows a moral life, and out of this life of the individual there springs up the discipline and morality of the community; public discipline and morality produce the law and order of the State. Pursuing this view, we find that the State occupies no longer merely the position of the worldly arm of the Church, but it becomes an organized body; it has heart, and head, and conscience; it has received from God Himself a duty to fulfil, for which it is directly responsible to Him, and to Him alone.

This is the point of contact existing between Christians, Lutherans as well as Anglicans, and the representatives of the modern idea of Constitutional government. The German Lutheran would have occupied a more dignified position during the present struggle between Roman theocracy and the German Empire had he studied more impartially his greatest modern scholar Stahl, instead of following those who seek to Romanize the Church, such as Louis von Gerlach, or falling into the views of the advocates of Calvinistic doctrines, that is, of such as those who, like the late Hengstenberg, advocate the teachings of the Old Testament.

The Church of Rome, as it said, has to all appearances relaxed its claims to the effect that civil rulers derive their authority from Papal investiture, but let gone be

deceived, this relaxation is but apparent. Thanks to three hundred years labor on the part of the Jesuits, the great end is about being attained, the consciences of Christians adhering to the Pope are being detached from all allegiance to governments claiming their authority by the grace of God, and not by that of the Pope. The Vatican teaches that there is but one authority, that of the Church, and that Church is the Church of Rome. Heaven soars above the earth, eternity overtops time, religious interests have priority over secular ones, consequently, says Rome, the Church has precedence, nay dominion, over the civil power. This is the well known argument of the Ultramontanes, which meets with the approval of those who deny or forget that the Kingdom of God appears in two spheres, distinct one from the other, though connected with one another, namely, the Church and the State. The Jesuits have dealt with the problem here presented as they are wont to do whenever they find anything which from its constituent nature resists their omnipotence, they deny its right of existence, and they go so far even, when they have the power, as to attempt to annihilate it. The Jesuits ignore, and in so far as they have the strength, destroy, individual religious responsibility, theology, Episcopal authority, national Churches, the independent authority of Ecumenical Councils, and all in civil life that corresponds to these things. Civil authority is considered legitimate only, in so far as it gives way to the Holy See. Let no one misapprehend the claims of the Vatican, or the hidden meaning contained in its concordats. Every concordat concluded between the Curia and a State, be it Roman Catholic or Protestant, bears with it, according to Roman interpretation, the admission that the government of the country treating with her, can only retain its organization and functions by the assistance of Papal sanction or permission. So great is Rome's desire to interfere with national civil authority, that a concordat concluded with an ultra-Protestant power, though it borders even on the sacrilegious, is sweeter to her than the most liberal Church laws of a Catholic country. The constitutional coöperation of a Roman Catholic Episcopate, as the national representative of the Church, does not make such civil authority more palatable to Rome. And when the State refuses to take the first steps on the road to Canossa, or mindful of its dignity turns back once for all, then the Jesuits and the Holy Father unfurl the banner of revolution. A Roman Apostolic King is set up against National Catholic republics, and a Catholic republic against Protestant monarchies.

The Catholic republic bids fair to be a powerful engine in forwarding the subversive designs of the Ultramontanes, not only at present, but in the immediate future. The sovereignty of the people, that is of the masses, was preached by the Jesuits long before the time of the men of the "contrat social" and of the fanatics of American freedom and equality, but always, however, with the reservation that in a really Christian community suffrage should be limited to members of the Roman Church. The existence of the Jesuit republics of South America, and the periodical rule of the Roman Catholic Irish element in our State, the most important in the Union, is proof conclusive that Rome by following this course, might regain the lost dominion of the world. How easily, should Germany ever constitute herself into a republic founded on the principles of radical democracy, could the Vatican obtain dominion over her, by means of majorities schooled to obedience to the Jesuits, led by a priesthood untrammelled with national sympathy, and an Episcopacy thoroughly subservient to the Curia. What pleasanter universal monarchy could the Black Pope of Rome long for, than a confederacy of such republics under the nominal sway of the white Pope as the Shepherd of nations. The alliance of the Ultramontanes with the socialist democrats, is readily understood when we bear in mind what they have in view. The internationalists of the Curia sanction the triumph of the Socialists, and their evidently shortlived existence, for are they not sure that they will fall heirs to their spoils. There has been inaugurated at the Vatican a thoroughly Jesuitical policy based in equal parts upon the divine promise to the Church on one side, and on the other upon carnal ambition and diabolical hallucinations, and they preach (interpreting it, however, in some essential points differently from the Evangelicals of Germany) "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

One can hardly comprehend how German patriots and Lutheran Christians can overlook the anti-national and anti-Christian tendencies of the Vatican, and sympathize with the representatives of the Roman propaganda whenever they come in conflict with civil power. Yet apparently there is a good reason for this. It is asserted that Russia and the Empire do battle against the Roman Church, not with the assistance of the Gospel, but with the weapons of this earth. Politicians set off against the unwarrantable claim of Rome to omnipotent power, the equally unwarrantable principle of universal rule of the State, which injures the Protestant churches as much as it does the Roman, in so far that it does not respect the sanctity of the home in the sphere of Protestant denominational education of the young, or even public or private religious conviction. There is much truth in this reproach, but those who raise the cry had better inquire into the causes which have led the governments and statesmen of Germany, instead of opposing to Rome the Evangelical Church and her followers, to seek relief from liberal enthusiasts and the advocates of civilization, reaping thereby a victory which may cost them dear in the end. The reason is simply this: in Germany there exists no Protestant Church upon which the Government can rely as upon an independent moral spiritual power. Ecclesiastical chiefs, and those who lead the Evangelical people, have resisted every effort made in modern times to give to their invisible Church a visible body, with a short-sightedness near akin to blindness. The attempts of Frederick William IV. to emancipate the Prussian State Church from civil trammels by reestablishing the Episcopate, were frustrated by the resistance of the theologians of all parties, from the ultra-Protestants to the Old School Lutherans.

In reading the correspondence of two late worthy King,