

inventions: speech, writing and printing, while in our own day the spreading and perfection of our intelligence has been aided by the kindred inventions of the telegraph and telephone. Civilization thus appears as the consequence of the dissemination of experiences among mankind.

Those who have brought together the story of the ancient civilization of Greece have agreed with unanimity that the separation between the mass of the people and the intellectual portion became at length insurmountable, and finally led to national destruction. This makes for our own view, that it was to a defect or incompleteness in the machinery for the dissemination of knowledge that we must ascribe the dying out of the older States. An intellectual aristocracy was established in Greece, which, in order to maintain its superior position, and from natural and selfish motives, endeavored to prevent the spreading of new facts, but it was assisted in this action by the limitation which an ignorance of the art of mechanically duplicating writing threw around it. Philosophers have explained the fall of Greece by considering it as a necessary step in the progress of humanity and the perfection of a future bloom of knowledge. And so in one sense it may be, but still, exactly where the defect lay and where there is a positive advantage in the conditions of modern civilization, and wherein modern civilization more adequately protects the State, has sometimes escaped them. To understand this fully we must come back to natural history, to anthropology, at last. A large class of persons with a certain bias persistently decry our modern civilization, and look for its more or less speedy evanishment, merely because Rome perished and Greece decayed.

But nowhere in nature is there exact repetition, and to understand

the new civilization we must remember that it rests on a larger average intelligence, brought directly about by the discovery of the art of printing. There is then a distinct reason, a scientific ground, for the opinion that our present civilization rests upon a surer basis than did those which preceded it, and this we may safely bring forward in the cause of truth. For science is in danger always of being regarded as the enemy of the State, because it tends constantly to modify existing ideas. But if we can show the necessity for a constant modification of our ideas, arising out of our own constitution, then it may be seen to be unreasonable to defame those who follow the search for truth. And it being undoubtedly true, as Locke says, that of all the men we meet with, nine out of ten are what they are, good or evil, useful or not, by their education, we can see how wide reaching the effect of our improved basis of civilization must be upon us as a people, and how important it is to understand the real direction in which it works.

But, indeed, the position I have tried to sustain in this paper lies outside of any criticism of modern education. I have tried simply to show the way in which our modern civilization has grown up, and its real superiority over ancient culture. From this we may rest assured, that science, while it influences, can never be an enemy of the State; and that the danger of the State, as well as other social systems within the State, will lie in the direction of an opposition to scientific truth and the right reason of mankind. But it remains for science to play a distinct part in the discharge of its full duty to the community, by popularizing its discoveries. Doing this, it will insure the stability of the State by increasing the general information of the people.