

ing that it had been decided to break off diplomatic relations between the Republic of France and the Pope; and on the same day M. Delcasse communicated this information to the Nuncio in Paris, and requested him to consider that his mission as Apostolic Nuncio to France had ceased. Thus, on these two questions, the right of the Nuncio to communicate directly with French Bishops, and the right of the Holy See to summon Bishops to Rome under pain of censure, the rupture, upon which French statesmen had set their hearts, was effected; and the way was prepared for the Separation of Church and State.

It is too early to speculate as to how the fortunes of the Church in France may be affected by the Bill of Separation, but about its effects upon the State there can hardly be any doubt. The position of France, as the recognised leader of the Catholic nations and the special defender of the Holy See, won for it a respect and an influence in its relations with other countries to which it could otherwise never have attained; and, besides, its being recognised as the acknowledged protector of the Christian missions of the East, gave it opportunities which it was not slow to utilise, for the development of French commerce and French influence. At home, relying upon the rights guaranteed by the Concordat, the State was able to control all the forces of the Church, and to use them in promoting its own interests. It had the right of nominating the candidates for the vacant Bishops, and in this way care could be taken, and care was taken, that no man likely to prove dangerous to the Government was appointed Bishop; it could prevent them from taking part in public discussions, and from exercising their rights as freemen to criticise the actions of the Legislature or Executive; while, as a last resource, it could appeal to the Holy Father, as it did appeal, requesting him to use his influence to allay the opposition of clergy and people.

But by its rupture with the Vatican, France has sacrificed all claim to the sympathy and support of the Catholic world; it has lost its right to be regarded as the protector of the Eastern Mission, and its place will be usurped to a large extent by Italy and Germany. At home, it has abandoned its powers of controlling the influence of the Church; it has no longer any voice in the appointment of Bishops, or in the promotion of priests; nor has it any claim to invoke the assistance of the Papacy in the difficulties which are sure to arise. The time, too, that should have been spent on useful and necessary legislation has been given up entirely to this mad campaign against the Church, which has resulted in stirring up the most dangerous feelings throughout the country and set the children of the same nation at each other's throats, at a crisis, too, when unless we are mistaken, France has good reason to oppose a united front to the foe.

CHRISTIANITY IN FRANCE

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE SITUATION

As the wires flash across the Channel the daily alarms and excursions incidental to the war against Christianity now inaugurated in the land of St. Louis, Englishmen (says the 'Saturday Review') begin to realise the meaning of the gigantic act of plunder and sacrilege recently perpetrated by the French Republic. The truth is that the pigmy Jacobins to whom French folly has entrusted the destinies of a great nation have torn up the religious settlement which the administrative genius of Napoleon devised and which for a century had given to France some measure of religious peace. The reasons that have urged these pigmy Robespierres and Dantons to this colossal crime are notorious outside England.

To do these atheists justice, they have for thirty years shouted their beliefs in the market place. From Gambetta's 'Le clericalisme voila l'enfermi' to M. Briand's 'Il faut en finir avec l'idée chretienne,' they have marched steadily on to their goal, which is the transformation of their countrymen into 'not only a non-Christian but an anti-Christian nation. Every word in this connection that the Jacobin politicians say, every act that they do, proves them to be not only the enemies of Catholicism, but also of Christianity. The Catholicism which they attack is allowed by learned French Protestants to be the only form of Christianity that practically counts in France. The contemptuous toleration that the Republic extends to pow-

erless Calvinistic sects in no way interferes with its general purpose, and serves to blind the eyes of Protestant England to its ultimate designs. While

The Faith of Christ

is assailed on the opposite side of the Channel, the tone even of those English journals that are presumed to appeal to the religious section of the community is pitiful and contemptible. That the organs of the dissidence of dissent should be willing to see Christianity injured, so long as the Papist suffers thereby, will surprise no one. It is more surprising to find Conservative journals seeking to cloud the issue in a fog of anti-German and No-Popery bigotry. Such an attitude on the part of a press that opposes the Education Bill and dreads Germany argues fatuity or bad faith. If the Pope is to be blamed for his resistance to the attempt to de-Christianise France, on what logical principle can the Education Bill be resisted? If Englishmen ought to sympathise with the eradication of Christian ideas from French soil, the able and eloquent pleas of a newspaper like the 'Standard' for doctrinal teaching in English schools become ridiculous and dishonest. Nay, grant even that it is right to sacrifice religious to worldly interests, such an attitude is none the less fatuous. If the German Emperor be indeed the remorseless enemy to England that certain Conservative writers proclaim him to be, could a worse service be done to the interests of this country than to link his name with the cause of faith against atheism, and to hold him up alike to the believing and unbelieving world, even in Morocco, as the new Charlemagne who has come to the rescue of Christianity in its hour of need?

In our comments on the betrayal of the French Christianity by the newspapers that find their way into English parsonages, we have given to those responsible the credit of good faith. The belief, however, is widespread that in their comments on French ecclesiastical matters they are tuned by the Jewish financial rings on the Continent. It is an unpleasant fact that their representatives in Paris are generally Jews; at any rate very seldom Christians. The 'Times,' for one, is represented in Paris by a Semitic gentleman. Newspapers which exist mainly by the support of Churchmen and Roman Catholics permit their readers to observe this attack on the faith of Christ only through Jewish spectacles. While the attitude of

Our Press is Contemptible,

the silence of the Anglican Church is regrettable. Our Primate a short time ago made a right protest against a Jewish massacre in a foreign country; but he and his colleagues are willing to leave to the Roman Catholic hierarchy of this country the honor of being the sole English protesters against this outrage to the household of the Faith. Their silence is enough to make us sigh for an hour of the Georgian episcopate. The English bishops who extended the hand of sympathy to the oppressed Gallican Church of the days of the First Revolution adorned not themselves with mitres or pectoral crosses. They did not even call themselves Catholics. To be frank, they fell sadly short of Christian perfection. However, in a great crisis of religion they showed a zeal for the common heritage and the common good of Christendom that their successors today in a like crisis do not display.

Perhaps the most offensive feature in this press campaign is the attempt made to represent the Pope as the assailant of the laws and liberties of Frenchmen, and to drape this Jacobin anti-Christianity in the honored mantle of Gallicanism. The truth is that throughout the struggle the Republic and not the Pope has been the lawbreaker. The very pretext for the Separation Law was the Pope's interference to abate a grave ecclesiastical scandal which no Church in Christendom could tolerate. The dissolution of the Concordat without notice to the Holy See was in the circumstances a discourteous violation of the diplomatic usages of civilised nations. The Separation Law violated the spirit of the Concordat in a most dishonorable manner. The paltry salaries paid to the French clergy under that treaty represented the nation's shabby compensation of the great wealth with which the piety or penitence of the pre-revolutionary ages had endowed the Gallican Church, and of which the Revolution robbed her. If the Concordat was to be dissolved,

Justice and Logic Required

that from a pecuniary point of view the Church should be placed again in the same position in which she stood in 1789. Practically no doubt this would have been impossible, still in view of past guarantees it was the duty of the State to make compensation not only to the individual clerics but also to the Church as a corporate body on a generous scale. Practically the