

The other, however, sitting in the next to the front pew, was not awakened by such a soft rebuke. The Kentucky person could stand it no longer. Keeping right on with the sermon, he shied a song book at the sleeper. One book followed another until the audience was in a titter, but the tired man simply opened his eyes for a moment and shifting his position from full face to profile, slept right on until the benediction without apparent interruption. Who would not envy such a gift of sleep?

## CAUSES OF THE PRESENT MISFORTUNES OF FRANCE AND THEIR REMEDIES

There is a great difference of opinion just now regarding the causes of the present national misfortunes of France. It is well to learn what certain Frenchmen, who seem to thoroughly understand their country, think on the matter. Among such competent authorities we may reckon Monsieur Louis Dufay, of Dijon, a former professor of history. In a most interesting essay he gives his views upon the present misfortunes and their remedies. After stating what he deems the basic causes of the misfortunes, he points out their remedies and adds a brief summary of the reasons that lead to the hope of his country's recovery.

The national misfortunes of France, in his opinion, are epitomised in one: the total or partial dechristianisation of vast numbers of French men and women; all the other woes spring from this one, or by it are greatly aggravated.

The causes why the French nation was incapable of receiving in the 19th century that deep rechristianisation rendered necessary by the preceding century and by the Revolution, are reducible to three, which indeed are paramount, for without their existence as obstacles or morbid causes, what remained of Christianity in France after the Revolution would have been a sufficient leaven to quicken and restore the Catholic religion.

These obstacles or morbid causes are—(1) The insufficient action of the Church in France consequent on the demi-servitude organised by the Concordat of 1802 and the Organic Articles imposed by Bonaparte on Pope Pius VII.;

(2) The insufficiency of the Christian spirit on the education of youth consequent on the monopoly and excessive privileges of the University of France, under successive Governments unconsciously unfavorable, or more or less hostile to religion;

(3) The tardy, insufficient and ephemeral Christianisation of children who, since the Concordat, hardly got any catechetical instruction before the age of nine, hardly went to Communion before that age, and after a brief formation of two or three half-years, had no serious likelihood of being able to persevere in a Christian life, at the age of early manhood and womanhood when the passions are so strong.

Prior to the Revolution, the political and religious Cæsarism of Royalty, the Gallicanism of the bishops, the Jansenism of the clergy and the magistracy, by hampering the teaching of the Popes, by lessening the spirit of faith and the frequentation of the Sacraments, paved the way to that philosophical Rationalism which ended in the civil or schismatical Constitution of the clergy, and the suppression of Catholic worship.

To the material order restored by his *coup d'état* Bonaparte pretended to add moral order by means of a Concordat with the Pope. He did indeed reorganise Catholic worship in all France (multiplying Bonapartists thereby), but banefully reduced the bishops and parish priests to mere State-functionaries, whom the First Consul and the future Emperor strove to make his *gendarmérie sacrée* (his clerical police). Notwithstanding the many beneficial effects of the official re-establishment of the Church in France, the servitudes of the new Concordat, aggravated by the Organic Articles, put insuperable obstacles in the way of the reconstitution of a truly apostolic clergy, as regards the vast majority of their members, a clergy untainted with Gallicanism and Jansenism at least in its digni-

ties, and able to reconquer in a fierce struggle the French nation to the Catholic faith. Napoleon completed the work of Cæsarism and oppressive centralisation of the Consulate by arbitrarily conferring the monopoly of education on the University of France, a corporation of functionaries of essentially latitudinarian doctrines, that is to say, whose professors held any or no religion as they chose, an institution where young Catholics did and do still hear history taught by Protestants or Jews, philosophy by sectaries or furious Atheists, where consequently doctrinal anarchy prevails, and the training of youth is too often anti-Christian. The well-founded charges of Lacordaire and Montalembert against the lycées, the reprobation by Thiers of the anti-clerical teachers, their socialism and anti-patriotism for the last thirty years are in the memory of all cultured citizens; and M. Lavissee sums up in one sad line the multitudinous evil deeds of the University: 'We have multiplied schools, but we have failed to give Education.'

And for over a century this corporation of State-officers yearly pours out into the body of the French nation thousands of young men with little or no religion. Who then can help seeing in this dissolvent action of the University a cause both remote and ever actual of French dechristianisation? Who is unable to detect in it one of the explanations of the inability of the clergy to make France Christian again? Mgr. Pie, of Poitiers, had no hesitation in writing, in the first half of the nineteenth century, that it was chiefly owing to Religious Orders of women and to their pupils, who became the Christian wives and mothers in society, that the Catholic religion was maintained in France.

The law of the 15th of March, 1850, no doubt improved to a certain degree the position of Christian families by permitting the existence of private, that is, non-State schools, both primary and secondary, and by giving to the Municipal Councils the right to call in Religious teachers; but this only restricted without destroying the action of the University, and the result was that the good effects of the law of 1850 were lessened by many hampering enactments, by the stubborn refusal to grant to Catholics the liberty of higher education, by the anti-Roman, anti-religious, and revolutionary policy of Napoleon III. Moreover—and this admission is painful—Catholics and their priests failed to make the utmost use of the partial liberty they had obtained. During the 25 years subsequent to the law of 1850, they taught men their private duties, but were well-nigh silent on public, social, and political duties. Hence arose that egotism, that indifference, that weakness of character, or that failure to grasp (in all classes and especially in the masses) the duties of electors and their obligation to resist the growing dangers revealed in the dechristianising programmes of Gambetta, Ferry, and their likes; hence that morbid receptivity of the hapless French nation in the presence and under the action of the revolutionary microbes of Republican and Masonic demagoguery, of laicisation and socialism. And by demagoguery is here meant any government, any men, any party which administer the common weal, not in the interests of all citizens, but in their own, for their own exclusive profit, and that too by means of systematic intestine divisions perfidiously excited and fostered among citizens.

So the 19th century closed before the national rechristianisation could be sufficiently achieved; the Church in France was unable to constitute itself by the choice of the best, and had not full freedom to develop and to teach; while the privileged University institution completely failed in its mission of moral education. Happily the two sores of the Bonapartist Concordat, and of the infidel University, found partially their remedy in the very acts of the enemies of Catholicism.

The 20th century, at its opening, saw the chains of the Concordat broken by the act of the French Government, by the felicitous blunders of the demagoguery. Blinded by hatred, they restored to the Papacy and to the Church in France their freedom of action. Despite all the financial damages arising from the robbery of the indemnity and of the property belong-

"Sweet as Mountain Heather."—Scotchmen are connoisseurs in Tea. Cock o' the North is prime favorite.

"Fresh as the Shamrock."—The Sons of Erin are great consumers of Ceylon Hondai Lanka Tea; 1s 6d to 2s 2d.