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This monograph is an inquiry into the ideological and historical background of the legislative program on education in France, 1879 - 1880, and into the attitude found in the pages of some of the British periodicals. The steps taken to effect the educational program resulted in the first distinctly anti-clerical campaign of the Third Republic.

The first chapter traces the struggle of the Catholics for the establishment and recognition of equality for 'free' faculties and universities, which was granted by the Law of July 1875. The second chapter discusses the political events of 1876 - 1878, which induced the outbreak of the conflict over education; and the initial efforts to render the educational system non-denominational.

The determination of the Minister of Education to reform the existing system of education caused the government to expel the teaching religious orders in 1880, and demonstrated the use made of education as a pretext to enforce an antagonistic political policy. This development forms the subject-matter of Chapter Three.

In Great Britain, the Catholic periodicals deplored...
the action of the Republican regime and showed compassion for their co-religionists and the proscribed congregations in France. The periodicals under less specific editorship professed sympathy for the French government. But, finding the measures undertaken and the manner of their execution to be illiberal, their writings were sharply critical. The attitude thus expressed is examined in Chapters Four and Five.

The last chapter contains the summary and conclusions of the inquiry. The texts of some of the more scattered and less known documents have been collected and placed in the Appendix.
FOREWORD

The strife over education in the decade investigated in this monograph was but one link in the historical process of nineteenth century France. The social, intellectual, religious and political aspects were all complementary elements of the peculiar climate which dominated the scene throughout the entire development of modern France.

The conflict over education is usually depicted as having been democratic, liberal France engaged in a struggle with clericalism. There is a distinct tendency to treat the period as that of 'two Frances', reducing all the intermediate parties and opinions to two groups: political and religious. Historical writings, especially those concerned with the Third Republic, show a trend which reflects the alignment of thought bequeathed by the French Revolution. The two sides are presented as opposing poles: the ascending republican Left battling with the declining monarchical Right.

There never was a single Republican party arrayed against a single Monarchical one. Both had experienced changing fortunes of extraordinary scope and complexity, and contained a wide range of opinion. In an age when the scientific and rationalistic spirit was continually gaining ground, many Republicans first became irreligious, then anti-clerical,
anti-Catholic, and eventually even anti-Christian. The mon­archists, conversely, owed their allegiance to several compet­ing royal houses, and the eventual success of the Third Republic was due more to the disunity of the Monarchists than to the design of the Republicans.

More than any other single factor, the conflict over education distorted the terms clericalism and anti-clericalism. Connoting much bitterness, these two words are inseparable from the French scene of this period. To find out why and how the strife relative to education took place was the basic aim of this inquiry.

For many centuries, England and France had a variety of historical ties. While a segment of the population in England was of Roman Catholic faith, at this time the country itself and the government were the world's leading exponents of Liberalism. On the assumption that a reaction to, and an opinion on, the events in France would be aired by the press in England, it was also a purpose of this study to ascertain the English attitude, as expressed by Catholic publications and by those under less specific editorship. The multitude of publications necessitated limiting this part of the in­quiry to only some of them, and to the years 1879 - 1880, as the legislative program of those years had a certain distinct unity.

Though in the first part of this monograph little
that is new is discovered, in the second half, the examination of some contemporary periodicals in Great Britain is original. It may be claimed modestly that this monograph is a fresh attempt to trod difficult ground, and to synthesize an attitude at this historical juncture, as found in a representative segment of the British press.

In the course of the work, it was discovered that literature in English on this problem is scarce and scattered, while the literature in French is difficult to obtain. Thus a large Appendix is included, which serves as a depository for the texts of some of the more scattered and less-known documents. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from French sources are mine, whether in the Appendix or in the text itself.

Because certain words had a particular meaning in the specific context of this epoch of French history and have been used extensively, they must be defined broadly here, so that their proper connotation may not be misunderstood.

Anti-clericalism. The precise meaning of this word is elusive. It often may mean anti-Christianism, but in this period of France, it most often connotes anti-Catholicism. The more specific meaning usually varies according to the men identified with its use, and the specific period when its sentiment was prevalent. When used loosely, its meaning should be considered in its generic sense.

vii
Clericalism at this historical juncture in France usually means a tendency toward the establishment of a narrow union between the French State and the Roman Catholic Church, the latter inspiring the former, and active participation by Catholic clergy in the secular affairs of the State.

Leicism, laic and all derivatives mean essentially that which is not ecclesiastic or religious. The laic idea comprises a certain philosophical conception of the independence and capacity of human reason, as well as a political conception of the rights of the State and of citizens vis-à-vis the Church. The laic idea recognizes no form of religion, and accordingly advocates a State independent of all Church, of all sectarian symbols, and the admittance of all citizens to civic equality, whatever their beliefs. The word 'laic' and its derivatives have been used extensively in this monograph, particularly in its political connotation. Therefore this word does not mean the equivalent of the English 'laic', lay or secular.

Freedom of..., free education are used in the sense of la liberté de l'enseignement, an expression and idea which proved a stumbling-block ever since it was promised in the Constitutional Charter of 1830. From that date, the Catholics fought to obtain it; their opponents fought to prevent them from so doing. I have used 'free' exclusively to imply denominational, in this case Catholic, education.
When it implies 'free of charge', I have used the word
gratuitous in order to distinguish between these two types
of education, since the elastic implications of the word free
in English could easily cause misunderstanding.

Finally, in translating from the French, I have done
so freely, on occasion modifying the tense of the French
historical present. However, I trust that at no time has the
essential thought suffered in transition, barring the spirit
of the proverbial traduttore, traditore.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND THE STRUGGLE OVER EDUCATION
1870 - 1875

I

The Third French Republic came into being as the result of a curious series of events which unfolded in the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century. Its historical background may be called a Radical-inspired revolutionary tradition.

During the nineteenth century, which was characterized by a keen clash of conflicting faiths, the school held a strategic position, particularly in France. The background of the struggle over education there must be sought in the social, intellectual, political and religious climate which dominated the French scene from the beginning of that period.

Throughout that century, the question of education implied that of religion, and both had a political implication. No other single aspect immediately brought Church-State relations into sharper focus than the problem of education. More often than not, this problem was viewed from the political angle. Because of it, and in spite of their discordant metaphysical beliefs, many Frenchmen sided
with one another in the realm of politics.

The question of education, therefore, became the particular form of a wider, religious question in France, and was, in effect, a substantial battleground in the intensive tug-of-war between Church and State. Both adversaries, the Catholics and the Republicans, feared that the schools might be used by the respective opponent to instil doctrines contrary and damaging to their own. The Catholics held that schools operated by themselves could educate youth in ideas which would render France immune to doctrines which they considered to be subversive to society and religion. Their opponents maintained that the Republic could not firmly establish itself as long as so many French youth were educated in schools run by the Catholic clergy.

Each side fought strenuously to preserve and advance its own influence in the sphere of education, making national instruction the prize of the struggle. Since education was the best means by which to persuade French souls in their formative stage, the struggle over it thus emerged as a specific feud in the larger clash, which, fanned by its political and practical overtones, assumed the better known form of clericalism versus anticlericalism.

In practical terms, the opposing philosophies were contained in those of the Christian ideas of Catholicism, and in those ideas of the State which advocated the total non-sectarianism of life. From these elementary conceptions
came the ideologies which inspired the Catholic party and the parties of the Left. The conflict of such views permeated the political and intellectual life of the nation during the entire century.  

II

The germ of future cleavage and bitter recrimination in education had been unwittingly planted by Napoleon. In 1801, having attained supremacy in the Consulate and realizing the importance of religion, he concluded a Concordat with Pope Pius VII.  

With the position of the Churches and of religion thus regulated, Napoleon embarked upon a bold scheme for a national system of schools in every commune, as the basis


2 For the full text of this Concordat, see below, Appendix I. The whole ecclesiastical arrangement by Napoleon tended to reduce the function of the Church to a mere branch of the Civil Service. Among the more important consequences were these two: (a) the sanctioning of the destruction by the Revolution of the Gallican Church; and (b) effective centralization within the Church itself, which made it turn more toward Rome, and thus marked the practical beginning of ultramontanism. In 1802, Napoleon unilaterally promulgated the "Organic Articles", which were aimed at recapturing for Napoleon the Gallican rights of the French monarchs. Three basic ideas were dominant in this document: (a) to increase the power of the bishops over the curés; (b) to increase the power of the State over the bishops; and (c) to control the power of the Pope over the French clergy. For the French text of the "Organic Articles", see J. E. C. Bodley, Church in France, (London, 1906), Appendix II; 121-134.
of a structure wherein the University and the Ministry of Public Instruction would be at its apex. An able administrator, Napoleon was no educator; his ideas on education were often chaotic and impracticable to a surprising degree.\(^3\)

Organized *ex nihilo*, Napoleon's University was a manufactured system, and being without stable roots, it was not broad enough to be acceptable to all Frenchmen. A result of compromise and compulsion, his system of education lacked harmony. The task of Bonaparte's University was to control the entire educational system in France. Ever since its creation under Napoleon's lofty scheme, the field of education was a vexing haunt for continuous attempts by the state and by the Church to gain domination in it. The aggressiveness of one provoked the counter-attacks of the other.

The Church at first participated negligibly in education, and the system as a whole lagged. From modest beginnings, and more by necessity than by design, the role of the Church in education came to grow.


Reforms were effected, and reorganization of schools and curricula took place, with many ideas of the new Revolutionary attitude being incorporated. Some old schools were revived, and the system was completed in 1808 with the creation by Napoleon of the Imperial University. This did not mean the University in the accepted sense. It was to represent the "omnipotent State in its educational capacity." Being a serious entity, "endowed, privileged and yet non-political", the University was a separate corporation. *Ibid.*, 228.
Under the Ministry of Villèle (1821-28), some advantageous concessions were made to the Church by the Royal government. New Bishoprics were created in 1821, and a year later the elementary education was placed, in effect, under the control of the Church, when Bishop Frayssinous was made Grand Master of the University and, in 1824, Minister of Education and Worship. 4

The Constitutional Charter of 1830 promised freedom of education. 5 The Catholics carried on a vigorous campaign against the monopoly of the state in education, and insisted on the liberty to open their own schools, in fulfilment of the corresponding Article of the Charter. The provisions of a law in 1833 gave to the Catholics the possibility of establishing their own schools. For many years these schools had excellent results in primary education. By pretermission, that law enabled the communes to choose between lay and religious teachers; and there was also an implication for freedom of moral and religious instruction. 6

After 1830, in a gesture of magnanimity, the directors of the University received into their ranks men of


6 Weill, op. cit., 63. The State did not aid the independent schools which began to appear, but neither did it endeavour to suppress them.
most diverse confessions. It was open even to the clergy -- who had already been introduced to it during the Restoration -- to remain as long as desired. The prevalent attitude was that capable professors should be admitted to the staff of schools under the University, whether they were lay or cleric. 7

Officially, the state maintained a monopoly in the University, and this aroused furious objections. From 1843 the Catholics brought the struggle into the open. Among others, one of the influential administrators in secondary education, Victor Cousin, had been singled out and, in a continuous barrage, was accused of pantheism. Presenting himself, in his counter-attacks, as a defender of the system he represented, Cousin was very critical of the Church and of the Jesuits.

III

In the mid eighteen-forties, two contrary views concerning education began to crystallize: laic and clerical. The ramifications of these conflicting persuasions were transferred to the arena of national politics, leading each side into a more militant position.

The Revolution in 1848 convulsed France once more, and brought violence upon the Church. Out of egotistical

7 On the eve of 1848, some fifty colleges had priests as principals. Ibid., 73
interest, the bourgeoisie became inclined to defend religion, and during the Second Republic, the educational system of France reached a milestone. The Church harvested benefits about which it previously could only dream.

Count de Falloux was appointed Minister of Education and Public Worship. A close association of some duration between one of the most illustrious Liberal Catholics, Count de Montalembert, and the new Minister enabled these men on March 15, 1850, to secure passage in the Assembly of the Falloux Law on education, by which the Church was given the liberty to run its own schools.

The Falloux Law broke down the University's monopoly on teaching. Henceforth, the Church or any other association or person with the necessary qualifications could open private schools, écoles libres. Two categories of school were given legal status: those of the state, founded and maintained by it, to remain in the hands of the University; and the "free schools", founded and endowed by private individuals or organizations, and neither controlled nor formally subsidized by the state. The free schools were to be "inspected by the state only to ensure 'morality, hygiene,

8 "The facts are bound together like the terms of a syllogism....The closing of the national workshops causes the upheaval of June. The Days of June strike the bourgeoisie with terror. The terrified bourgeoisie vote the law of 1850 as a measure of social preservation." L. Liard, L'Enseignement Supérieur, etc., II, 233, cited by Guérard, French Civilization, 235.
and sanitation', and to see that the instruction conformed to 'the Constitution, morality and the laws.' Only the elementary and secondary levels of education were regulated by the Falloux Law.

A number of Catholic prelates became members of the academic councils, that is to say, of the governing body of the reconstituted University. In practice, the free schools were opened and run by the religious communities, which alone had the facilities, organization, and resources to undertake the task before them.

---

9 Evelyn Acomb, The French Laic Laws, (New York, 1941), 17. The so-called Liberal Catholics greeted the Falloux Law as the nineteenth century Edict of Nantes, while the group of intransigent Catholics around Louis Veuillot denounced it as "a miserable compromise". Bury, op. cit., 84, n. 1.

Adolphe Thiers and Abbé Dupanloup, future President of the Third Republic and Bishop of Orleans, respectively, worked hard and in harmony to bring about an agreement which facilitated the ensuance of the Falloux Law. Cf. Dansette, I, 368-370. For the French text of the Law, see A. Debidour, Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870, (Paris, 1898), Pièces Justicatives, XIX, 701-718. For the views of Edgar Quinet on this occasion, cf. below, Appendix VI, B.

10 They were able to compete successfully with the lycées of the state. In secondary schools, by 1854, the number of pupils in the Church schools became higher than in those of the State. By the end of 1851, 257 new schools were opened. Between 1850 and 1866 the percentage of boys educated in Church primary schools rose from 15.7 to 20.9. Philip Spencer, Politics of Belief in Nineteenth-Century France, (New York, 1954), 166.

On another provision of the Falloux Law, see below, n. 40.
The official policy during the first decade of the Second Empire was simultaneously protective and generous toward the Church. The first Minister of Education, Fortoul, collaborated with the religious authorities in the sphere of education.

The substantial and growing influence of the Church in the affairs of the Empire earned it an increasing animosity in many quarters. The Roman question, resulting from the inept policy of Napoleon III toward Austria and Italy in 1860, which inevitably included the temporal power of the Pope, brought the rapid deterioration of cordial relations between the Church and the Empire. Because of variations in policy toward Pius IX, all parties in France, organized or not, were concerned with the Roman problem. They shaped or modified their attitude toward the government accordingly. Each party looked for argumentation in favour of or against the Church, and the word *clerical* entered the vocabulary.  

---

11 For example, religious exams were made mandatory in the lycees; while the selection of teachers for primary grades was taken away from the rectors and depended on the prefect; such appointees were made subordinate to the curé. For the stipulation of duties regarding religious practice, see below, Appendix VI, C.

12 Though used as an adjective from 1848, it appeared as a substantive toward 1860. For the genesis of the use of the word, see Weill, *op. cit.*, 179, n. 1.
In 1863, Victor Duruy became Minister of Education. His designs to uproot the clergy from education and to laicize instruction were a reflection of the upsurge of a strong laic spirit in overt opposition to the participation of the Church in education. The Minister emphasized the necessity for gratuitous and compulsory education by making the primary school practically free of charge, but failed to make it compulsory. Other reforms were effected as well, thus provoking the suspicion and anger of the Church. The clergy became most indignant when Duruy proposed public secondary schools for girls. The protestations and pressure which was brought to bear, checked this innovation and Duruy was dismissed.\textsuperscript{13}

Besides the changes effected by Victor Duruy, an important movement for reform in education was started in 1864 by a young teacher in Alsace, Jean Macé. His Ligue de l'Enseignement was officially endorsed by the government two years later. Though claiming both political and religious neutrality at first, the League was organized with the aim of rendering education laic and combating the influence of the Church in it. A Republican of conviction, Macé had faith in laic education and a stubbornness that did not stumble before

\textsuperscript{13} This passage based on Guérard, \textit{French Civilization}, 238f. Contrasted with the measures of the eighteen-eighties, Duruy was to appear "as a figure of shining white against the black and sinister silhouette of Jules Ferry." Spencer, \textit{op. cit.}, 209.
any obstacle.

The Bishop of Metz gave the alarm in 1867, the Bishop of Orleans soon joined him, and the clergy then attacked the League without reservation. In turn, this action earned for the fledgling League the overt support of the Masonic Lodges. Being a Deist and a Mason himself, Macé welcomed this aid and by 1872, more than one hundred Lodges adhered to the League.

V

In a traditionally Catholic country such as France, Freemasonry assumed the form of a sect and became a rallying point for the anticlericals. Considering the secret nature of their organization, the Lodges exerted an influence out of

---

14 Macé himself stated in 1881 that "the two organizations were independent of each other but worked for the same end"; he completed the statement in 1885 by calling the Education League a "Masonic institution". Acomb, *op.cit.*, 113.

15 This association and the character of the League can be seen in the early 1880's, after the government's decision to remove religious symbols from the schools. The League proposed a bust of the Republic to replace the crucifixes in the classrooms. The pedestal of the bust..."bears significant ornaments: on the right, Ignorance and Superstition symbolized by a mitred monk, are strangled by a chord on which one reads: *Ligue de l'Enseignement*. A veil with Masonic emblems covers the left side. Voltaire lifts it and laughs at the progress his ideas have made." R. P. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la Troisième République*. 2 vols. (Paris, 1910), II, 158. French Freemasonry did not have a centralized organization. There were several rival "obediences". The most famous, influential and numerous was the Grand Orient of the French Rite. C. J. H. Hayes, *France: A Nation of Patriots*. (New York, 1930), 120.
proportion to the size of their membership.

Since the majority of Jacobin leaders during the Great Revolution had been Masons, there existed a close, two-way identification of the "Principles of 1789" with the tenets of French Freemasonry. The revolutionary spirit of Jacobinism was maintained throughout the nineteenth century. The Jacobins and the Masons strove continuously to check the influence and restrict the rights of the Catholic Church. Being inspired by the anticlerical tradition of the Revolution, many of them became "not only anti-Catholics but atheists."\(^\text{16}\)

In the eighteen-sixties, French Masonry grew and prospered. Every city of importance had an association and "the most notable of the Republicans and friends of laic spirit held meetings in the Masonic ateliers".\(^\text{17}\) Members of the bourgeoisie formed a prominent segment of the Masonic fraternity. Using their business and professional connections, they sought proselytes to the "new spirit of secular self-confidence".\(^\text{18}\)

Freemasonry in France was strongly influenced by the ideas of August Comte's Positivism. The heretics among

16 Hayes, *op. cit.*, 118f.
17 Weill, *op. cit.*, 188.
18 Spencer, *op. cit.*, 207.
Comte's disciples accepted only some of the teacher's principles. Thus remoulded, this hybrid Positivism produced a most eminent advocate in the person of Emile Littré, who accepted Comte's scientific outlook, while deflecting its Positivism towards "democracy". Under Littré's guidance, Positivism was endowed with the Republican spirit and being such, it became anticlerical:

A new dogma, a new cult must come forth, so that a new society may replace the old one....Social reforms can only be gained by the extinction of the theological beliefs....There is no new and effective idea but that which intends to replace the old theological doctrine by a social one.  

Anticlericalism, which connected the compound parts of the League of Education, Freemasonry, and Positivism, was to reach its extreme about 1880. This was evident in the words of a professor of literature at Douai, M. Courdavouxs, to a Lodge at Lille:

The distinction between Catholicism and clericalism is purely official and subtle, for the needs of the tribune. But here in the Lodge, let us say aloud, for the sake of truth, that Catholicism and clericalism...


The affinity of Positivism with Masonry was manifested in 1875 on the occasion of the initiation of E. Littré and J. Ferry into the Lodge Clémente Amitié. Littré presented a declaration on positive philosophy, with which Ferry agreed, and the "exceptional publication of which made a great stir." Gabriel Hanotaux, *Contemporary France*, 4 vols. (New York, 1903-1909), II, 554, n.l.

"In the new constitution of the Grand Orient, drawn up in 1884, the humanitarian and scientific objects of Positivism were fused with the Jacobin ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity." Acomb, *op. cit.*, 114.
are only one; and in conclusion, let us add: one cannot be Catholic and republican at the same time; it is impossible.20

VI

Material prosperity and scientific advances could not compensate for the mounting diplomatic reversals of the Second Empire after 1860. The regime was seriously ill and, gnawed by the cancerous growth of hostile political tissues, its strength was ebbing. Republican opposition from 1867 onward "...in the legislature, in the press, and at public meetings increased in confidence, severity and volume."21

The solution to the dramatic agony of the Empire came in the form of its tragic death. In the summer of 1870 the Franco-Prussian War broke out. Within a few days


For the text of the resolution of the Anti-Council of Free-Thinkers, held in Naples, 1869, see below, Appendix VI, D.


A group of 'Young Liberals', most of them lawyers, was gaining prominence. Men like J. Favre and J. Simon, "...supporters of law and order...members of the bourgeoisie and deists were being gradually supplanted outside Parliament by the younger generation, Republicans who declared themselves irreconcilable, anticlericals, atheists and Radicals...men like Jules Ferry, Gambetta, Floquet and Brisson." René Arnaud, *The Second Republic and Napoleon III* (New York, 1937), 327.

"This new generation...put humanity in the place of God. Its inspiration came, directly or indirectly, from Comte, Littré, Renan." Debidoir, *Histoire des Rapports*, 595.
of that event, in the distant Vatican, the new Constitution
* Pastor Aeternus, defining Papal Primacy and Infallibility,
was promulgated. These two, seemingly unrelated events were
pregnant with consequences in the following years.

From its outbreak, the Franco-Prussian War was one
in which "the odds were more decisively on one side and that
side was not the French." Like a series of thunderbolts,
news of military defeats reached Paris; the French army was
collapsing. The crucial debacle at Sedan ended on September
2, with the surrender of Emperor Napoleon III. Within
forty-eight hours, the Third French Republic was bloodlessly
born in Paris.

In essence, the position of State, Church and Educa-
tion entered the period after 1870 quite unchanged. Bent on
peace, in February 1871, the nation elected a Conservative
Assembly to decide the future course of French affairs. On February 17, Adolphe Thiers was named 'Chief of the
Executive Power'.

The period between March 18 and May 28, 1871, marked
the brief duration of the Paris Commune, which showed its
ture face concerning religion and education, and which the

---


23 Of the 630 members in the new Assembly, there were
no less than 400 Royalists of various adherence. There were
only 80 Radicals. Frank Jellinek, The Paris Commune of 1871.
(London, 1937), 87.
Third Republic later emulated to a surprising degree. In early April, the separation of Church and state was decreed. Much of the legislation was carried out by various commissions set up by the Commune. One was that of Education, through which its commissioner, Edouard Vaillant, pushed many measures to open laic schools. To satisfy the demands of the anticlerical Jacobin and Blanquist leaders of the Commune, he aimed principally at rendering the schools not only laic, but gratuitous and compulsory as well. Vaillant succeeded in secularizing some schools, but his task consisted mostly of reorganizing the system of education, which had fallen into utter chaos during the war. His main achievement was the expulsion of priests from teaching. In a brief span of time, Vaillant established a pattern and a precedent which was later fulfilled by the Republic on all three counts.

24 See text of the Decree to that effect, below, Appendix VI, E. Almost from the beginning, the wholesale arrest of priests began. In just one instance, in the final days of the Commune, 74 prominent hostages were executed; one-third of them were priests, including the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Darboy. "So high a proportion grimly indicates the deep anticlericalism of the Commune." Spencer, op. cit., 243.


26 In that respect, Vaillant was a precursor to the educational reformer of the Republic, Jules Ferry. On Vaillant's role in education at this time, cf. Jellinek, op. cit., 404-9, on which the above sketch is based. For an extract from a letter from George Clemenceau to the teachers in his municipality pertaining to religious education at this time, see below, Appendix VI, F.
The radicalism of the Commune added new impetus to French religious feeling. The middle classes once more saw in religion a guarantee of social order, protection for their acquired fortunes, and a barrier against radical tendencies tainted with socialism.

VII

The composition of the new Assembly revealed a strong desire for a third Restoration rather than a Third Republic. As three distinct allegiances and three different pretenders to the throne existed, the question was which monarchy should be restored. The Legitimists had the strongest claim to restore Count de Chambord, the last of the senior Bourbon line. But there were other problems as well.

With the disastrous war, the historical continuity of the French political, national and social forces received an abrupt jolt, requiring a profound re-appraisal and re-statement of France's ecclesiastic, domestic, foreign, and colonial policy. The first two were so often interlaced that they were, on many occasions, almost identical. The best example of it was in the common ground of education, where for a century a great battle had been raging between the Church and the Revolution. 27 In spite of a revival of

27 'The battle between Church and Revolution' is an apt expression. It closely and symbolically connotes the fight of the opposing spirits that each represented. Both Lecanuet, op.cit., I, 242, and Emanuel Barbier, Histoire du Catholicisme Liberal, etc., 5 vols. (Bordeaux, 1924), I, 276, use this expression frequently.
religious fervour, France after 1870, was no longer a dominantly Catholic state. The growth of areligion in the secular life of the nation was a potent factor.

Ostensibly still in force, the Concordat of 1801 continued as the regulatory basis of the relationship between the Church and the new regime. Though intact, some provisions of the Concordat ceased to be observed during the eighteen-seventies. But the general atmosphere and the position of the Church were healthy. Catholicism was again flourishing strongly and was in power. In addition, the clergy served, with a splendid record, during the war and thus earned a new popularity. They sensed their advantage and wanted to use it.

In their sermons, the bishops pointed out the goal of irreligious doctrines, suggesting that the recent trying events were the logical consequence of revolutionary atheism. And if the cause of papal temporal power was difficult to support effectively, the prelates and the clergy of France were at least in a position to work toward giving the crown

---


29 The attitude of the State could be seen in the rise in the budget allocated for Public Worship. The last one voted under the Empire in 1870 was 49.7 million francs; in 1872 it rose to 53.2; and in 1878 it was over 53.7 million. Exact figures in Lecanuet, 1, 225. Also, cf. Debidour, L'Église catholique, 1, 87.

30 Weill, op.cit., 217.
to De Chambord. The bishops, including Dupanloup and Pie, in spite of certain personal differences in outlook, had been striving for restoration.  

It was Count de Chambord who gave the coup de grâce to the futile and prolonged attempts of the anxious royalists. At the moment when enthronement appeared imminent, on October 27, 1873, De Chambord wrote the famous Salzburg letter, wherein he reiterated his refusal to "become the legitimate King of the Revolution."  

VIII

Coming into the open between 1871 and 1873, many aspects of the national political temperature helped to accentuate rivalry between the hostile parties, which in turn penetrated into the overall sphere of the problem of education.  

The first signs of a shift of the political axis in the Third Republic came relatively early. A convincing demonstration of it was contained in the result of the by-elections of July 2, 1872. Of 118 vacancies to be filled,  

---

31 Ibid., 186 f.  
32 For the text of the letter, see Count de Falloux, Memoires, 2 vols., (London, 1888), II, 459 f.  
33 The political structure of the period was in a state of flux. There were four main groups, each encompassing a number of branches: (a) the Royalist parties, controlling the Assembly; (b) a small, but active party of Bonapartists; (c) moderate Liberal-Conservatives, currently in power and led by Thiers; and (d) the Republican wing, fostered and led by Gambetta.
the Republicans captured no less than one hundred.  

Encouraged by these results, Radical leader Leon Gambetta undertook to dispel any doubts as to the course which the surging republicanism might take. In a cross-country tour, delivering speeches, invoking the "fertile ideas of 1789", appealing to the unity of the "artisan and peasant", he ended by spelling out the program which was to dominate the coming years. He vehemently denounced participation by the clergy in politics:

There is no longer any occasion for talking of monarchical parties. There remains a party that you know well, a party which is the enemy of all independence, of all enlightenment, and of all stability, for this party is the declared enemy of all that is beneficent in the organization of modern societies. It is the enemy...you have named it: it is 'clericalism'.

The new atmosphere out-dated the moderating services of President Thiers. All his daring political skill in adopting "eighteenth century skepticism to nineteenth century opportunist realism" no longer could succeed in subduing the crystallization of new political blocks. Talleyrand's last pupil, Adolph Thiers resigned, and on


35 Speech at St. Julien, October 20, 1872, cited by Hanotaux, I, 504. For the text of the Radical party program, see below, Belleville Manifesto, Appendix II.

36 Jellinek, op. cit., 44
May 24, 1873, the Duc de Magenta, hero of the Crimean War, the vanquished of Sedan, Marshal MacMahon, was elected the new President.

IX

In education, the provisions of the Falloux Law remained in force. While this basis was essentially maintained de jure, recent events made its application and observance very precarious, often ignored. Both Church and state desired more than they actually had.37

In their clamour for freedom, their frustration under the Empire, and envy of the favoured position of the Church, the Republicans were carried into an extreme view. They regarded freedom as a means of subverting the Catholic faith itself. The upsurge of an aggressively laic philosophy excited the anticlericals, not by the mere prospect of liberty under the Republic, but rather by the liberty to "...secularize education, to expel monks and nuns, [and] to humiliate the bishops."38

By virtue of the Falloux Law, the status of education was favourable to the Church, which thus became an

37 After 1870, a new phase in education seemed inevitable. There was an almost universal struggle for control of education: in Austria, Belgium, England, Italy, Prussia and the United States. In each case there was a drive to render education laic or non-denominational. Barbier, I, 276. In this upsurge for reforms, he blames secret societies for having ordered the campaign. Cf. Ibid.

38 Spencer, op. cit., 208.
easy target for attacks by those who wanted to exclude its participation in the system. The demand for educational reform under the Third Republic turned primarily into a strong anticlerical campaign. All Free-Thinkers, whatever their singular denomination or purpose, found a common enemy in clericalism and formed a united front to combat it.

The well-known cry, that it was the German school-master who conquered at Sadowa and Sedan, symbolized the new awareness in France of the importance of education. In a few simple words, the whole Republican principle for primary education could be summarized: make it compulsory, gratuitous and laic.39

The official move came on December 15, 1871. The Minister of Education, Jules Simon, maintaining only the first part of the principle, introduced a bill on primary education in the Assembly. He claimed indignantly that some six hundred thousand children did not attend school or receive any instruction. The only solution, he explained, was

39 It was claimed that education would become truly national only when this tri-pronged principle was accomplished. The reasons: gratuitous, because that which concerns all should be paid by all; compulsory, because it was necessary to assert that the child did not belong exclusively to the family, and that it was his natural right to receive the elements of instruction, and a no less natural duty of society to guarantee it; laic, to make education independent of different religious denominations. From Ferdinand Buisson, "La nouvelle éducation nationale", La Foi Laïque. (Paris, 1913), 16 and 17.

In a speech at San-Quentin, Nov. 16, 1871, Gambetta expounded the republican program of education and defined what he meant by laïcisation: 'respect for liberty of conscience. The Church teaches faith; the school should teach scientific method.' Cited by Paul Deschanel, Gambetta, (New York, 1920), 154.
to make primary education compulsory. This principle established, he admitted that the existing arrangement could continue, leaving the option to the municipal councils to choose between religious and lay teachers. But Article 16 of Simon's bill stipulated that from January 1, 1876, no-one could teach without being in possession of a teacher's certificate testifying to his qualifications. This meant abolishment of the letters of obedience which, up to then, had been sufficient for religious teachers.

The Catholics promptly perceived in this bill a partial realization of the revolutionary program. If education was to be compulsory, they reasoned, next it would be gratuitous, as poor families would not be able to defray the cost of the compulsory system, and both these concepts implied laicization. By endowing its own schools, the state would make them preferred to those run by the Church, which did not receive a subsidy from it.

Moreover, the Minister of Education, invoking the principle of neutrality in education, would probably soon

---

40 Lecanuet, I, 242 and Barbier, I, 276 f. The brevet de capacité was a teacher's diploma given upon completion of a prescribed course, especially pedagogy. The lettre d'obédience was a device granted by the Falloux Law. It gave recognition to novitiates, and in it the nuns received their pedagogical instruction. Estimated as equivalent to the Normal School course, the letter of obedience by the Superior of the Order given to a nun was, in consequence, acceptable in place of the brevet de capacité.
abolish basic instruction in religion in the primary schools. Following that, the rudiments of positivistic ethics would be substituted for the catechism; and it would end by the founding, in a legally atheistic Republic, a school of impious doctrine. The Catholics maintained that the advocates of such reforms wanted to impose their schools upon the youth of France to make it anti-religious.

X

Such clairvoyant declarations, daily filling the columns of the Catholic press, explain the fight that ensued over Simon's bill. All the bishops soon joined in, and a letter addressed to the Assembly by Cardinal de Bonnechose expressed the position of the clergy:

We, the bishops of France, natural guardians of religious and moral principles, defenders of the rights of conscience and of pious families, solemnly protest the fatal and vexatious introduction of this bill. We beseech the deputies of the National Assembly to reject it or to modify it in the meaning of the true interests of the country and of Christian civilization.

The Catholic Committee of Paris launched a program of petitions and eventually gathered some one-half million signatures. Not to be outdone, the League of Education started its own petitions. The campaign quickened, and republican papers all over the country duly supported the League's agitation. In mid-June, 1872, the League's mammoth petition, bearing over eight hundred thousand

41 Cited by Barbier, I, 277 f.
signatures, was presented to the Assembly at Versailles.\textsuperscript{42}

In early January 1872, the Assembly appointed a parliamentary committee to study the projected Simon bill. Only two of the fifteen members of this committee were in favour of compulsory instruction. Despite hostile objections, Bishop Dupanloup was the chairman of the committee and M. Ernoul was appointed its reporter. The committee set out to match Simon's bill with a counter-project of its own.

Six months later, with Ernoul's report, the committee introduced its own version of the bill, which Louis Veuillot's paper, \textit{L'Univers}, called "the greatest and most memorable page of contemporary legislation.\textsuperscript{43} Declaring itself fervently in favour of the improvement of education in France, the committee took a stand against compulsion in it.

The principle of the gratuitous school was censured. Education should be provided free of charge to all children whose families were unable to pay for it. The head of the family, when able, not the state, ought to provide the necessities involved for the education of his children.

Finally, M. Ernoul declared that education was

\textsuperscript{42} Debidour, \textit{L'Eglise catholique}, I, 92; breakdown of signatures: 116,000 for compulsory education alone; 363,000 for compulsory and gratuitous; 348,000 for all three reforms. \textit{Loc. cit.}, n. 2.

\textsuperscript{43} Cited by Barbier, I, 279. A number of by-elections were held that summer, and among the mostly republican deputies who were sent to the Chamber was a scientist, Paul Bert, who was to become one of Jules Ferry's closest collaborators.
inconceivable without religion and without moral instruction. The proposed bill of the Dupanloup committee never reached the debate stage. With no trace in it of his own project, Jules Simon carefully refrained from bringing to discussion a bill contrary to the principles he wished to follow. Both projects, thus shelved, suffered a slow death.

XI

The problem of secondary education differed greatly from that of primary. Prior to the Law of 1850, the Higher Council of Education (Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction Publique), an ostensibly lay body, which was a branch of the University, directed the policy of secondary education. The Falloux Law broadened the base of the Council to include elected representatives from all social bodies of the country. Two years later, this was reversed under the Empire, and government appointees were substituted.

Toward the end of 1872, the Bishop of Orleans, Dupanloup, with the support of a number of prelates and men

44 He said: "Teaching is a force and an instrument which must be entrusted to honest hands; it is a light which must direct the soul of the child and guide him toward the eternal source of the good, beautiful and true." Journal Officiel, July 1, 1872, cited by Barbier, I, 280.

For this whole episode, I have drawn heavily on Barbier, I, 276-81, and Lecanuet, I, 243-7.

45 This and the following sections are based chiefly on Barbier, I, 294-314; Debidour, L'Eglise catholique, I, 138-146; Hanotaux, III, 114-120 and 265-67; Lecanuet, I, 248-60; Weill, 220-6 and 245.
from the University, moved to have the Law again reversed to
the basis of the Falloux settlement. Duc de Broglie prepared
a report for the Assembly which a favourably disposed commit-
tee undertook to study. It was proposed that the Council
ought to consist of thirty-eight members, only seven of which
should be from the teaching profession and appointed by the
government. Among others elected by their peers ought to be
four archbishops or bishops, four professors of the faculty,
three members of the Institute of France, and two members of
the Supreme Court.

A bill to this effect was introduced in the Assembly
on January 7, 1873, when the first serious discussion with
overtones of clericalism took place. The lively debate
lasted some one dozen sessions. Paul Bert and M. Brisson
were the staunchest enemies of the Bill. Its defenders were
De Broglie and Mgr. Dupanloup. The latter elaborated on the
reasons why the episcopacy ought to have a seat on this
Council, firing a salvo at the opponents:

One must recognize that there is a moral force in
the Church, in religion....We ask that there be no
law of exclusion against us, that we not be removed
from the Council of Education, because our place is
there....You need moral law. I assure you that there
is only one which can save you, and that is the Deca-
logue. When you violate it, when you deny God, when
you make yourselves the independent masters of your
conscience and of your life, there is only disorder
and straying....

If the Christian civilization - which your sad
efforts make smaller every day among these poor
people - disappeared with us, the Paris Commune
would soon be everywhere, and you would become the fright of the civilized world. 46

Both M. Vacherot and Jules Simon spoke in favour of the law, which was passed with some minor modifications on March 13, 1873. Due to lack of time, the Assembly did not reorganize the Academic and Departmental Councils. In the thus enlarged and re-established Higher Council, representatives of Agriculture, Commerce and Manufacturing were also given membership.

XII

This was merely a prelude to the struggle for the precious stakes of Higher Education. All attempts of the Catholics to gain liberty of higher education went without success for over thirty years.

Falloux did appoint two commissions to study this particular problem. Almost twenty years later, in 1867, the question was revived, and the project dragged inconclusively in the Assembly. To break the deadlock, the then Minister of Education, Segris, appointed an extra-parliamentary commission to study the situation and attempt to prepare a specific bill. The war brought the effort to naught. 47

The Catholics felt handicapped because the state

46 Cited by Barbier, I, 296. For an extensive text of the speech by De Broglie, see Lecanuet, I, 248-50.

47 Former Premier Guizot directed the unfinished project. Lecanuet, I, 251.
retained the exclusive right to confer university degrees, and thus guarded "...the door both of higher culture and of superior posts." 48

The question was re-opened in the Assembly soon after the war. A zealous Catholic, Count Jaubert, introduced a bill on the last day of July, 1871. A committee was delegated to study the proposed law and a Liberal deputy, Laboulaye, was appointed its reporter. The committee required a full eighteen months to consider the bill and the report was tabled in the Assembly on July 15, 1873.

The proposed law declared liberty in higher education. Any citizen who was of age and with no legal encumbrances would have the right to offer courses and open establishments of higher learning. He might teach anything in his courses, except that which constituted a law-breaking offence. Associations could be formed freely for the encouragement or propagation of higher education. Laboulaye reported:

We did not question whether these associations will be religious or laic. It is a matter of conscience for the citizens to adopt a way of life,...Religious liberty is no less respectable than any other form of liberty and we have no right at all to exclude Frenchmen and citizens from education because they are guided to it by a sacred vocation. 49

Of the more important provisions, aside from those concerning the holding of property, this was a major one: the

48 Hanotaux, I, 114.

49 Laboulaye's Report, 2, cited by Barbier, I, 297. For more detail on the report cf. ibid., 297 f.
free Universities and faculties may be given the legal power to confer degrees. There were, however, some conditions: the number of chairs and professors must be determined by the Council of Education; all who preside at examinations must be holders of a doctorate; and finally, the same regulations as in the state faculties must prevail in the programs and requirements of the candidates. But, due to pressure of other matters, the project was shelved and a new delay ensued.

XIII

When the bill finally came up for discussion before the Assembly in early December, 1874, the resulting debate was a battle less on the principle of the law than on the two contrary philosophies of education. Opposing Laboulaye and Mgr. Dupanloup were two university professors, Paul Bert and M. Baussire, joined by one of the best orators of the Left, Challemel-Lacour.

Paul Bert opened with violent objections to the bill. The Bishop of Orleans answered him in a lengthy apology for the Church in education. He enraged the Republicans by putting the Revolution itself on trial, claiming that under the old regime religion and liberty had created everything, and

50 The draft of Laboulaye's law exuded..."the most sincere and absolute" liberalism. Barbier, I, 298. While Mgr. Dupanloup and a number of Catholic deputies were in agreement with the project, many liberals in and out of the Assembly strongly criticized it.
impious revolutionary tyranny ruined it all. Mgr. Dupanloup extolled twenty-three universities of the old regime which were fertile, independent, free institutions and radiant foci of intellectual life. He further irritated his opponents by the use of the ecclesiastical 'We'. The Bishop answered his own questions thus: "Indeed, who was it that created in France and in Europe, Public Education, Higher Education, the Universities? Who endowed the world with schools? We alone, the Church."

Challemel-Lacour, a Jacobin by temperament, took his turn to deliver a counter-blows at the Bishop. He denounced the bill, considering it to be an attack on the moral unity of France, on the security of the civil government, and on the external security of the country. Men educated in free universities would indefinitely foster the worst of discords, the discord of souls. The main target of his speech was the Church:

Only one interest is in question, that of the Catholic Church. No lay association can be established in order to profit by this new liberty. The only association which could profit by it is the only one which exists, rich, free, authorized, powerful, ever conquering, and never satisfied, the Catholic Church.


52 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 116 f. In the versions of this speech cited by Barbier, I, 301, and Debidour, Eglise catholique, I, 143, the first sentence of the citations is not followed by "No lay association...", nor is the break indicated. Because the passage cited above appears to be a compound, it was used.
In the continuation, Challemel-Lacour directly attacked the teachings of the Church. The Syllabus of Errors, issued by Pius IX in 1864, was the object of his ire: future generations educated in Catholic universities would seek to support and to apply the principles of the Syllabus; the vast majority of contemporary Frenchmen considered the condemned propositions to be the very foundation on which its society rests. Only a cataclysm would result if the nation were to be allowed to be divided into two camps. The choice must be made. It would hardly be prudent to allow France to "become the champion of Ultramontanism, the fortress of Catholic spirit, the instrument of clerical restoration."

Perhaps sensing the republican sympathies, the speaker ended with a direct plea to the Assembly, whom he urged "...not to allow such a debate to be opened; let it [the Assembly] be adjourned until a time when the disposition of Catholicism will be modified, when the Catholic clergy, in one way or another, will have become reconciled to modern ideas...."

The Bishop Dupanloup felt compelled to answer the criticisms and the charges. He pointed out that the accusations against the Church exposed the weakness of the accusers, who feared competition and liberty itself. The

---

53 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 118.

54 Ibid., Lecanuet, i, 257, called this speech "perfidious and spiteful".
remainder of his speech was taken up with defence of the Syllabus. The Bishop demonstrated the accusations as being based on the ill-conceived and erroneous interpretation of the Syllabus given by most of its critics.

Laboulaye intervened, trying to pacify the spirits. A motion of amendment by Bardoux, suggesting reservation to the State of the power to confer degrees, was not acted upon. With many republicans abstaining, the Assembly voted 331:184 to pass on to a second deliberation.55

With emotions somewhat cooled, on December 21 the debate began. There was an amendment offered by Pascal Duprat, seconded by Jules Simon, which provided for a free higher educational system, while stipulating that the state alone should retain both supervision of it and the power to grant degrees. Duprat took a moderate position. He pleaded for complete liberty under the authority of the laws. By enjoying freedom of teaching, the Church would use her right. This could not be denied to anyone, as long as such a right did not become either a monopoly or a privilege.56

The compromise, as conceived by Duprat's amendment, visualized thereby the preservation and safeguard of the secular principle. But such a modification, if adopted, would have meant the first substantial alteration of the bill as reported by Laboulaye. In turn, the move threatened

55 Barbier, I, 302.
56 Hanotaux, III, 119 f.
to fall short of the objective which the Catholics had been
trying for so long to attain. They then offered an amendment
of their own. 57

At the end, only Article 1 of the proposed law was
voted by the Assembly which, unable to find a solution for
the remaining clauses, postponed further debate, adjourning
it for another session.

XIV

The interruption lasted longer than anticipated.
The Assembly was preoccupied with discussing the issue of
the new Constitution. While the republicans spared no ef­
fort to smother Laboulaye's project, Mgr. Dupanloup contin­
ued his efforts to keep it alive. 58 The Assembly agreed to
place discussion of the law again on the agenda, setting
the date for June 6, 1875. Laboulaye opened the debate,
stressing anew the Liberal thesis which was the soul and
principle of the project. Asking for liberty for everyone,

57 Proposed by Adenet, Buisson and Henry Fournier, the
amendment read: "Free establishments shall be administered
by three persons at least. They shall include at least one
Faculty, comprising the same number of Professor's chairs
as one of the similar faculties belonging to the state.
Professors shall have a Doctor's Degree." Cited by
Hanotaux, III, 120.

58 In the Assembly on March 15 and 28, 1875, the Bishop
protested the postponement, claiming that there appeared
to be a prevalent desire to bury the law. Barbier, I, 302.
he said: "If you refuse us individual liberty as Catholics, what would you want us to do as citizens? I demand that Catholics should have freedom as citizens; I do not ask privileges for associations."\(^5^9\)

In his turn, Mgr. Dupanloup expressed bewilderment at the distinction being made between Catholics and citizens. Alluding to certain accusations, he denied that the Church and the Catholics ever asked liberty for themselves alone. They wished for no monopoly in education, but they did demand common law and common freedom. Their only desire was for liberty to be granted on just and equal conditions for all. Mgr. Dupanloup said that it was incorrect:

...to believe that the associations for which we claim freedom of higher education, are only religious associations. If the law is made well, the quarry is open to all laymen and religious; they can enter it with an equal ardour, and...contend for the prize of public confidence and esteem.\(^6^0\)

This argumentation by the Bishop was both clever and disarming. At the moment when the tide was turning favourably for Catholic demands, in his own zeal Chesnelong sounded a sour note which the Republicans did not fail to hear. He demanded for each diocese the right to open classes and, in claiming it, he expressed his argument in terms that seemed contrary to that of Mgr. Dupanloup. He

\(^5^9\) Cited by Hanotaux, III, 264.

\(^6^0\) Cited by Barbier, I, 302.
stated:

We believe that the Catholic Church, to which we have the honour to belong, has in the matter of Education, a proper and superior right which it owes to its origin and which is part of its mission. Wherever the Church is precluded from taking her place in Education, Truth remains in bonds.61

Article 2 of the bill allowed the departments and the communes the liberty to institute courses and open faculties. Surprisingly, by a stroke of fortune and in spite of vigorous opposition by the radicals, the Chesnelong amendment was passed, thereby providing the same benefits of Article 2 to the dioceses. Without obstruction, the other articles were passed in succession, until the Assembly arrived at Article 12, on collation des grades.62 On this point, the Left took a firm stand and fought relentlessly.

The Catholics demanded for future faculties the right to confer degrees. The project of the Laboulaye committee stipulated that this right might be granted to the Catholics by a special law, after the new universities had fulfilled certain conditions, and had given evidence of their operation. A variety of proposals were made concerning this thorny question. Some deputies invoked the exclusive right of the State; others favoured 'mixed juries'; still others

61 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 265; the effect of the amendment which Chesnelong advocated would have meant the creation of civil individuality for the dioceses, which was equal to the "return to mortmain". Ibid.

62 Lecanuet, I, 258; collation des grades implies the whole aspect of granting degrees.
favoured one State jury alone; and some advocated the right of conferring degrees to free faculties after they had been in existence at least five years.

In the debate which followed over Article 12, Jules Ferry mounted the rostrum. Opposing the measures which he saw as advantageous to the Church, he clarified the principles of the whole radical outlook of the republican wing, which he represented, when he said: "I believe in a laic State, laic in its essence, laic in all its organs."  

A few days later, Ferry declared himself in favour of the exclusive rights of the state, and proposed an amendment to that effect, ably defending the state's prerogatives: control was the essential function of the state in education and had for its goal the effective maintenance of the standard of studies. He then pointed out Catholic 'designs' in the whole matter by quoting the concepts of a program decided at an earlier congress of French Catholic Committees.  

---

63 Hanotaux, III, 265; for highlights of the discussion on the new law, see Weill, 220 - 226.

64 Cited by Weill, 225, n. 4.

65 Held in Paris, in April, 1874, one of the main items on the agenda was the question of higher education. A petition drafted by Father Marquigny, S.J., was sent to the Deputies asking for prompt discussion of the law. The petition expressed regret that the proposed law 'should be founded on the freedom for all to teach all.' The exclusiveness of the claims for the Church in education advocated by Father Marquigny were out of proportion to reality, and
demanding: (a) suppression of the University monopoly and the right to found their own universities, which would confer degrees without outside examiners; (b) equal recognition of degrees granted by free universities with those conferred by the state universities; (c) a civil personality for the free universities; and (d) the abrogation of the laws and decrees interdicting religious congregations, and hampering their rights.

Ferry declared that the concession which the Church gained by the Chesnelong amendment was a partial realization of the aggressive Catholic program, and that it "meant the Church against the State: a State within a State." Pursuing this reasoning, Ferry continuously attacked the Church, accusing it of the intention of gaining a monopoly in education. Citing Father Marquigny, S.J., Ferry saw the Jesuits as the inventors of the Church's claim to grant degrees.

provoked much opposition to the Church itself. In Etudes religieuses, August, 1873, p. 258, he wrote: "Ideally, the Church should be teacher of the people...director of the schools and inspiration of the sciences,...To the Church ought to belong the divine right to teach and to reign, to the State the duty to serve and protect the Church." In the issue for March, 1874, of the Etudes, he further stated: "The 'perfect' regime of public Instruction, a regime which would correspond to the normal state of society, would be one in which the Church would possess alone, in deed as in right, direction of all instruction, at all levels; this would mean to consign to the Church the universal overseeing of primary schools, secondary and superior." Cited by Barbier, I, 298 and 299. For more extracts, see ibid.

66 Based on Hanotaux, III, 265 f.
67 Cited ibid., III, 266.
Alerting the Assembly to all the dangers for the State if this privilege were granted, and alluding to the demands of the Church, he concluded:

I have the right to point out this doctrine and to tell you: here lies the peril! And, if M. Chesnelong will allow me, he is too clever a man not to give the word its purely intellectual meaning, here is the enemy! 68

XV

Bishop Dupanloup undertook to rebuke Ferry and to parry the accusations about the Church’s desire for a monopoly in education. Elaborating upon the reasons why the free university ought to be accorded the right to confer degrees, the Bishop estimated this privilege to be an essential condition of liberty and of life. To refuse this right, he continued, would mean to deprive the free universities of honour and to refuse them the right of free work by free methods. What M. Ferry advocated, the Bishop maintained, was dependence and servitude: the state would be the judge and the jury. The moral freedom of Christian students would be impeded; for if the state retained the power to grant degrees, only its method would be valid at the examinations.

Jules Simon added his own plea for the state to retain exclusively the collation des grades; but when

68 Journal Officiel, June 13, 1875, cited by Lecanuet, I, 259; and partially by Hanotaux, III, 266, on which this translation is closely based.
Ferry's amendment came to a vote, it was rejected by the Assembly. This important question was still far from a practical solution.

Almost as if anticipating this deadlock, when writing his report Laboulaye had included the idea of compromise: the state may delegate the conferring of degrees to the free universities. To whom and in what manner the state was to delegate it, was a minor problem. It was only necessary to find a satisfactory formula, and in the search for it there was ample room for compromise. Inspired by this thought, one of the deputies, M. Paris, proposed a fresh amendment which was designed to institute a formula of mixed juries. The proposal met with a favourable reaction. The Minister of Education, Wallon, agreed to it, and Bishop Dupanloup, having found Paris's amendment a fair bargain, rallied to its support. On June 16, the amendment was passed by a vote in the Assembly.

Final deliberation on the bill began on July 8. While the success of the Catholics seemed assured, the opposition not only continued, but stiffened its resistance.

The text of M. Paris's amendment: "A special jury will be formed from professors or agrégés of the State faculties and of the free faculties, who are holders of a doctoral degree. They will be chosen in equal number from both types of faculties to which the candidates for examination belong. They will be appointed for each session, by the Minister of Education, who will also designate a chairman. The examination sessions will be specified each year by a decision of the Minister, upon advice of the Superior Council of Public Instruction." Cited by Barbier, I, 304.
The adversaries of the bill fought every step of the way, speaking more frequently and offering more amendments. The champions of state exclusiveness, Brisson, Favre, Beaussire and Tolain, each in turn, attacked the law. Lucien Brun, De Richemont, Chesnelong and Grivart defended it. By his openly liberal attitude during the series of debates, the Minister, Wallon, contributed to the final victory of the Catholics. On July 12, 1875, the Assembly voted the passage of the Law on Higher Education as a whole, by a majority of fifty votes.

In spite of gaps and a weak foundation, the Bill constituted a considerable advantage for the Catholics. Its passage was a red-letter day in their calendar and represented, in their eyes, *une oeuvre capitale* of the Assembly. While the Catholics celebrated this great success, their enraged enemies quickly began to issue threats. But the

---

70 In the final critical stages of the debate, Mgr. Dupanloup asked to speak, but declined his turn to avoid irritating the emotional opposition. Whereupon Cardinal Guibert was prompted to say: "I have often admired the Bishop of Orleans for his courage to speak; I admired him yesterday even more for his courage to remain silent." Cited by Barbier, I, 305 f.

71 Lecanuet, I, 261; the vote was 316 : 266. While giving the same ratio, Hanotaux, III, 267, gives the date as July 8. For the French text of this law, see Debidour, *L'Eglise catholique*, I, Appendices, I; 419 - 424.

72 *L'Univers* acclaimed it jubilantly: "Presently the cause of freedom has won and that of monopoly has lost. We can sing the *Nunc dimittis*." Cited by Barbier, I, 306. For the mixed reaction of the Pope, see *ibid.*, 307; and
Catholics, with élan, quickly set out to apply the new law. Thanks to the generosity with which they responded to appeals from the episcopate, five free universities were very soon founded, simultaneously, at Angers, Lille, Lyons, Toulouse, and in Paris, where in November 1875 the faculty of law opened its classes.

This latest victory for the Catholics in the sphere of free education was destined to last for but five years. One of the educators, Father Didon, commenting at that time on the July Law of 1875, expressed the attitude of many Catholics when he wrote: "The struggle has begun; the battlefield is the country; the aim the universities; Catholicism and Positivism are about to dispute the soul of France." 73

---

CHAPTER II
OUTBREAK OF THE CONFLICT OVER EDUCATION
1876 - 1878

I

During the two years after Marshal MacMahon became President, France "entered the Republic backwards."¹ After lengthy preparation and study, in January 1875 the Assembly opened a debate on proposals for the solution of the constitutional question. A set of three clumsily-drafted laws was eventually passed, which together represent the so-called Constitution of 1875.² A joylessly-conceived piece of political carpentry, by an accidental majority of a single vote in favour of the Wallon amendment, these laws emerged as the Constitution of the Republic. This document owed "its origin, as it [owed] its duration, to the weakness of purpose and dissension of the monarchical parties."³ As in its earlier stages, the Third Republic had grown like

---

¹ Brogan, French Nation, 164, citing Gambetta's newspaper La Republique Francaise. Gambetta began to publish this paper in 1871; his aim had been to make it "an organ and a nursery of the Government." Deschanel, op. cit., 152.


³ J. E. C. Bodley, France, 2 vols., (New York, 1898), I, 263. At the age of five, the illegitimate child of the Franco-Prussian war, the Third Republic, was thus legalized.
"a stalactite, from the top downwards." Having completed its work, the Assembly was dissolved on December 31, 1875, and a new election was called.

Elected on February 20 and March 5, 1876, the new Chamber had a majority which was republican and anticlerical. The new alignment of political parties in this freshly-elected body effectively reflected the deep change in the political climate; and the ramifications overflowed into the realm of foreign affairs, as well as into the fiscal

---


5 Hanotaux, III, 412. Prior to dissolution, of the seventy-five Senators for life that the conservative Chamber had to elect from among its own ranks, no less than two-thirds were men of the Left.

6 George Weill, *Histoire du Catholicisme Libéral en France*, (Paris, 1909), 201. From now on, "anti-clericalism became the necessary part of the republican theory." Debidour, *L'Eglise catholique*, 1, 147. Only ten out of 36 million citizens were enfranchised by the new Constitution and "only 75% of these actually voted in 1876. Over one-half of the electorate, 5,383,000 lived by agriculture, and 3,552,000 of them owned the land they tilled." Thomson, op. cit., 41. "If the government of the Republic did not amuse its clientele with some attacks against the Church and religion, the people would perhaps wish to divert themselves by war on property and property holders." Eugene Dufeuille, *L'Anticlericalisme avant et pendant notre republique*, (Paris, n.d.) [1911], 342.

And later on, "the statements of Gambetta and Ferry, testimony of their contemporaries, and the parliamentary situation all seem to indicate that anti-clericalism was deliberately fostered...as a means of satisfying the radical element, while the social reforms for which they clamoured were indefinitely deferred." Acomb, op. cit., 81.
policies of the country.

The Conservative President decided to cooperate with the Chamber and endeavoured to chart a moderate political course. His choice of Armand Dufaure to form a new Cabinet was a promising one. A typical conservative Republican, Dufaure was the "best Minister that the middle class could provide." 7

A parliamentary waiting-game occupied the early stages of the re-orientated Assembly. The struggle over political influence continued, though with subdued tones, while the Dufaure administration discharged its duties in conventional manner. But, when in the fall months, several conflicts with the Chamber were followed by the defeat in the Senate of a bill on amnesty for political prisoners, Dufaure chose to resign on December 2, 1876. Inheriting much the same problems, the next Cabinet was headed by Jules Biron.

Liberalism and Democracy were the dominant ideals of the age, and the dominant figure in it was the fiery Gambetta. He had criss-crossed the country during the recent election campaign, urging the French to be Liberal. Defining for his audiences the stock variations on the basic Liberal theme of freedom of conscience, Gambetta was specific on one point:

By a 'Liberal' I also mean one who has made up his mind to prevent any clerical faction from becoming a force in the political world. I propose that the Church shall

7 Hanotaux, III, 480.
remain the Church. There lies the peril, not merely for France, but for Europe.8

II

The successful campaign for Church rights in education - in which the Catholics "demanded freedom of higher education of which the liberals had been the chief sponsors,"9 - had given rise among them to hopeful speculations which had but a weak foundation in the political reality of France. Conversely, their opponents, having won the Constitution and the next elections, then redoubled their hostility toward the Church.

8 Campaign speech at Lille, February 6, 1876, cited by Deschanel, op. cit., 212 f. After the electoral victory, Gambetta "issued a clarion-call for the massing of all Republican forces." Ibid., 217.

The best prophylactic measure against the 'peril' was to fight the influence of the Church everywhere, whether real or imagined. The whole leftist press, regular journals and anti-religious brochures, continued pouring out vitriolic attacks on that 'peril'.

All the Catholics worked on the reaction against irreligion, but remained irretrievably divided. Weill, op. cit., 187.

9 Weill, op. cit., 195.

10 The battle was not confined to any single domain of human activity. It was fought in the realm of criticism, philosophy, science, and particularly in the field of education and politics. In criticism, Ernst Renan is representative. Of the many philosophical systems in vogue, Charles Renouvier is typical, with his specific outlook on religion - a brand of thought much akin to that of Quintet and Michelet. Through the ideas of Positivism, philosophy and science are tied by an umbilical cord. Littre was its archpriest. Lecanuet, I, 473 - 480. The Positivistic doctrine of Littre was far removed from that of Comte, but he was able to win over to it both Gambetta and Jules Ferry. Weill, op. cit., 200. Already in 1873, Gambetta
French Freemasonry, especially the Grand Orient, by its concepts and through its lodges, was the perfect focal point against Catholicism for the diversity of attitudes among diffuse Free-Thinkers. There was a growing 'enfeoffing' of republicans into the Grand Orient. This obedience became a powerful political factor and a veritable launching-base from which attacks against the Church were conducted.

That the lodges were the headquarters for anticlerical ideology was ostentatiously affirmed when the general assembly of the Grand Orient decided to suppress the old text, which acknowledged the vague Grand Architect of the Universe, by wording which had eradicated that last weak link with Deism.

Littre, Gambetta, and Ferry eulogized Masonry at every

"had evinced his leanings toward Positivism", and some seven years later proclaiming "adherence to the Positivist school ...[he] described Auguste Comte as 'the most powerful thinker of the age.'" Deschanel, op. cit., 278.

11 This was the central statement of the new text: "Elle a pour principe la liberté absolue de conscience et la solidarité humaine. Elle n'exclut personne pour ses croyances." Cited by Weill, Histoire de l'Idée Laïque, 262. The Grand Orient resolutely remained with this text after it was decided upon in September 1877, in spite of the opposition of the Supreme Scottish Council and the Grand Lodges of Great Britain and the U.S.A., which broke off 'friendly relations'. Ibid. By this time, the Grand Orient had under its obedience 261 lodges, forming 306 ateliers. There were 203,000 active Freemasons in France, 15,000 in Paris alone. Lecanuet, I, 482. For a selected 'directory' of major republican leaders as members of various lodges, and on Masonic publications, see ibid., 483 - 487. Also on French Freemasonry, of. Hanotaux, II, Ch. 13.
opportunity, maintaining that, in the midst of violent fanaticalism, it was a "conspiracy for tolerance." 12

At the same time, the interference of the clergy in political struggles -- often an ill-timed activity -- was an important contributing factor in the birth of hostility toward the Church. One animated case, illustrative of such conflicts, occurred in the recent elections. Count Albert de Mun was a candidate at Pontivy in the Morbihan, where he was running against a Bonapartist priest, Abbé Cadoret, and a republican, De Maguet. The Bishop of Vannes, Mgr. Becel, in whose diocese this riding was located, wrote a letter full of praise to De Mun, which was made public during the campaign. Endorsement of the candidate by no less a person than the Bishop probably had some influence on the voters; it certainly outraged the republicans: 13

The distribution of voting papers, or the posting of placards on a church building by a curé, or his giving the benediction at a public meeting, or even the delivery of a speech on behalf of a candidate, has been held by the Chamber to be undue clerical influence. 14

12 Debidour, I, 150.

13 The Bishop wrote, in part: "Monsieur le Comte, you speak, you write, you act as an Apostle....Every day the sacerdotal soul utters the same wish and shares the same hope....The Morbihan will be honoured by having chosen you to carry and support the flag of its Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Faith." Cited by Hanotaux, III, 488. De Mun was elected, and the central act of the drama was played in the Chamber. There was a sharp debate resulting in disqualification of De Mun's mandate, on the pretext that the electorate was unduly influenced by the clerics. For more detail, cf. ibid., 488-491.

14 Bodley, II, 132 f.
III

Occasioned by the old problem, the Roman Question, the breach between the Church and the Republic came into the open in the spring of 1877. In his political plight with the Italian government, the Pope directed a world-wide appeal to Catholics asking all pastors to inform the faithful of all the difficulties to which he was subjected. Furthermore, Pius IX told the clergy that:

they must exhort...[the faithful] to employ all the means allowed them by their country's laws for bringing to the consideration of their rulers the painful situation in which the Head of the Church is placed; and for taking efficacious measures to remove the obstacles standing in the way of his complete independence.15

Though the French Catholics were put in a delicate political position, the meeting of the Catholic Committees held in Paris early in April drew up a petition asking the government to intercede on behalf of the Pontiff. That was all that the republicans needed for an immediate casus belli. In the XIX* Siecle, Edmund About denounced "...those maniacs intoxicated by holy water who...try to involve the country in an immoral and stupid adventure."16

While in the face of republican rage, some bishops

15 Cited by Barbier, I, 393; Hanotaux IV, 154; and for a larger passage from this Pontifical speech, see Lecanuet, I, 526.

16 Cited by Lecanuet, I, 527. Edmund About was a Voltaireian, very hostile to the Church, and "was even nicknamed 'Voltaire's grandchild'." Albert Guérard, French Prophets of Yesterday. (New York, 1913), 108.
like Mgr. Pie tried to assuage the controversy, other prelates added fuel to the fire. The most extreme was Mgr. Ladoue, who wrote an open letter to the President, demanding immediate French disengagement from the Italian Republic.17

The rage assumed official form when it reached the Chamber. Jules Simon tried to bury the issue; the radicals were not willing to do so. They placed a motion censuring 'ultramontane intrigues' before the Chamber. With agitation growing stronger in the House, Simon then attempted to pacify both sides. In a speech on May 3, 1877, having recently returned from a private trip to Rome, he added that the claims of the Pope were exaggerated, and were "lying declarations."18 Simon was satisfied to let the debate end there, but Gambetta was not. The next day, he delivered a long, harsh and fiery peroration, denouncing the encroachment of the clerics. He ended the harangue with these words:

...there is one thing which, equally with the former régime, disgusts this country, disgusts the peasants of France, and that is the domination of clericalism...that is why, from this tribune, I say to you, in order that it should be your condemnation before universal suffrage; and I merely express the feelings of the people of France when I say of clericalism what my friend Peyrat was saying one day: 'Clericalism, that is the enemy.'19

17 For an extract from the letter, see Hanotaux, III, 594; also Lecanuet, I, 528, who called this act of the Bishop 'most imprudent'.

18 Cited by Lecanuet, I, 532, n. 1. For a larger quotation from this speech, see Hanotaux, III, 598 ff.

Upon learning of Simon's speech, Pius IX was offended but forgiving, and considered Simon's words an outrage. Cf. Debidour, I, 172.

19 Cited by Hanotaux III, 602, who called it 'somewhat
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Following the crescendo of applause that greeted this speech, the Chamber decided on a recess.

When the sitting resumed, a deputy, Bernard Lavergne, spoke of an article in Dupanloup's paper La Défense Religieuse, which indicated that Jules Simon, on assuming office, had given certain promises to the Catholics, and had been instructed to break away from the Republicans. The article ended with an indiscreet boast, which amounted to a threat if Jules Simon did not comply with that which was expected.

brutal peroration'.

The Republican paper Rappel, (January 25, 1876) reporting on a meeting of Senatorial delegates of Paris, quoted Felix Peyrat as having said on that occasion: 'Ce qui est redoutable, c'est le parti clérical; voilà l'ennemi.' Cited by Lecanuet, I, 493, n. 2.

The paper was founded in 1876 under the full name La Défense Sociale et Religieuse, and was a champion of the Conservative cause. Weill, Histoire du catholicisme libéral, 196 - 200; also Barbier, II, 3. Its first issue appeared on May 16, and was promptly dubbed by Le XIXe Siècle as le journal de bon Dieu. Lecanuet, I, 341.

In the years following 1870, a great wave of anticlerical and anti-religious propaganda began to flood the country in print and by word of mouth. Almost every party of the Left published at least one political newspaper or periodical. In the variety of streams of thought that were swelling this river of propaganda, one current was common to all: anticlericalism. They mocked and attacked everything from the Miracle at Lourdes to the devotion of the Sacred Heart.

Louis Veuillot, through his paper L'Univers, ..."alone had the genius to turn the tables on the mockers and sneerers of the anticlerical Press - to laugh at them in tones as derisive and destructive as the voice of Voltaire. Where a journalist of less talent would have explained and defended and protested...Veuillot rushed into the fray with a roar of delight, seeking out his opponents with a furious gusto,...toppling over their careful sophisms with a great shout of moorn." Spencer, op. cit., 211.
of him.  

Enraged and indignant, Jules Simon tore up the copy of the paper and, stamping on it, claimed that his honour had been insulted. As the damage was done, he "now could not appear to weaken in the face of the clerical menace."  

The moment was propitious for the leaders of the Left to bring a formal motion:

The Chamber, considering that ultramontane manifestations, of which recrudescence might compromise the internal and external security of the country, constitute a flagrant violation of the laws of the State, invites the Government, in order to repress their unpatriotic agitation, to make use of the legal means at its disposal.

This motion, if acted upon, would have meant an official declaration of war on the Church. On behalf of the episcopate, the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Guibert publicly protested against it, and advised moderation, patience and charity.

IV

The whole Cabinet, though reluctant, accepted passage of that motion. Jules Simon had chosen sides, and without endearing himself to the Left, he alienated himself

21 The fatal sentence ran: 'If at the last moment M. Simon draws back, we know well what means to employ to force him to adopt this policy.' Cited by Lecanuet, I, 534, who states that he personally was told by the Baron d'Yvoire, editor of La Défense, that the article slipped into print without his noticing. Ibid., n. 1. Also, cf. Hanotaux, III, 603.

22 Brogan, Mod. France., 133.

23 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 605.
from the Right. President MacMahon was infuriated by the boldness of the Left and the timid behaviour of his Prime Minister, whom he wanted to dismiss immediately. He was momentarily restrained in his intention, but enmity between the two men soon led to Simon's resignation. On the fateful May 16, 1877, Duc de Broglie was appointed as his successor to head the new Ministry. The crisis of Seize Mai had begun. Odium and stigma were attached to that date, but MacMahon's action was only a political crisis, not a constitutional one.

With a burst of energy and a dedication defying description, Gambetta participated everywhere and in everything, fighting for the Republican cause. He unified and led the loosely-knit republican factions, which now presented a solid front. Pressing for dissolution of the Assembly and claiming that May 16 was le coup de Vatican, he mounted the

---

24 MacMahon told Simon: 'I am a man of the Right, we cannot continue together any longer. I would rather be overthrown than remain under the orders of M. Gambetta.' Marcère, Seize Mai, 47, cited by Lecanuet I, 537, n.3.

25 The Seize Mai was merely an unorthodox political change, inasmuch as the leader of a parliamentary minority was called upon to form the Cabinet. The next day in the Chamber, Gambetta himself said: 'No-one can deny the President's loyalty to the Constitution.' Cited by Bodley, I, 289. Though to Professor Brogan "the folly" of May 16, 1877 "seems so clear today," Mod. France, 135, MacMahon acted within the spirit of the Constitution, which did not stipulate the nomination of the Prime Minister; this was deemed the prerogative of the President.

Hanotaux, III, 620, appears to have commented best, saying that the Seize Mai was "neither absurd, nor illegal; it did not succeed, that is all."
rostrum and declared: "A cry has resounded throughout France. It has been said: This is a coup of the priests. This is a government of the curés." 26

Before the end of June, Gambetta got his wish: new elections were ordered. From the start, the campaign was furious. The republicans had a motive force - Gambetta; the conservatives, disunited, had "but one rallying signal - the sign of the Cross". 27

In the preliminaries to the decisive battle at the polls, the clergy joined the fray, with a fervent attempt to stem the republican tide. Episcopal letters from the Archbishops of Bourges and of Chambery; the Bishops of Séez, Angoulême, and Arras, among others, urged the voters to the ballot-box. 28 In various dioceses the bishops recommended that the curés take an active part in the campaign.

The government saw cause for alarm in this clerical zeal. A certain number of prelates had appointed general

---

26 Cited by Lecanuet, I, 541. In a speech to the Députation de la Jeunesse des écoles, on June 1, 1877, Gambetta said: 'The struggle is more profound than a mere combat for the Constitution. The struggle is between the old castes, with their privileges of a by-gone regime, between the agents of the Theocracy of Rome, and the sons of 1789.' Cited by Bodley, I, 289.

27 Hanotaux, IV, 149. The conservatives remained 'lulled, indifferent', while the republicans vigorously observed discipline in their tightly-closed ranks. Barbier, I, 399.

28 Wrote the Archbishop of Bourges: 'The faithful dare not hesitate, they have no right to stand aside from this decisive conflict.' Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 176. For more of similar extracts on this occasion, see Barbier, I, 402 ff., n. 7.
prayers for the coming elections and had given considerable publicity to their pastoral letters. Brunet, Minister of Education and Worship, and a conservative, telegraphed on October 3, to the prefects, requesting each one to visit the bishop in his Department and urge complete silence.

While Brunet estimated the intentions behind episcopal acts as excellent, he feared a negative effect, as they represented only fuel to the calumnies and just imputations of clericalism to which the government is subjected. Three days later the Minister renewed his plea to the prefects:

"Request the Bishop in each diocese to urge the clergy to say nothing in the pulpit with regard to the elections; the government attaches the greatest importance to these injunctions." After this absurd action by the government, interdicting prayers on its behalf, the outcome of the elections of October 14 was in little doubt. The government was convincingly defeated.

---

29 Cited by Barbier, I, 404, note.

30 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 177. Bishop Pie could not resist a wry comment: 'The conservatives look on clericalism as their stumbling block.' Ibid.

31 After the second ballot on October 28, of the total of 533 seats, the republicans won 326 against the combined 207 for the Right. Barbier, I, 404.

Hanotaux, IV, 191, estimated the distribution of the Right as roughly: Legitimists 104; Bonapartists 46; other Monarchists and Orleansans 57.
When on March 9, 1876, Dufaure formed the Cabinet, Waddington became the Minister of Education. Soon thereafter, Waddington announced the attitude of the new government concerning the very delicate subject of educational reform. A review of the whole system was being contemplated. The Minister promised early improvements in higher education. He stressed the importance of popular education and a need for reform in it, as well. "'More hygiene and more space!'" was his pregnant formula for modern progress in education. He believed that the program of compulsory education ought not to be undertaken without due caution, but preparations could be started in order to reach this goal as soon as was feasible. The government was to construct more schools and open new teachers' colleges in order to meet the need for additional facilities.

Not a man to delay progress, on March 24 Waddington introduced a new bill to rescind the Articles of the Law of July 12, 1875. This meant abolishing 'mixed juries', and revoking the power of the free universities to grant degrees. The statement in the preamble of the bill was indicative of the character of the new proposal: "The liberty of teaching in no wise implies, for free faculties, the right of conferring degrees....The greater the freedom, the

32 Hanotaux, III, 501.
33 Lecanuet, I, 501.
more strict and efficient must supervision be."

This proposal would have rendered void two of the chief provisions of the Law of July, 1875, even before the first academic year of its life had come to an end. This meant a cruel blow to the Catholics. With Spuller as its reporter, the Chamber appointed a committee which was in sympathy with the Waddington bill. On May 26, Spuller tabled the report, pointing out that the new bill merely sanctioned restoring the status quo ante of the right to confer degrees, returning it exclusively to the state.

The debate on the bill opened on June 1, 1876. The first to speak on behalf of the Catholics was Paul Cassagnac, who bitterly questioned Spuller's impartiality. His use of aggressive terminology caused disorder in the Chamber. Deputy Emile Deschanel answered with equal vehemence, charging "clerical hypocrisy [and] the insolent claim of the Bishops".

Thereby the religious question emerged dominant, and that of education was again delegated to the background. On the third day of the debate, in a fiery speech Keller declared that beneath it all the radicals were pursuing the 'destruction of Catholicism' and cautioned the moderates

---

34 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 509 f., (who gives March 23 as the date when the bill was introduced).

35 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 510 f.
with the prophetic announcement: "Beware! ... The holocaust of the law of July 12, 1875, will only make the anticlerical zeal more demanding and more imperious." 36

The two Catholic Deputies had an able colleague in De Mun. He predicted a long struggle, stating that the Catholics would not yield with indifference to the proposed destruction of their work in educational equity, which they had watched grow with such great hopes. They would not cease to protest against the violence which the Waddington bill would do to them in education. Even though they were powerless to stem the measure in the Chamber, there remained yet another Assembly, the Senate, where they still hoped that the justice which they demanded would be granted to them. 37

Invoking the Law of God, De Mun reiterated the principle of the Catholic position in education:

And it is from that Law that the Church, established by God to be the interpreter of truth, holds its mission in education in a way that freedom of education, for the Catholics, is but a transaction with modern legislation, is at the same time for them a law which proceeds from freedom of conscience itself. 38

Among the republicans who ardently supported Deschanel were Jules Ferry and Paul Bert. While Waddington

---

36 Cited by Barbier, I, 383.

37 Based on a passage from De Mun's speech cited by Hanotaux, III, 511.

38 Cited by Barbier, I, 383. The speech merited high praise from the Bishop of Poitier, Mgr. Pie: 'You have re-kindled the fire, the struggle will continue, and there will be fighting in the void no longer.' Ibid., 384.
was in agreement with Spuller's committee report, he denied that his proposed law assailed religion. Ferry persisted in accordance with his axiom, that the state was exclusively laic and so should be its instruction. By a vote of 357:128 the Chamber passed Waddington's bill. 39

VI

At the news of the Waddington project, Bishop Dupanloup, who had fought so valiantly for the Law of 1875, felt 'struck to the heart'. 40 He sounded the alarm and other prelates joined in. A group of bishops, founders of the University at Angers, wrote a letter to the Senators. In it, in the name of 'justice, equity and honour', they implored the Senators to preserve the integrity of that 1875 law. 41 Other high Churchmen held meetings, and published episcopal letters. Cardinal Guibert raised his voice at the General Congress of the Catholic Committees. Petitions were organised and, by early July, more than 126,000 signatures had been collected. 42 In this atmosphere of concerted episcopal effort to defend the recently-won rights, the bill was sent to the Senate.

The temperature was different in the Upper House.

39 Lecanuet, I, 505.
40 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 510.
41 L'Univers, (June 16, 1876), cited by Lecanuet, I, 504 f.
42 Lecanuet, I, 504.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Based on their Liberal principles, some Senators of the Left were in sympathy with the Catholic cause. The reporter of the bill was M. Paris, who declared himself against it. He favoured the system of mixed juries, estimating it to have been an equitable, honourable and wise compromise; there was no reason to rescind the Bill of 1875 just because the Chamber had passed a new one; besides, the free universities had scarcely had an opportunity to prove their merit in practical application of the principle. 43

The debate opened on July 18, and there was a desire to expedite the matter before the summer recess. But, from the moment Challemel-Lacour began the debate with a harsh attitude against the Catholics, it was clear that the session would be marked by even more vehemence and anguish than had been the case in the Chamber. He turned his scorching remarks in the direction of the Church, urging the state to be on guard against the perils emanating from it, because the Church condemned liberty and sought universal domination.

Being especially confronted by a group of Liberal Catholics who defended the Law of July, 1875, he thrust his barbed jeers and scornful criticism, telling them that their inclination to compromise was considered, even by Rome, as guilty complacency and an irremediable weakness. Then, addressing Mgr. Dupanloup specifically and citing a communication from Pius IX to the Bishop, he continued: "The letter

43 Based on a citation in Hanotaux, III, 519.
which the Pope wrote to you last year on the subject of freedom of higher education contained indirect condemnation.

Pius IX does not allow such liberty."

This acerbity created an atmosphere in which Laboulaye's pleas for moderation fell on deaf ears. The chief architect of the July 1875 bill declared himself against the Waddington project, lest this sudden reversal of governmental policy should "turn Catholics against the Republic."

Among the formidable array of republicans were Dufaure and Simon, the former aggressively and the latter meekly, lending their support to the new bill. In opposition to them stood two fervent Catholics, Mgr. Dupanloup and De Broglie. The aging Bishop of Orleans ably defended Catholic rights, while the adversaries strained to assure the Senate that the new educational law would not injure Catholic conscience or right. Jules Simon wanted to dissuade the Catholic Senators from their belief that enemies of religion were before them, and that certainly he was not one; moreover:

... if at any time freedom of instruction were in danger, I would ask the honour of defending it. I also say: if

44 Cited by Lecanuet, I, 506. The Pope wrote: 'We estimate, therefore, venerable Brother, that your efforts, to inject an antidote for the poison which has diseased secular society, have been cunning and opportunistic.' Ibid. Other Liberal Catholics in this group were De Broglie, De Meaux and Buffet.

45 Hanotaux, III, 520.
there were laws undertaken which would be contrary to the liberty and legitimate rights of the Catholic religion. I would not allow the honour to anyone; no, not even to the most fervent Catholic who should come to its defence. 46

In order for the Senators to gain time for reflection, Wallon proposed that the Senate adjourn the debate for another session. But with emotions rising, it was no longer a question of the Waddington law per se. It became a matter of defining a political principle and of clarifying the independence and authority of the Senate as distinct from the Chamber and the Cabinet. That seemed a point worthy of exploration, and De Broglie seized upon it. The purpose in establishing the Senate was to make it a bulwark against the disadvantages of popular caprice:

Constituted like a sea-wall, to resist the waters, will it give way to the first wave which reaches it?... Political struggles are being transformed into religious struggles....At an election meeting, M. Gambetta said, with arrogant authority, 'I will have that law repealed'; his voice has already been obeyed.... 47

This pronouncement had a stirring effect. The integrity of the Upper House had been challenged, and the hour was opportune for the Senate to assert itself. When put to a vote the Wallon motion to adjourn resulted in a tie and failed to

46 Journal Officiel, (July 20, 1876), cited by Lecanuet, I, 508, n. 1.

47 Cited by Hanotaux, III, 520. During his campaign speeches, Gambetta, in Lille, February 1876, exclaimed that the law of July 1875 was not French but Romish and added: 'Je me propose de la faire abroger.' Cited by Lecanuet, I, 493.
carry. Finally, by a slim majority, the Senate voted to postpone debate on the Waddington bill. This meant, in effect, a reprieve for the mixed juries. At least temporarily, the Catholics had won a meagre victory. Not wishing to press further, the Senate was satisfied to let the matter rest.

VII

In the short-lived Cabinet of Jules Simon, formed at the close of 1876, Waddington retained his portfolio of Education. Toward the end of January 1877, he spurred the efforts of the government to improve education by introducing a bill designed to extend the capacity of the primary system. This resulted in some 3,545 new schools being opened during the course of the year.48

At the same time, the government had not abandoned the principle of establishing gratuitous primary education. The clamour for it led Waddington to introduce, early in March, a bill for the establishment of a fund to build a number of school-houses. This was the famous 'School Fund' which became an object of controversy and of bitter reproaches in the Chamber to the Republican party. The bill enjoyed strong support and by mid-March the project was voted by an overwhelming majority.

Sixty million francs were appropriated for the School

48 Hanotaux, III, 575.
Fund, which was placed at the disposal of the Minister of Education. He was gradually to distribute parts of this sum in the form of government grants for the sole purpose of improving old schools or building new ones in the communes across France. Another sixty million francs were authorized, to be used as a standing fund from which Communes desirous of so doing could borrow additional sums to improve the physical aspects of their schools. All this activity helped to evoke a new interest in popular education. 49

In this enthusiasm, acting on a proposal by Deputy Barodet, the Chamber appointed a committee of twenty-two members to study the problem and to inquire into plans relative to elementary education. But the events of the Seize Mai intervened and substantially changed the whole complexion of internal affairs in France. This meant a change of course in future educational developments as well.

The astounding victory in the October elections of 1877 was the result of the phenomenal upsurge of republicanism after the fall of the Empire. From the time of this triumph, the Third Republic was firmly established and, with the exception of its President, it finally became republican. Having stormed the parliamentary fortifications of the Chamber, the victorious parties seemed satisfied to spend the

49 "This feeling was manifested in the raising of school buildings, humble or imposing, which embodied the modern faith in knowledge." Hanotaux, IV, 237.
first half of 1878 entrenching themselves in the captured ramparts. The period of calm was needed for stock-taking, and gave fair appearance of a return to normalcy.

The profound change in the spiritual temperature of the country was reflected in the apparent paralysis of the French Catholics in the political arena. The influence of the Church was on the wane; Catholicism was no longer the force it had been. Even in the traditionally devout provinces, where the priest had retained a semblance of influence upon the flock, it was not "always powerful enough to prevent his wilful penitents from voting republican." 50

VIII

The political lull could not endure too long. Concerning education, the republicans intended resolutely to mould it according to their views. They had a principle; being in power, they had the means and official sanction. While the Catholics had manifested their electoral victories with laws favourable to religious instruction, the republicans were to mark their own similar triumphs with laws favourable to laic instruction. 51

The a priori reasoning of the Republic was crystal-clear and relatively simple: In a system founded on

50 Spencer, op. cit., 257.

universal suffrage, instruction should be a duty of the state and consequently it remained exclusively for the state "to mould the mind of childhood."\textsuperscript{52}

The Minister of Education, since December 1877, in the newly-formed Cabinet of Armand Dufaure, was M. Bardoux. He explained the ideas in education of the new era:

The democratic France of the future will be what the University will have made her. He who does not care for education is no patriot; whoever loves France, must love education. Before all things, education must inspire love of country.\textsuperscript{53}

Bardoux was not alone in stating new principles for education. During the summer of 1878 there were independent pronouncements on the matter, some of which were semi-official. A characteristic example was the passing of resolutions by the General Council of the Department for Yonne, which in its session of August 27, 1878, made the following declaration:

\begin{quote}
Considering: that the spirit has a need for light as much as the body requires nourishment; that experience has shown that the moral level of a people rises with the degree of its education; that in a republican government based on universal suffrage, all citizens should be placed on even terms to understand their duties and their rights;

The undersigned demand compulsory, gratuitous and laic primary instruction, for both sexes in all schools subsidized by the communes, the department and the state.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} Hanotaux, IV, 447.

\textsuperscript{53} Speeches at Lille, July 15, and at Dreux, September 8, 1878. Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 282.
Compulsory, in the combined interests of the individual and of society in the name of their mutual dependence;

Gratuitous, in the name of legality and to remove any pretext of ill-will;

Laic, because the principle 'Science belongs to the school and religious instruction to the Church' is the only one which protects freedom of conscience with efficacy. 54

The Catholics legally enjoyed freedom of instruction at all levels, and their institutions were all managed in one form or another by the Church. 55 The principle of the universal laic school, in order to become actual, required the removal of all obstacles inherent in the free system directed by the Church. To do so, the government would need to legislate away these obstacles.

Propelled into the apogee of his political popularity by the events of 1877, Gambetta was keenly interested in the question of education, which represented a distinct part of his many-sided political enterprises. He was a prominent figure in the struggle over education and gave many speeches elucidating the stand of the Republic in the field of education. He firmly asserted that a democracy "must preoccupy

54 Cited by Léon Dubreuil, "Un artisan des lois laïques, Hippolyte Ribière", Revue d'histoire économique et sociale, XXI (1933), 82. The department of Yonne never deserved more than at this time the name of "red department." Ibid., 53. H. Ribiére was the prefect of this department during the Franco-Prussian War, and was very active in the work of laicization. 55

55 For some statistical data on the position of the Church and its participation in education, see below, Appendix VI, G.
itself before all and above all with instruction and with education." 56

During September 1878, Gambetta made a triumphal tour of the country, showered with flowers at every turn. At each stop he delivered an oratorical variation on the main theme of clericalism. Before anything could be done with education proper, the republicans had to break down the sea-wall of clericalism which retarded their own designs.

Delivering the strongest diatribe of his tour against the Church, Catholicism, and clericalism, he pointed out what really bothered him and the Republicans. The notable outburst of his tour took place at Romans:

I have a right to denounce the danger which circulates in French society, such as it is and such as it wants to be. It is the growth of a spirit, not only clerical, but vaticanesque, monastique, congréganiste, and syllabique, which is not afraid to deliver the human spirit to the coarsest of superstitions, masking them under the most subtle and profound contrivances. Combinations of the spirit of ignorance... try to entrench themselves upon general servitudes... I have the right to say it, pointing out these masters of the art of making dupes, who speak of social danger: it is they who are the social peril. 57

56 Speech of June 16, 1878, cited by Weill, Histoire de l'Idée laïque, 268. Parliamentarians of all republican groups shared the same language and the collective of the leftist press constantly encouraged them to action. Ibid.

57 Cited by Lecanuet, II, 14 f. "Whenever the nation's fortune was down, it was jésuitisme which rose," said Gambetta in a speech on September 18, 1878. Weill, op. cit., 255; also Debidoir, I, 196.

Concerning the Syllabus this was the overall reaction after it was published: "As to militant philosophers, savants, free-thinkers, liberals and radicals, who made it a point of honour to resist clericalism, they were filled with
Gambetta depicted clerics as the ones who always took advantage of events, and who had successfully encroached upon all three levels of education. He synthesized his point of view relative to the matter of education, advancing specific proposals which in retrospect bore an astonishing likeness to the execution of the educational reforms carried out in the course of the next few years. There were two urgent things which had to be done first:

(a) Disperse the religious congregations, that 'multicoloured malice without country whose fatherland lies only in the last seven hills of Rome'; and

(b) Laicize all levels of education by taking it away from the clergy and placing it under State jurisdiction.

This radical scheme for educational reform, expressed so succinctly by Gambetta in the fall of 1878, was transferred by the quick turn of events to the hands of Jules Ferry for execution. He began the operation in the spring of the following year -- sooner, perhaps, than Gambetta himself might have anticipated.

glee; they would have been really disappointed if the Pope had not published his views, and they were at no pains to disguise theirs." Debidour, Histoire des Rapports, 593.

58 In Chateau-Chinon, October 26, 1877, Gambetta said: "What I have attacked, and always shall attack, are the men who try to make the Church a lever of political power and mastery, when its true function is to help and console." Cited by Deschanel, op. cit., 240.

59 Based on a citation in Lecanuet, II, 15.
CHAPTER III
THE EDUCATIONAL QUESTION AND LEGISLATION
1879 - 1880

I

The events of the first two and one-half months of 1879 constituted the prologue of the action. In the Senatorial by-election for eighty-two vacant seats, the Republicans captured sixty-six and, for the first time, gained a clear majority in that august body. Similarly, the successful move to grant amnesty to the condemned Communards indicated how radically the thinking of the Chamber had changed. As a reflection of this Republican dominance, the process of political patronage was accelerated, and many party followers were rewarded with better or influential positions in public offices. In this exhilarating mood, the Minister of Education, Bardoux, introduced in the Chamber a bill designed to render primary education compulsory for all children between the ages of six and thirteen.

Seized by a bout of inertia in the face of these changes, President MacMahon eventually took a firm stand and

---

1 By a governmental decree on January 15, a pardon was granted to 2,245 prisoners not charged with a major crime. An additional thousand were pardoned shortly after; all of which gave rise to indignant protest from the Catholics.

2 Cf. Hanotaux, IV, 421.
refused to sign a decree by which several high-ranking officers would have been relieved of their posts. Rather than compromise with the rigid attitude of the Cabinet, he tendered his resignation on the evening of January 30. Within two hours, the National Assembly, in a joint session, elected Jules Grévy on the first ballot. The next day, as if by way of an epitaph, La Révolution wrote that what transpired at Versailles was more than the replacement of one man by another; it was "the end of a system and the inauguration of a new government. It was a legal revolution."  

With the departure of MacMahon, Dufaure also resigned. On February 4, Waddington formed a new Cabinet in which Jules Ferry became Minister of Education.

In the long preparation for the task before him, Jules Ferry was inspired by Condorcet, guided by Quinet, and taught by Comte. He had arrived early at his dedication; on April 10, 1870, he said:

I have made an oath. From among all the needs and problems of the present, I shall choose one to which I shall devote all my abilities, my whole soul, heart, physical and moral strength: that problem is one of public education.  

---

3 Cited by Lecanuet, II, 16. Grévy was elected by 563 votes of 713 cast. Gambetta, among several candidates, mustered only five votes; a visible demonstration of his unacceptability for the office because of his temperament. Hanotaux, IV, 425, who considered the election of Grévy "a mistake." Ibid., 434.

4 Cited by René Acollas, "Jules Ferry et l'école laïque", Revue politique et parlementaire, CLIV (1933), 343. Ferry never wavered from this vow, and from 1879 he kept his
A man endowed with mediocre intelligence but with a strong will and great energy for work, Ferry set out to fulfill an educational program in accordance with his own postulate: "The State wants, demands and will re-take all domination."5

portfolio in five different Cabinets so that he could carry out the plan.

"It is much ignored in general, the intellectual mastery which the strange and robust genius of Quinet exercised on the future men of the state of the Third Republic; this expression of Gambetta is much forgotten: 'The promoter of laic instruction in France, that is Quinet'; and the other expression of Jules Ferry: 'All we did was to take over the heritage of Quinet.'" Georges Goyau, L'Ecole d'aujourd'hui (Paris, 1910), 72, cited by Lecanuet, I, 16 f., n. 1.

Installing his successor in the Ministry of Education (Paul Bert in the short-lived Gambetta Cabinet), Ferry showed him a book by Quinet (perhaps L'Enseignement du peuple) and said: 'This is my breviary.' Cited by Weill, Histoire de L'Idée Laïque, 120, n. 3.

Condorcet in 1794 wrote: 'The time will come when the sun will shine upon a world of free men who recognize no master except their reason, when tyrants and slaves, priests and their stupid or hypocritical tools, will no longer exist.' Idem, Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain. (ed. by O. H. Prior), 210, cited by G. H. Sabine, A History of Political Theory, (New York, 1950), 572.

For Condorcet's idea on National Education, see below, Appendix VI, A.

5 Cited by Lecanuet, II, 18. An interesting appreciation of the new Minister by a fellow sympathizer runs thus: "Jules Ferry had all a leader's spirit, and was influential in combination. Amongst these Protestants - Waddington, De Freycinet, Le Royer - he felt at ease: he, the free-thinker, determined to impress upon the clericals the force of the legalist and the Positivist. By giving him the Ministry of Education he was entrusted with the Soul Department, and though he was not allowed that of Public Worship, yet his arm was long enough, his hand powerful enough for that, it did not escape his influence." Hanotaux, IV, 441.
One of the first acts of the new Minister was to appoint a crew of reliable assistants: Ferdinand Buisson was made director of primary education; the placement of Zévort in charge of secondary education soon followed; while Gréard became head of the University of Paris. Among the luminaries in the gallery of eminent Republicans at this time were Floquet, De Montjau, and Clemenceau. These men advocated an 'advanced' program and clamoured for 'necessary demolitions,' which meant "the removal of clerical influence from instruction."

Being apprehensive and unfriendly toward the Republic, the Church hierarchy was, not surprisingly, concerned about recent changes in direction of the political winds. The Cardinal Lavigerie, who was to emerge as a dominant prelate along with Cardinal Guibert, was preparing for martyrdom. Though his sentiments were highly pessimistic, they

---

6 Jules Ferry called Gréard 'the first school-master of France'. Cited by Buisson, op. cit., 53. As late as 1902, Buisson was proud to have been the one who remained "faithful to the tradition of Jean Mace, this free-thinker who always remained a free thinker, in preserving from injury the fundamental principles of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, by asking for instruction...only freedom with its corollary, responsibility." Ibid., 135, speech to the closing session of the 22nd Congress of the League of Education, Lyons, September 28, 1902.

7 Hanotaux, IV, 444; yet these men, for the moment, did not ask for the disestablishment of the Church and several other points which were inherent in the system formulated by the Belleville Manifesto.
were illustrative of the anxiety which was prevalent among the Church leaders. Lavigerie wrote to Bishop Bouret:

...as everything foretells we must soon finish our course. The devotion of the moment seems to mean that of the beheading of John the Baptist. There is no lack of Herods to place our heads on trenchers, nor of Herodiases to ask for them....By sword or by bullet we shall give witness for our Lord.  

During the month of February, a project of law inspired by Barodet was before the Chamber. An elaborate proposal in 109 articles to make primary education gratuitous, compulsory and laic, the Republican code for public education enjoyed warm support in the Chamber. Impatient lest this lengthy bill suffer from delay, Jules Ferry decided on more dramatic and efficacious methods.

II

On March 15, 1879, Ferry introduced two bills: the first, on a High Council of Education and Academic Councils; the second, on freedom of higher education. This was the beginning of Ferry's educational reforms.

The first law was to rescind the provisions of the 1873 law for an enlarged basis of the Council; the representatives of certain interests and social influences were to be replaced, on the principle of professional competence, by technical men and teachers.  

---

8 Letter of February 6, 1879, cited by Hanotaux, IV, 446
9 The new law was to exclude from either Council all clerics of all denominations, as well as the members of the Council of State and of the Supreme Court. Lecanuet, II,
In essence, the law on freedom of higher education was designed to revoke the Law of 1875. Of the few brief clauses, article seven was particularly controversial. Its wording, and its inclusion in a law aimed ostensibly at reform of higher education, made it the cause célèbre of the struggle and an object of passionate polemics. It was to "rend asunder the Republican party and the country." It read: "No person belonging to an unauthorized religious community is allowed to govern a public or private educational establishment of whatsoever order, or to give instruction therein."

This article was "irritating in character and anti-Catholic in particular, striking with no preliminary warning." No-one in France could miss its utmost importance. By it, the government had made a declaration of its position regarding the majority of religious orders:

It was a most telling blow, which the Republic could have brought down on the illicit congregations and on the most powerful as well as the most unpopular of all...the Society of Jesus.

To checkmate the Jesuits and their numerous and

19. On July 19, 1879, after only two days of debate, this law was passed, 363:144, in the Chamber. ibid., 31.
11 For the full text of this law, see below, Appendix III, A.
12 Hanotaux, IV, 448.
13 Debidour, L'Eglise catholique, I, 210. Article seven was a "trumpet call for warfare on religious belief." Bainville, loc. cit.
and remarkably well-administered educational institutions was the obvious aim of the article. The government admitted to careful deliberation and ripe reflection before incorporating this article in the law, which endeavoured to reconstitute the domain of the State in education. Foreigners had no right to teach in France; therefore, in the opinion of the government, those who belonged to an order essentially foreign in the character of its doctrines and nature, the objects of its laws and the authority of its leaders should be neither recognized nor authorized. Such was the scope of the new measure, which the government "considered appropriate to introduce into the law, and which will be applied in its spirit as well as in its terms, to all levels of instruction."14

Stunned momentarily, the Catholics quickly rallied to offer strong resistance to the new law. In the face of the peril therefrom, they closed their ranks, displaying a unity and discipline such as had not been seen for many decades.15 In all parts of France, the bishops protested, often vehemently. Cardinals Guibert and Bonnechose were among the most active of the prelates. By the end of May, the petitions occasioned by this article contained more than one-half million signatures, despite all the handicaps put

14 Cited by Barbier II, 26; but this passage based mostly on a citation in Hanotaux, IV, 449.
15 Lecanuet, II, 20.
in their way.

In answer to Catholic protests, Jules Ferry added fuel to the fire on May 19, by introducing another bill which was "distinctly anticlerical", and by which all teachers of both sexes would be required to produce a certificate of capacity. This meant suppression of the letters of obedience.

III

The stormy debate on the Ferry bill on higher education opened on June 16, with Paul de Cassagnac being the first to speak. He violently attacked the hypocrisy of the bill and the hate for the Church which it inspired. Tempers rose so high that the Chamber ordered him ejected. Next was Paul Bert as the reporter of the committee on the bill. The

16 Ibid., II, 24 and n. 1; by the summer there accumulated 1.8 million signatures. Barbier, II, 28.

In the early stages of the conflict, through his nuncio, Mgr. Czaoki, Pope Leo XIII suggested a course of prudence and moderation to the prelates. Cardinal Guibert commented: 'If the nuncio speaks thus, it is his point of view, he is a diplomat; whereas we are bishops; our duty is to defend the people, and since speaking is necessary in their defence, we shall speak.' Cited by Lecanuet, II, 21.

17 Debidour, I, 276. The inspiration for this bill came from Paul Bert, who suggested establishment of an Ecole Normale in all departments where none yet existed. Among 37,000 women teachers at this time, only 5,700 held a teaching certificate. Hanotaux, IV, 449 f.

Jules Ferry said on April 23, 1879: 'If the republic does not act at this time, when it is all powerful, if it does not profit by this maximum force which belongs to every new government...when will it do so?' Idem, Discours, III, 59, cited by Acomb, op. cit., 123.
debate which followed showed the increasing vehemence of the opposing partisans. The pattern was variable only with the talent and character of the orator. It was Paul Bert who bluntly defined the difference between the parties engaged: "We do not speak the same language, we sons of the Revolution ...[as]...the representatives and defenders of the Catholic Church." 18

A republican deputy, Etienne Lamy, parried the attacks of Paul Bert and conducted an offensive of his own. With a talent equal to his generosity, on June 26 he very effectively scorned the whole project, including article seven, claiming it to be injustice itself. He accused Ferry and his parliamentary cohorts of wanting to close the schools because there was only one objection to their teachers: their success. 19 Making a pointed contrast, he added:

The religious communities are to be dispersed just as the culprits of the Commune are restored to


Bodley, France, stated that Paul Bert "was chosen as the ruthless anti-clerical instrument of the Republic", I, 55; ".was practically the author of the 'Ferry Laws', II, 217; and that he was "a free-thinker of aggressive bigotry", II, 429. "The bellicose ardour of Paul Bert, sometimes embarrassed" even Jules Ferry. Weill, op.cit., 280.

With Paul Bert "la laicité was an intellectual conception, one would say almost a philosophical one." Rivero, Revue Politique, CXLVIII (1931), 369.

19 Lecanuet, II, 26. The instigators of the law, said Lamy, breathed nothing but war and reprisals against the Church. Ibid.
It took Ferry two sessions to answer the charges. His reply was nothing more than a repetition of former declarations against the clerical peril and a reiterated apologia for State sovereignty. Describing the nature of the education given by the Jesuits as clearly anti-modern and anti-revolutionary, Ferry admitted: "We attack the Jesuits because the Jesuits and their adherents are the soul of the organization which we have been combatting for the past seven years."

Paul Bert added that article seven was "but a momentary accident, or rather it [was] the first round of this great combat." He accused the Jesuits of having trained virtual soldiers in 'the army of Loyola', and then concluded that in the field of education:

> the clerical party must be fought, without hesitation and respite....[France rejects] this impregnation of the spirit of young generations by the spirit of the

---

20 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 469.

21 Barbier, II, 27.

22 Speech of June 27, 1879, cited by Hanotaux, IV, 469. In the same speech Ferry stressed that to fight clericalism and jésuitisme was not the same as to fight Catholicism, and 'to attack Catholicism, to engage in a war with the faith of the great majority of our compatriots, that would be the last and most criminal of follies.' Cited by Weill, op. cit., 272, n. 2. In the Senate, June 10, 1881, Ferry reiterated: "Yes, we wanted an anticlerical fight, but an anti-religious one, never, never." Ibid., 280, n. 2.
Society of Jesus, which is domination of the spiritual world over the secular.

It was in order to avert this, that the Minister of Education has presented his project of law.23

Former Minister Bardoux proposed a compromise by which the provisions of article seven would be substituted by those of a stricter system of inspection of the religious establishments in which the Orders were allowed to teach.

This was promptly rejected by a very strong majority.

Jules Ferry asked the deputies in the Chamber for support, exhorting them: "If you do not pass Article Seven, gentlemen...you will have accorded for all time to this country free instruction by the Jesuits. Is there one among you who desires to take the responsibility for this?"24

Before the final vote, some extremists opposed article seven as inadequate. De Montjau even suggested that, regular or secular, no member of a religious community should be allowed to teach. In an atmosphere polluted by bickering, on July 9, article seven and the new law as a whole on higher education were voted with a majority better than two to one.25

---

23 Speech July 5, 1879; in Bert, op. cit., 234, 239. Bert stated that the Jesuits had made the clerical party and emphasized that he did not call it a Catholic party, because "the distinction is important. The Catholics are citizens who ask only protection from civic society in the free exercise of their faith; the clerical party demands of civic society to submit to the dogma of Catholicism. That is quite different." Ibid., 237. His charges were answered by E. Keller. Cf. Barbier, II, 27.

24 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 470.

During the summer recess, agitation over article seven reached every corner of the French countryside. The Catholics mounted a large meeting-demonstration held in the Winter Circus in Paris on July 10. Albert de Mun gave expression to Catholic objections to the new laws. The Catholic tenet was that freedom of action regarding the upbringing of their children belonged to the heads of families. The governmental measures were designed to invalidate this authority by usurping it. The new school would be without ideals, sound principles, or patriotism. De Mun saw a 'Satanic spirit' in the joint sharing between the League of Education and Freemasonry in this campaign, and declared that "a priestless school would be a Godless school." 26

Both the episcopate and leading Catholic men carried on the campaign with numerous speeches in Paris and across the country. Not to be outdone, the Republican leaders, solidly backed by the anticlerical press, did the same, soliciting popular approval for their action.

The role played by Jules Simon in this episode remained unique. In a day when anticlerical passions reigned supreme, he boldly stood against the overwhelming tide.


On March 31, 1879, Ferry expressed his gratitude to the League for its concurrence in his proposed legislation. The League by now called itself Sociétés Républicaines d'Instruction. Lecanuet, II, 25.
trying to stem it, not because he defended the clerics, but because he drew his stubborn strength from a firm belief in the righteousness of his cause. The last of a vanishing breed, he was, by sentiment, a descendant of Victor Cousin's eclecticism. Even more firmly implanted in him was the faith of Liberalism. He reproached the Ferry circle:

We desire to make the Republic beloved. You think of making it feared. We wish to make it desired; you want to make it a yoke....preoccupied with what you call the rights of the State, the moral unity of the State, [you] become intimidated by the diversity of creeds, without perceiving that under this name it is Liberty itself that frightens you.27

Though he agreed with most of the bill, he disliked article seven, and explained his attitude:

Having for forty years claimed the necessary liberties in my speeches and my writings, and defended, especially in my capacity as a philosophe, the freedom to think, write and teach, it becomes today impossible for me to vote against all those.28

Soon after passage in the Chamber, both Ferry Bills were sent to the Senate, wherein lay the last, faint hope for the Catholics. Though his objections to the principle of article seven were made known, Jules Simon, the doyen of the Senate, was appointed chairman and reporter of its committee to study the law.

Adversaries on both sides of the conflict over article seven spent the second half of 1879 stirring up

---

27 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 502. Bishop Dupanloup once remarked that Simon "will be Cardinal before I shall." Ibid., 501.
28 In his letter, August 7, 1879, to the Comité démocratique de Reims, cited by Lecanuet, II, 31 f.
emotions and soliciting support. The position of the Waddington Cabinet became precarious in an atmosphere filled with dissension. The new policy of Ferry and his radical supporters, was considered as being bold and hasty by many unorganized Deputies and Senators, who advised moderation and caution. Being suspicious of Ferry's preponderance in the government, and lacking enthusiasm for article seven, just before Christmas 1879, Waddington resigned. He recommended either Gambetta or Ferry to succeed him. Impartial to either one, Jules Grévy asked De Freycinet to form a new Cabinet, in which Ferry kept the same portfolio.

Without haste, the Senate committee studied the Ferry Laws, which did not come up for debate until January 23, 1880.

V

The first task of the Senate in the new year was to dispose of the Ferry bill on the Higher Council on Education and the Academic Council. The Republicans had the situation well in hand, and the month-long debate only prolonged the agony of the Catholics. The Duc de Broglie excelled in his defence of the Church position, but to no avail. Retaining in the Bill the provision to exclude bishops from membership in the Councils, the first Ferry law was passed by the Senate on February 23, in its entirety. The same day, the Ferry bill on higher education was introduced. Simon, not ready to
cede, defended freedom of instruction:

Gentlemen, Republican France as I see her, is France where there is not only freedom to act, but also freedom to think and consequently freedom to instruct... you have no right to impose just any doctrine. You have only one right and that is to love freedom. With it, - with liberty you shall live - France and the Republic will also live.29

The first six articles were discussed one by one, and on March 2, they were all passed. Then came the crux of the matter. Engaged in a bitter and acrimonious verbal clash, the opposing partisans relentlessly matched each other, blow for blow, in one of the most heated parliamentary debates the Senate had ever experienced. Senator Berenger, one of the first to speak against the article, said to its proponents:

If the Roman Catholics constitute a political party, this is your own doing. If you had not attacked the Catholic faith, the liberty of Catholics, they would never have thought of forming such a party. If you stigmatize [as] clerical every man who fights for his convictions, then every cause has its clericals. If every cause has zealous adherents, why not that of Catholicism, too? 30

29 Cited by Lecanuet, II, 41.

30 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 519. Bodley had a different opinion: "The clerical party was the first aggressor...it impetuously drew the sword and provoked a merciless reprisal." France, I, 139; but he added this, as well: "The intolerant system under the Third Republic differs from all prosecutions known to history, in that it is not only practised in the name of Liberty, but it aims at laying official disability on an established religion." Ibid., 149. Another author of reputation on the subject was more cautious. He stated that it is insoluble and daring to answer the question: "Who started the war between the Church and the anticlericals?" Weill, op. cit., 9.
The major exchange was between the two Jules, Simon and Ferry, each representing the acerbity of his respective House in the Assembly. Ferry used a whole afternoon session to answer the Catholic defenders. In a powerful harangue, he surveyed the history of secondary and higher education after the Revolution. Ostracizing the teaching methods of the Jesuits and stressing the political and social aspects of the educational question, Ferry called..."on all who have received the inheritance of the French Revolution to join"...in this conflict, because "...our first duty is to save the soul of the new generation from the influence of those who disdain the political and social order of the world."31

Reverting to his favourite subject, Ferry stated the principal character of laïcité, giving the idea of the laïc state:

It is not inspired by the spirit of religious denomination. No, it is uniquely inspired by political outlook. We are not theoreticians, nor metaphysicians, burdened to discuss philosophical views on the rights of the state and of the individual; we are political men, facing passions which do not subside, having a responsibility to establish a government in this country.32

Jules Simon was the next to address the Senate. Moved by the boldness of Ferry's speech, he at first expressed interest in the system of government itself: "I ask myself, in view of the mood in the Senate, if I ought to

31 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 520 f.
32 Ferry's speech in the Senate, March 5, 1880, cited by Rivero, op. cit., 370 f.
discuss anything other than to find out if liberty shall exist or not." Then he proceeded to shatter article seven. "Here is what I think of your article seven," he said to Ferry, and began to enumerate the reasons. Firstly, it was useless because the fears which Ferry had expressed had no foundation. Secondly, it was ineffective and would achieve nothing. The Jesuit dogmas to which Ferry objected were taught wherever there was a Catholic priest, and would continue to be taught by Jesuit successors, secular or regular. Thirdly, it was, unfortunately, unjust; and fourthly, it was supremely impolite. He concluded by saying that one truly loved liberty when one allowed it among one's enemies. To love freedom for oneself alone was neither to love it or to understand it, and such a person was not even worthy of understanding it.

Fearing a reversal of sympathy after the impression made by Simon's eloquence upon the Senators, De Freycinet intervened on behalf of Ferry. The Prime Minister's words revealed his own helplessness and foreshadowed the future:

...it is impossible to escape a similar law, or some other law, which probably will be less moderate than this one. It is from this point of view that I have accepted it.... If this measure is not passed, the executive power will, in any case, be forced to apply laws much more harsh than these. Vote for Article VII, it is the most moderate you can obtain.

33 Cited by Barbier, II, 29.
34 Based on a citation in Lecanuet, II, 43.
35 The first paragraph cited by Lecanuet, II, 44; the second by Hanotaux, IV, 52.
With this realistic speech, the advocates of the article appeared to have regained some of the ground lost during Simon's pique. Former Premier Dufaure arrested this new threat, and with vigour surprising for his age, countered:

> Whatever you may say, article seven raised the gravest of all questions - the religious....I refuse to judge the Jesuits....As for the Senate, let it continue faithfully to defend high principles and liberty - let it reject article seven of the measure.36

Following a last plea from Simon, the Senate on March 9 rejected the article 148:129 in the first voting. In the second reading on March 15, the rejection was confirmed, by 187:103. Except for article seven, the two Ferry bills were passed by both Houses of the Assembly. The Republic of "Simon, Dufaure and Thiers cried Halt! to the Republic of Ferry, Brisson and Gambetta."37

VI

Though article seven was buried, the issue behind it was not. The day after the first rejection in the Senate, Gambetta's paper stated that the problem would re-appear "more imperious and more urgent"; it vowed that "in the duel between democracy and clericalism, it [was] not democracy which...[would] be the vanquished one."38

36 Adapted from a citation in Hanotaux, IV, 522 f.
38 La République Française, (March 10, 1880), cited by Lecanuet, II, 45.
On March 15 the Chamber started the second deliberation on the law on higher education. Though he could see no alternative but the application of the Laws, De Freycinet suggested that the government should accept the verdict of the Senate. The onus, therefore, was placed squarely on the Chamber. The leaders of the major republican groups then agreed in principle that, as far as the spirit of article seven went, its rejection in the Senate was not binding on the Chamber. The next day, by a formal motion it expressed confidence in the government, relying on its perseverance in the application of laws relating to non-authorized associations. Without debate, the Chamber then passed the bill on higher education as it was returned from the Senate, and the law was promulgated on March 18.

Perhaps in order to set the mood for the bold action which was to follow, Paul Bert spoke at length at a private meeting on March 21 in Le Havre. A few ideas expressed on that occasion illustrated the principal avenue of his own thoughts, as well as that of Ferry, Brisson, Gambetta et hoc genus omne. The Jesuits were the main target of the invective of this positivist professor at the Sorbonne. Stressing the importance of education in shaping the minds of children, Deputy Bert denounced 'the pretensions' of the Jesuits and

39 See the text of the Report to the President, below, Appendix III, C-1.
clerics. In the new system of instruction, it was no more:

- a matter of making a fervent Catholic and an obedient subject of [the child] ... A strong education must prepare him for all social developments, and strong moral training must, for him, replace the official guardianship of the priest.

Then, turning to his favourite subject, the Jesuits, Paul Bert added:

> These alleged teachers have placed themselves outside of society by their vows, discipline and doctrines including their garb...we cannot bear to see the education of youth entrusted to them any longer...in their eyes, France comes long after Rome; their teaching crammed with mystical nonsense, is a daily protest against the most precious of things that the French Revolution bequested to us: freedom of conscience.40

The government was committed to yield to the antagonism toward the Jesuits. But few anticipated the extremes to which it was ready to go. Article seven was to exclude the Jesuits from education; the government now prepared a measure to exclude them from France itself.

---

40 Bert, op. cit., 112, 118. A few more thoughts, delivered in the course of a single speech, are illustrative of his attitude. He spoke on religious instruction in the school. In the Winter Circus on August 28, 1881, with Gambetta as chairman of the proceedings, Bert said:

> "The Catholic Church and her religious instruction which I attack...has great pretensions of purity. -- No-one will find me erroneous when I affirm that [this instruction] easily becomes...the school of imbecility, of fanaticism, of antipatriotism and of immorality. We have done well to have chased it out of school, it is absolutely contradictory to all the points of scientific instruction.... -- The priest, [this] delegate of God, who has the secret of His will and who pretends even to be mightier than He, as by a single word he forces Him to come down to the altar. In such a manner, while laic instruction develops activity, science and progress; religious instruction begets inaction, inertia and superstition." Ibid., 101-107, passim.
On March 29 the President signed two decrees to carry out this decision. The provisions of the first of the Decrees of March 29 allowed the Jesuits, specifically, three months in which to disperse and to evacuate the establishments which they occupied. The second demanded that all other non-authorized orders apply, within the same period, for authorization from the government.41

From then on, this radically anticlerical measure dropped all pretensions of being motivated by anything but political reasons. "Free thought and Freemasonry intervened no less energetically, convinced that nothing could be done in France until she was released from Roman Catholic influence."42

Conversely, just three days before the Decrees struck and stunned the Catholics, Cardinal Bonnechose wrote to the Pope: "I can only acknowledge that the thoughtless imprudence of many Catholic laymen has occasioned this violent reaction against the religious communities and against the Church."43

VII

Following publication of the Decrees, the highly-aroused emotions of the Catholics in France were contrasted

41 For the text of both decrees, see below, Appendix III C-2 and 3.

42 Hanotaux, IV, 526. The Ministries, headed by Waddington and De Freycinet, were by no means immune to the influence of the Protestant spirit which was so long allied with Liberal teaching. Cf. ibid.

43 Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 528, n. 1.
by restraint and caution in the Vatican. Receiving French Ambassador Desprez in early April, the Pope Leo XIII made a simple but pointed allusion:

We are grieved to hear that certain measures are contemplated against the religious communities. In the eyes of the Holy See they all have an equal value. Our heart would feel profound sorrow knowing them to be exposed to hostility from the government and being obliged to raise a voice of protest on their behalf.44

The Ambassador sought to persuade the Pope and others in the Curia to abandon the Jesuits, in effect, by allowing them to vacate France so that the remaining orders might be spared.45 The Pope, supported by the Cardinals, did not assent to such a transaction. Thus, the policy of the Vatican evolved: it judiciously refrained from actively engaging in the conflict, which was, in reality, an internal affair of France; yet it remained steadfast in the face of diplomatic pleas to counsel the Jesuits and others into submission to the governmental ordinances against them.

In France, Catholics, lay and clergy, sprang to their feet to a man. Universally aroused, they allowed more rein to their emotions than to a sober analysis of the

44 Cited by Lecanuet, II, 48; the first sentence by Hanotaux, IV, 528. The Pope sent a note to De Freycinet through his nuncio, protesting, in the name of justice and religion, the obvious measures of persecution, and holding the government responsible for any consequences that might result.

45 Cf. Lecanuet, II, 60 f; on the activities of Desprez in Rome at this time, cf. Barbier, II, 34 f.
situation. As in the past, but even more energetically, the bishops raised the cry in defence of the threatened Congregations. The Bishop Bouret told the Jesuits: "Your cause is that of the Church itself. We will make your pain ours. Your persecutions are ours." In this spirit, the secular clergy resolutely adhered to the episcopal protests. All the laymen joined in, and the leaders among them undertook a tour of the country to campaign against the Decrees.

Nor did the affected orders remain idle. Assuming the Jesuits irrevocably condemned, the remaining orders considered the second Decree as having left ajar a door to some accommodation. The Superiors of various orders in Paris met at the Oratorian house and agreed unanimously to endorse two essential points: solidarity in their ranks, and to discontinue authorisation. In addition, they decided to hold a

46 "When the religious orders wished to appeal to the courts against the decrees, the prefects held that the latter were incompetent in the case; and the Court of Conflicts, over which Cazot, signer of the decrees as Keeper of the Seals presided, declared that their only redress was an appeal to the Council of State." Acomb, op.cit., 146. The injustice of giving this Council jurisdiction in the conflict, in which the state was a party, was obvious. Located at Paris, the Council of State was a political body, and after it was enlarged in 1879, it was predominantly composed of republican members. Debidour, I, 218. A veritable epidemic of magistrates' resignations surpassed 400 at the end of the year. The majority of them were republican, but gave up their position rather than rule on a measure which they considered unjust. Lecanuet, II, 56. The climate of opinion was favourable and if the Catholics quietly reappraised the mood of the nation, "with a little more determination and suppleness, perhaps many satisfactory concessions might have been possible." Hanotaux, IV, 541.

plenary assembly on April 27, to which all Superiors throughout the country were invited.

At this meeting, more than sixty houses across the country were represented. After a brief discussion, they emphatically reiterated their unity and their decision to decline compliance with the Decree. The lines were drawn; there was nothing more but to await the hour of reckoning: the execution of the Decrees.

Except those actively engaged in teaching, for whom the moratorium expired on August 31, the deadline for the Jesuits' evacuation was June 29. They had made no move to comply with the Decree. Bent on their expulsion, the government saw no alternative but to use force.

At dawn on June 30, members of the Paris police

48 Reconstruction of this phase was drawn closely from Barbier, II, 30-36.

There is an interesting side-light to the whole episode. On April 16, 1880, De Freycinet wrote a circular to the French external ambassadors to explain governmental policy as a result of the Decrees. The letter ended: "It has been supposed by some that the Decrees relating to religious communities might bring about the abandonment of our secular policy in the East and Far West, and that we might cease to protect the missionaries who contribute to the extension of our influence and renown. This is a complete mistake....The measures taken in no way affect the conditions of our protection of missionaries abroad." Cited by Hanotaux, IV, 530. When Cardinal Lavigerie solicited governmental help for his work in Algiers, Gambetta, having become Premier in mid-November, 1881, assuring him of his personal assistance, said: "L'anticléricalisme, Monseigneur, n'est pas un article d'exportation." Cited by Lecanuet, II, 228.
called at various local Jesuit establishments, broke in, and began ejecting the priests, most of whom were old and infirm. The prefect of police, who supervised the operation, Andrieux, a Free-Thinker himself, left this description:

The clearing of the houses lasted a long time; it was a painful matter for those responsible for its accomplishment. The police met with passive resistance, and had to turn defenceless priests into the street; their prayerful attitude, their calm, resigned expression contrasted painfully with the use of public force.

That same morning, almost at the same hour and in the same manner, the wholesale expulsion of the Jesuits was carried out across France. There were numerous touching and dramatic scenes. In Toulouse, a former army chaplain, ninety year-old Father Gusy was the first Jesuit expelled. Bearing on his chest the cross of the Legion of Honour, he was helped out, while the gendarmes who knew the old priest cried and saluted. The peaceful Jesuits were thus purged on schedule and almost without incident.

VIII

The firmness bordering on brutality with which the expulsion was carried out, and the widespread reprobation it caused, placed the government in an embarrassing situation.

49 One of the Jesuits, Father Lefebvre said to the Police: "The men of the Commune let me stay here and you are throwing me out." Cited by Lecanuet, II, 63.


51 Lecanuet, II, 63. Jesuits of foreign nationality under the diplomatic protection of their respective countries were exempted from expulsion, temporarily at least.
Within virtually a week, the Prime Minister assumed a mollifying attitude, while a certain number of prelates began to show conciliatory inclinations.

By virtue of his position, the Archbishop of Algiers, Mgr. Lavigerie, had good contacts within governmental circles, at the same time enjoying a considerable reputation in the Vatican. He was thus well qualified as a mediator. In June, the Bishop travelled to France via Rome, where the Pontiff, seeing little chance for the Jesuits, asked him to endeavour to save the remaining orders. From the moment of his arrival at Paris, Mgr. Lavigerie undertook a series of confidential conferences, particularly with De Freycinet.

On June 20, the prelate was able to inform the papal nuncio, Czacki, that a formula for solution of the impasse could be reached. The government could overlook the failure of the Congregations to apply for authorization, if the Superiors would sign a declaration disavowing any intention of political hostility or opposition to the existing institutions of the country.

This solution was favoured initially. But, after consultations with Cardinal Guibert and having witnessed the expulsion of the Jesuits, the Committee of Superiors

52 Lecanuet, II, 66.
53 For the text of this declaration see below, Appendix V, A.
unanimously rejected it. Mgr. Lavigerie was not discouraged by this refusal. Pointing out the potential damage of such a stand in a letter to the Pope, he blamed it on an obduracy to "preserve ill-contracted political alliances", and entreated the Pontiff that he alone could break those ties.\textsuperscript{54}

The silence concerning the remaining orders was broken on August 10, when Leo XIII wrote to Cardinal Bonnechose saying that he had been persuaded by episcopal letters, while the assurances from the French government:

...confirmed the hope of being able, - by an act which is not at all opposed to the maxims of the Church; constitutions and rules of each congregation, - to save them from a complete dissolution which would cause irreparable injury to the Church and Catholic France.\textsuperscript{55}

Only after considerable persuasion, and after being confronted with authentic documents and the papal letter, did the Superiors relent. With heavy heart, they agreed to sign the Declaration. Within a few weeks, declarations from fifty-two male and 280 female orders arrived at the Archbishopric of Paris.\textsuperscript{56}

All negotiations connected with the Declaration were conducted in utmost secrecy. The first hints that something

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. extract from the letter in Barbier II, 56. In order to expedite a solution, De Freycinet entered into direct negotiations with Rome through his own diplomatic channels.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{55} Cited by Barbier, II, 56.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{56} Lecanuet, II, 74.
might be under way came from De Freycinet in a speech at Montauban on August 20. He stated that the recent expulsion of the Jesuits had demonstrated the power of the government, which might allow the remaining congregations to take advantage of a law then being prepared to regulate all lay and ecclesiastical associations.

Thinking that the time for discretion was past, the Catholic paper La Guyenne on August 30 published the text of the Declaration, thereby divulging the whole process. A storm of indignation and protest was raised on both sides. De Freycinet clumsily attempted to weather it by issuing a formal denial of any government engagement with the Pope, but it was of no avail. The ensuing Cabinet crisis exacted its pound of flesh for the radicals in the form of De Freycinet's resignation. Jules Ferry, perhaps as a vindication, was called to form a new Ministry. An honest attempt to bring about a truce between the Church and the Republic had disintegrated.

IX

All that remained for the Congregations was to die, as the Minister of the Interior, Constans, had pronounced

---

57 Cf. Hanotaux, IV, 533 f. The Minister of the Interior, Constans, resigned and was quickly joined by a few others; De Freycinet then resigned on September 19, bringing about the crisis. From September 13 to 18, 1880, the Grand Orient held its annual meeting, "which may have helped bring about the fall of the Freycinet cabinet and the decision to execute the decrees against the unauthorized orders." Acomb, op. cit., 117. Jules Ferry was honoured on that occasion: 'Masonry
A war of nerves followed, as the papers continued daily to forecast the purge for the next day, or the next. The axe began to fall on the morning of October 16, when the police swooped down on the houses of the Carmelite and Barnabite Fathers in Paris, forcibly evicting them. The operation was suspended for the next three weeks, but apprehension mounted. In many places, the orders took precautionary measures, raising barricades and mounting sentries. The well-planned raid came at dawn on November 5. An odd assortment of police, their agents, and firemen descended upon eleven houses of various orders and all were forcibly evicted. The wholesale operation, often requiring *manu militari* to carry it out, was thereby under way.

For various reasons, seven communities were spared. In some regions, confronted by the hostility of the local population, the Trappists were spared. The Oratorians, will not forget that the Minister of Education is one of its most distinguished sons." Cited by Lecanuet, II, 78.

58 For the text of his letter to that effect, see below, Appendix V, B. For texts of various letters by and to Cardinal Guibert in this period, see below, Appendix IV, A - F.

59 That same day, all Carmelite Fathers were purged across France, while the Italian order of Barnabites was asked to leave the country immediately.

60 A famous and embarrassing incidence occurred in a section of Tarascon. Acting on a rumour that the monks were preparing for energetic resistance, a whole regiment of infantry, five squadrons of dragoons, and several pieces of artillery were summoned and placed under the command of General Billot. The siege lasted four days. Finally, the troops stormed the door and flushed out -- thirty-seven monks engaged in prayers. Lecanuet, II, 85.
expulsed in Tours, were not disturbed in Paris, thanks to the energetic intervention of Dufaure. Certain Houses of Eudists and of Prêtres de la Miséricorde were allowed to remain, on the pretext that they had no vows. No community of women was dissolved.

In the course of 1880, Jules Ferry introduced three projects of law: one on the certificate of capacity, actually on the agenda since May 19, 1879; one on gratuitous education, and the third on compulsory primary education.

The first of these bills had its airing in the Chamber on May 24, 1880 and was eventually adopted. The Senate debated it March 29, 1881, voted for it, and promulgated it on June 16, 1881.

The second Ferry project came up for debate on July 15, 1880, and was greeted by strong Catholic opposition. Among the variety of arguments against the bill was a claim that, if the principle of gratuity were carried further, it would develop into a clamour for free food, clothing and lodging. Bishop Freppel stated that logically, this theory of the State -- the universal teacher, would evolve into a theory of the State -- the universal provider. Suspended during the summer, discussion was resumed on November 25,

61 Lecanuet, II, 80 - 88.
62 Ibid., 113.
63 Ibid., 115.
and on December 1 the bill was passed without change. It reached the Senate on April 5, 1881; was voted, and then promulgated on June 16.

The third of these projects was brought up for debate on December 4, 1880 and was vigorously attacked by the Catholics. The opposition was powerless and the bill was passed by the Chamber on Christmas Eve, 1880. This symbolic date inspired a Catholic lament:

During this Christmas vigil, when Christian peoples surround the manger of the Divine Child, the French Chamber, more cruel than old Herod, has consummated its crime against the faith of our little children.

And concerning the religious orders, on December 31, 1880, in making up its balance sheet, the French government published the result of its victory: 261 communities with 5,643 members were suppressed.

---

64 For the partial text of the Ferry law on compulsory primary education, see below, Appendix III, B.

When this bill came before the Senate during June and July, 1881, Jules Simon insisted on the insertion of this sentence in article one: "Teachers will instruct pupils on their duties toward God and toward the country." Over the violent objection of Jules Ferry, this was added and the bill passed by the Senate. The Chamber then revised it, restoring its original wording, and it went one step further. It forbade priests all access to the schools, even for religious instruction. Lecanuet, II, 128.

65 L'Univers, (December 26, 1880), cited by Lecanuet II, 123.

66 Lecanuet, II, 89. The victory was not absolute. As late as 1899, one of the adherents of the laic spirit, A. Aulard, wrote:

This vast social and political association called the Roman Church aspires to substitute its mystical principles and its infallible and capricious authority
On that note ended the bitter and colourful first decade of the Third French Republic, in which the struggle for control in education had ramifications and repercussions far beyond the bounds of education. The republican legislation, designed to solve the educational question, fell short of its goal, and only aggravated the struggle, which continued for quite some time.

over the national principles on which our French society reposes, and aspires to govern it....This pretension, that is clericalism.

This pretension is not of this century nor of this hour: it has always formed the essential design of the Roman Church. As the French Revolution is the boldest venture yet launched to thwart this design, it is the French Revolution which, to our day, grapples above all else with this Church.

The fight against clericalism therefore has as its object defence of the principle of the Revolution.

These principles can be maintained or ruined only by persuading the people that they are good or that they are evil principles.

It is therefore over education that these two parties presently are fighting. The struggle is between the laic university and the religious congregations.

Bert, op. cit., Preface, vi.
CHAPTER IV

ATTITUDE OF BRITISH PERIODICALS UNDER
ROMAN CATHOLIC EDITORSHIP
1879 - 1880

I

By the quality of their writing, the quantity of their readers, and the duration of their publishing, the Tablet and the Dublin Review must be considered as the most renowned Catholic periodicals in England. The pages of both exuded ultramontane spirit, which was well-reflected in their interest, warmth and compassion for their co-religionists in France. The Tablet, a weekly, was more of a chronicler of events; while the Dublin Review, being a quarterly publication, dissimilar in nature and approach, contained little commentary on current events across the Channel.

In the Dublin Review, only two articles appeared which dealt explicitly with the question of education. Inspired by analysis in other sources of the background of recent events, each of the two articles was written before

---

1 For an historical sketch and discussion of these two periodicals, cf. J. J. Dwyer, "The Catholic Press", in George Andrew Beck, ed., The English Catholics, 1850-1950. (London, 1950), 475 489. After 1868 and at this time, the motto of the Tablet was: "Pro Deo, pro Rege et Patria... the words, in that order, proclaimed the principles of the paper." Ibid., 485.

102
the respective climaxes took place, but suggested a reason­ably accurate prognosis.²

"Published every Friday for Saturday," the Tablet contained, among other varia, "Original Articles upon Polit­i­cal, Artistic, Educational, and Religious Questions."³ There were, in the Tablet, two chief sections: the Chronicle of the Week and the editorial articles, the latter often based upon the former. The initial three to five pages of the Chronicle in each issue offered straight reporting of the more important news items, mostly on political events at home, throughout Europe and, not infrequently, overseas. The space devoted to these varied according to their gravity or ramifications, presumably as seen by the editors. Although the Chronicle customarily led off with domestic, especially governmental, affairs, other news often took priority. When the situation in France was grave, those developments were displayed on the front page.

The editorials dealing with France were sometimes inspired by the events themselves, other times by an opinion.

² The absence of comment in the issues of the Dublin Review after 1880 may have implied - when the prediction materialized - the resignation of the disappointed contrib­utors to the fait accompli.

³ Editorial statement of its nature, in each issue of the Tablet. This one taken at random, LIII (February 1, 1879), 159. Established in 1840, the Tablet was the "oldest Catho­lic paper in Great Britain." The Dublin Review was esta­blished in 1836.

The comments contained in this chapter are, of neces­sity, dominated by the writings of the Tablet.
expressed in some of the contemporary publications. Strictly speaking, these editorial articles more often represented an editorial review, an amplified commentary, rather than a decisive statement of intrinsic principles. But in either case, a fundamental ultramontane inspiration remained constant.

At the outset, concerning the results of the Senatorial election of January 5, 1879, the Tablet reported the "anticipated" victory as "decisive", in a Republic it considered "moderate". The election results outstripped the most sanguine expectations of the Republicans, while the opposing parties could not have sustained a more complete rout. This electoral triumph was the crowning achievement in a series of successes which confirmed the extent and sincerity of Republican popularity, while explicitly indicating the sentiments of the French nation in this long contest.

The Tablet accepted the result calmly and realistically. There would be no patriotism in seeking to overthrow the new regime, nor to impede its successful development, as Republicanism had "manifestly been accepted in France." But the idea of a Republic for which the great mass of people voted, the Tablet believed, was a reasonable, Conservative one. With

---

4 Chronicle of the Week, [hereafter cited as COW], Tablet, LIII (January 11, 1879), 33. The wording of this chapter is liberally interlaced with the language of the papers under consideration.

the Senate as a bulwark against disrupting forces, the Republic had a favourable chance for permanent success. The Tablet counselled the monarchists to accept the inevitable and abandon the unpatriotic course of trying vainly to re-establish the monarchy. They ought to concentrate their strength in opposing a more dangerous evil, that of socialism and irreligion. At the same time:

If France has become Republican, she is still Catholic, and if attempts are meditated by the extreme members of the Left upon the Liberty of the Church or the freedom of religious education, the Conservatives would, with the aid of the Moderate Party, be enabled to defeat them.

Conversely, the Tablet felt that the Republicans ought not to endanger their success by imprudent use of their victory, which ought to be enough satisfaction, and the triumph should not be taken as a warrant for violent and extravagant measures: "France expects to find in her Republic a wise, moderate, and safe form of government, and it is the hope, as it is the interest, of Europe that she may not be disappointed."

The Tablet very soon had to revise this initial, cool assessment of political realities in France. The moderation of Dufaupe's Cabinet lost its halo when it proposed new
legislation relative to education. The surprised Tablet correctly understood that this meant revocation of the power to grant degrees from the new Catholic universities, and also suppression of the letters of obedience.9

In addition, Gambetta's latest manipulation gave further cause for apprehension. The Tablet saw little encouragement in his intention to create a Cabinet of "puppets whose strings were to be pulled by himself." It also disagreed with the Paris correspondents of the press in England, who wrote stock texts of political sermons for the English papers, creating an illusion that Gambetta had developed into "that type of Liberal which most commends itself to English sympathies."

Though not sharing political opinions with them, the Tablet was convinced that "almost all Liberalistic English papers" would be well satisfied to see France "settle down as a Constitutional Monarch"; but failing to see any probability of that, they desired to see her "settle down as a Republic."

The Tablet speculated that Gambetta's design was the Presidency itself. Recalling that Gambetta "proclaimed his mission to extirpate" clericalism, which he explained meant not only Catholicism, but the "influence of supernatural religion on civil society", the editorial feared that "no French Catholic...could look upon" such an event as anything

---

9 COW, Tablet, LIII (January 25, 1879), 97.
"but a real calamity." And:

As for ourselves, we should welcome the restoration of traditional monarchy tempered by constitutional restrictions, but we fear...that[presently]the only practical alternatives are a moderate or most mischievous Republic.10

And should Gambetta fulfil his aspirations, pondered the Tablet, there would remain no room for doubt as to which of the two kinds of Republic would emerge.

The events leading up to the election of Grévy as the new President gave open cause for concern to the Tablet, in view of the rapidly deteriorating situation in France. Under the guidance of Dufaure, the Republic was proving a "weak stop-gap against the aggressive designs of the more advanced revolutionary party." To the Catholics outside of France, this weakness was demonstrated in concessions expected of the Cabinet "to the crusade against religious education and religious freedom."11

Curiously, the next issue led off with news of the exchange at the helm of state, calmly reporting the election of Gambetta to the Presidency of the Chamber to replace Grévy, and the formation of a new Cabinet by Waddington.12 There was no editorial comment. A subsequent issue did carry one,

10 Editorial, "M. Gambetta and the Future of France", Tablet, LIII (January 25, 1879), 101 f. Gambetta tried unsuccessfully at this time to have General Farre, a man compliant to him, installed as Minister of War.

11 Editorial, "The Outlook in France", Tablet, LIII (February 1, 1879), 134.

12 COW, Tablet, LIII (February 8, 1879), 161 f.
however, which gave a sustained analysis of the new Ministry, noting that, in the new Cabinet, the Prime Minister and four others were Protestant; two Ministers were distinctly anti-Catholic; and for the rest, the editorial writer was not aware whether a single one was a practising Catholic. 13

When the Republican Ides of March brought the proposal of the Ferry law into the Chamber, in issues for the entire month of March, a peculiar quietude, almost inertia, appears to have fallen upon the Tablet. There was very little mention of the Ferry laws, but the Tablet reported what it called the official attack on the French Catholic universities; and the proposed disqualification of the Jesuits and other religious. 14 Soon, with a rather calm discussion of the purpose and consequences of the Ferry Bills, more particularly an analysis of the background of, and prospects for, the arbitrary article seven, the concern of the Tablet began to

13 Editorial, "The Apostasy of States", Tablet, LIII (February 15, 1879), 197 f.

14 COW, Tablet, LIII (March 22, 1879) 343 f.

In the section "Foreign News" under "France", the Tablet carried dispatches from its own correspondent in Paris. In the issues LIII (March 1, 1879), 278 f; and (March 15, 1879), 342, the current educational question in France was discussed, but is only informative in character. Another section in the Tablet was "General News", where the varia of subjects was reported in an average of three to eight lines. In the issues LIII (March 8, 1879), 313; (March 22, 1879), 376; and (March 29, 1879), 409; brief notices pertaining to education were carried. All these are indicative of interest in the problem, but do not change or add appreciably to the general pattern of the Tablet's attitude.
intensify, although the tone of this editorial review remained moderate.

As if having taken time out to study dispassionately the implications of the Ferry legislation, the Tablet summarized its appreciation of the situation and proclaimed that war had been declared against religious freedom in education. It was almost incredible, to the Tablet, that such a project would be entertained by responsible statesmen in any country. If French statesmen intended to provide for their country "a succession of fresh revolutions, they could invent no plan so sure to carry out that object as the proposed banishment of the influence of religion from the schools." The policy of prudence and moderation for which the Tablet had hopefully counselled was now regrettably at an end.

This was followed by further expressions of regret and disappointment in governmental design to obtain a monopoly in education "at all hazards and at the sacrifice of every principle". To fulfil this design the government did not "scruple to invade individual liberty and to imperil the best interest of education itself by the banishment from the

15 Editorial "The French Legislature and the 'Unrecognized' Congregations", Tablet, LIII (March 29, 1879), 390 f.

school of the most accomplished teachers." 17

Writing on the same theme and speaking of Catholics in general, the Tablet pointed out the course of its own future orientation. Catholics in all countries, with good reason, must feel the deepest concern for the struggle under way in France. It was only natural that their attention should have been "painfully directed towards the Bill." The external liberty of the Church, particularly her freedom of teaching, was a common possession of all Catholics, and the progress of the Ferry measure, "so full of mischief should be watched with intense and growing interest." 18

III

By April 1879, the consequences of the political changes on the French scene prompted the Dublin Review calmly to take stock of the situation and, with deep affinity, to demonstrate sincere concern for the French nation in general,

17 Editorial "The French Education Bills", Tablet, LIII (April 12, 1879), 454.

The Tablet found some consolation in the fact that: "The English press in general, and notably that portion of it which can least be suspected of sympathy with what is called clericalism, has condemned them with singular unanimity." Ibid.

18 Editorial "The French Education Bills and the Teaching Congregations." Tablet, LIII (April 19, 1879), 486 f. There were nine religious congregations engaged in teaching, but only the Lazarists among them were authorized to teach in accordance with a decree of July 27, 1876. Ibid.
and for its Catholic citizens in particular. 19

The Dublin Review speculated that the Perry action, having provoked unparalleled indignation in "Catholic and Conservative France", might well become the issue over which both sides would fight a decisive battle. While it was impossible for the Dublin Review to state the outcome of that conflict, it suggested, without the intention of predicting, two contrasting possibilities: "a frightful social convulsion, or national impotence and foreign conquest." It added its own gloomy assertion: "...if separation of Church and State, secular education, an immoral press, and an executive which prosecutes religion, if these things constitute an abyss, France is sliding into it." 20

The rapid march of events since the previous Christmas was discouraging for the Conservatives and Catholics. Their only consolation, the Dublin Review held, might have been: "the worse the storm, the sooner it will be over." Ever since the Senatorial elections, followed by the election of Grevy to the Presidency, completed the deliverance of the Republic, there was hope for the country to enter on a long period of tranquillity and peace. But a few dark clouds began to gather almost immediately. Grévy's pledge to defend the interests of the State, translated into practice,

19 Article "Church and School in France", Dublin Review, 3rd ser., I (April, 1879), 493 - 503. [Hereafter cited as DR].

20 Ibid., 494.
meant a war against the Church. Then, almost the next day, came the announcement of the program of Premier Waddington. This man "of business, sensible and respectable", committed himself to the dismissal of non-republican officials; "to the revocation of the extremely modified independence of the Catholic universities; to compulsory education; and to strict examination of elementary teachers."  

When, in addition, the personnel of the Cabinet was more closely examined, the whole picture thus conveyed was not reassuring, and impressed the Dublin Review as the establishment of a pagan régime. All this showed little promise for the Church. Bad omens seemed to multiply and to be everywhere. The clamour for reforms, many of which were under way, all showed clearly enough which way the current was setting in France.  

At first, these indicated that bad times may have been in store for the Church and Catholic education, but the Ferry Bill now before the Chamber was not only a foretaste of those, but if enacted, would bring "a very substantial

---

21 Ibid., 496.

22 Among the reforms, these were the chief ones: Abrogation of the law of 1814 on the observance of Sunday; the adoption of La Marseillaise as the national anthem; the 'purification' of public offices, e.g., purge and replacement in the judiciary, army, and education personnel; amnesty for the communards; a vote of censure on the De Broglie and Rochebust Ministries, i.e., vengeance for the Seize Mai. Cf. ibid., 497 - 500.
instalment of persecution."\(^{23}\)

Waddington's Cabinet was faced with a very radical measure. Ferry's supporters would be satisfied with nothing short of suppression of the Catholic universities, disqualification of all religious teachers, and the expulsion of the Jesuits. While the Dublin Review was correct in assessing this, it did not expect it to be feasible, and added that the fall of the Waddington ministry could not be far off.

The Republic was abandoning moderation, and -- in view of so many protests and petitions pouring in from all quarters -- it had "succeeded, most unmistakably, in rousing not a part, but a Catholic nation." Warmed by this latter development, the Dublin Review ended its analysis of French conditions with a somewhat mistaken conclusion:

Let the clergy and the people continue to speak boldly and resolutely, and they will succeed in doing what, in our opinion, they might have done before -- they will make the Radicals respect them.\(^{24}\)

IV

The Tablet also saw encouraging signs in the current campaign against the bill, especially article seven. The odium of the latter was receiving an expression of strong

---

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 501. This article gives some statistical data, much of which is contained in Appendix VI, G, below. The staff, the establishments, and the students in ecclesiastical schools, had increased between 1866 and 1876 by more than ten per cent. Of 13,000 schoolmasters and teachers, about 4,000 were ecclesiastics at this time, and one-half of them would be excluded from teaching by the Ferry bill. Ibid., 501, 502.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., 503.
disapproval from a large proportion of the French nation, including many who could not "be stigmatised as anti-Republicans." At the same time, objections to the Ferry bill were beginning to gather distinguished advocates, and the Tablet noted:

...the defenders of the new Catholic Universities against the politicians who would restore the State monopoly of higher education have found a new ally in the person of Jules Simon, whose Republicanism and emancipation from clerical prejudices can scarcely be suspected.

Moreover, even pro-Republican opinion in England was becoming averse to the Ferry measure. The Tablet was pleased to see John Morley, editor of the Fortnightly Review, raise a voice of protest and level criticism against the bill. He considered it "either impotent or unnecessary", and found it to be that which so many of its official supporters had denied it to be:

...a measure directly aimed at religion and conceived in the spirit of M. CLEMENCEAU's dictum, 'The clergy must be taught that it is necessary to render to CAESAR, the things that are CAESAR's, and that everything is CAESAR's.'

If Jules Ferry had hoped to find support in Protestant England, he also must have found out his mistake in so

25 COW, Tablet, LIII (May 10, 1879), 577.
26 COW, Tablet, LIII (June 7, 1879), 706.
27 Editorial "An English Freethinker upon the French Educational Crisis", Tablet, LIII (May 10, 1879), 582 f., citing John Morley "The French Republic and the Catholic Church", Fortnightly Review [date not identified].
doing. The Ferry legislation shocked "the moral sense and the instinctive love of justice of Englishmen," who objected to it because of its inconsistency with their conceptions of freedom and of right. Not every person in England was of the same mind on the subject of education, but they all agreed upon respect for the right of the parent in the education of his child.

The developments in France evoked the sympathy and apprehension of all Catholics in England. The enthusiastically-endorsed Resolution of the Duke of Norfolk stated:

The deliberate and systematic efforts...in foreign countries to exclude the Christian faith from the education of European nations makes it all the more the duty of the people, and especially of the Catholics of this country, to maintain inviolate the Christian education of England. 29

With keen interest, the Tablet followed the controversies and debates, which mounted daily, and centered mostly on the ramification of the 'obnoxious' article seven. This can readily be seen in the space devoted by the Tablet to these daily affairs. The paper was more than occasionally filled with gloom. It feared at first that there was little chance for article seven to be rejected by the Senate. 30 The

29 "Supplement", Tablet, LIV (July 5, 1879), 5.
30 COW, Tablet, LIV (July 12, 1879), 34. This feeling came after the Chamber had passed the bill.
prospects were bleak, because the champions of the bill objected, not to the casuistry, but "to religious, that is Christian education." However, a faint hope remained because there were still champions of truth and honesty in both Houses.**

V

From the early proceedings in the Senate, the Tablet deduced that the rejection of the Perry bill became "extremely probable". It wrote almost gleefully that the prospect of defeat had..."created no small consternation among the anti-Catholic and Republican politicians". On the other hand, since Waddington claimed the measure of article seven to be purely political, declaring the Society of Jesus to be a political, not a religious association, the Tablet was alert enough to hear the carefully-implanted rumours: If article seven were rejected by the Senate, the government was to "fall back on the obsolete law of Charles X's reign, and expel the Jesuits altogether from the country."**

To say that the attack on the Jesuits had no character of religious persecution, because the Order was classified

31 Editorial "The French Chamber and the Jesuits", Tablet, LIV (July 12, 1879), 38 f. This article was chiefly inspired by the recent proposal of an amendment by radical Deputy Nadier de Montjau, to the effect that the 'prohibitions to teach should be extended to the clergy and all congregations whatever.'

32 COW, Tablet, LIV (July 26, 1879), 98. This was almost a year before the expulsion took place.
as a political association, was a weak argument in the opinion of the Tablet. The fallacy was too transparent to deceive anyone and Waddington ought to remember that a great many French regarded the "proposed law, should it unfortunately be enacted, in the light of a galling and intolerable persecution." Discussing the present condition and prospect in France, in a brief passage the Tablet gave an indication of its own admiration and compassion toward that country:

Emphatically a great nation -- great in the genius and high temper of her people, great in her natural resources, great in her material prowess -- it is sad to think of the base yoke, under which she languishes, of the vile ends to which her strength and influence are being prostituted. [France is] crushed under the ignoble tyranny of mob despotism, and prey of political adventurers and unscrupulous demagogues who mock her with empty talk of liberty.

During the summer of 1879, the departmental General Councils considered the Ferry laws, and while on August 28, twenty-eight of them approved of the measure, thirty-eight condemned it. Since the decisions of the Councils-general represented the mind of the electorate better than that of the Chamber, this was a demonstration to the Tablet that the deputies on many points were not representative of the ideas of their respective electorate. To recover their lost way in secular politics, the deputies tried to compensate by "striking out a new line in ecclesiastical politics."

33 COW, Tablet, LIV (August 30, 1879), 257.
Judging by the hostility of the circle of their acquaintances toward religious orders and to all religion, these deputies magnified this sentiment and assumed that all France "would hail a Liberal campaign against the influence of the Religious Orders in education." No, continued the Tablet; they were not elected to "vote that way, or on that subject." Many Frenchmen, even those who were 'bad Catholics', sought religious education for their children, particularly the mothers, who had a strong voice in French homes. The Radical deputies had "miscalculated the national will". Even if the Ferry Bill were to be enacted, it would not obtain a majority in the French nation. Hence the importance of the condemnation of article seven by the Councils. If Jules Ferry were to 'go to the country' on this question, he would not be re-elected.

Based on this analysis, the Tablet summarized:

It has become evident that a majority in the Chamber does not represent a majority in the country; the voices of departmental Councils-General have helped us to demonstrate this truth. And if we combine with them the conclusive testimony of the national petitions, we have sufficient proof that, as far at least as regards this question, the French Chamber does not represent France. 35

The last quarter of 1879 quieted down, a forecast of calm before the storm. In the issues from mid-September to the end of the year, there was editorial comment on France, but the news from there was not at all startling in respect

to the educational question. The last issue for the year, that of December 27, 1879, reported briefly and without ostentation, the demise of Waddington's Cabinet.

VI

The change in the Ministry did not disturb the Tablet, as there was no basic departure in policy. Finding the program of De Freycinet's Cabinet to be absolutely colourless, the Tablet gave the general impression that the new Ministers were "just the same as their predecessors - 'only more so.'"  

With the arrival of the Ferry bills at the Senate, the Tablet resumed its concern, and usually led off its subsequent issues with a story from Paris. These reports were rich in detail and carried many cardinal passages from various speeches in the debate. This concern is strongly

36 Curiously, the issues of the Tablet, LIV (October 11 and November 22, 1879) failed to mention France by a single word, because there was so little news from France.

37 COW, Tablet LV (January 24, 1880), 98. The corollary to the official policy in education was the reform in the educational system for young girls, a project introduced by Camille Sée, which the Tablet considered as part of the "progress in the anticlerical campaign". Ibid.

38 Cf. COW, Tablet, LV (February 28, 1880), 257; (March 6 1880), 290; and (March 13, 1880), 323.

"Foreign News", carried interesting excerpts from Jules Ferry's statistical report to the President, in which the progress in education was traced from 1837 to 1877. The teacher-pupil ratio was 1:53 in 1837; now it was 1:48. For every 10,000 population in 1837, there were 752 pupils in primary schools, vis à vis 1,281 in 1877, an increase of 70%. In 1837 there were 5,667 communes without a school, and in 1877 only 298. Of every 100 recruits in 1837 only 42 could read; in 1877, the number was 85. Tablet, LV (February 14, 1880), 216.
reflected in the frequency of editorials, and the language used. Perhaps indicating its own feelings, the Tablet noted that the Ferry proposals had been exhibited long enough; those who thought it strange to see a government of advanced Republican principles bringing down a reactionary and tyrannical measure had had "time to get over their first astonishment."39

The ruling principle of the Republicans was "hostility to religion, [and] their fixed determination to strike a blow at Catholic education." This stubborn insistence by the State on imposing upon the country its own views on the subject of education was going against the express wishes of many of its citizens. The evidence was ample: 1.8 million signatures on petitions.

Still better attestation was the success of the schools run by religious orders; the number of pupils in them demonstrated parental preference for them. These schools did not enjoy extraneous advantages; the only thing they required was liberty, which was "the right of citizenship in a free state".

Since liberty in education as granted by the Falloux Law had proved successful to the religious orders, its opponents wanted to "invade it". Jealousy of their success was the sole motive for the attack. The course taken by the government in this matter had met with "apprehension and disapproval"

39 Editorial "The Ferry Education Bill", Tablet, LV (February 28, 1880) 261 f.
by the well-wishers of Republican institutions. Even the Senate, as then constituted, was commonly known to lack favour for the Ferry bill.*0

The Tablet was elated when article seven was rejected by the Senate, noting that the majority of nineteen was "much larger than the most sanguine Catholics expected". Then, as if in congratulation, it added: "The French Catholics and the friends of liberty had fought a good fight."41

VII

The Tablet had a strong opinion of its journalistic colleagues in England. There was a regrettable lack of courage in those quarters, and it was a sadly curious thing to "study the utterances concerning religion of the most accredited" newspapers in England, and to trace "the nice gradations of current unbelief from the decorously veiled secularism of The Times, to the overt agnosticism of the Pall Mall Gazette."42

40 Ibid.
41 COW, Tablet, LV (March 13, 1880), 324.
42 Editorial, "The Latest Substitute for Christianity", Tablet, LIV (September 6, 1879), 295. Earlier, the writers of the Tablet and the Dublin Review were described as possessors of "that abnormal capacity of blindness to facts patent as the sun at noonday to all but Ultramontane eyes in the Dublin Review and the Tablet." Cf. "The Pope and the Press", Saturday Review, XLVII (March 1, 1879), 269.
The truth, insisted the Tablet, was that Englishmen surveyed the public order of the Continent from an English point of view, forgetting that their institutions had no true counterpart among other European nations. The average man in England was "usually very much at the mercy of the foreign correspondents of our journals" and these gentlemen, many of whom were of Socialistic tendencies, were "the unsafest guides of the British householder". They "popularize error under the name of liberty"; and they have pursued this dishonest art with a great measure of success." Therefore, it easily happened that the sympathies of Englishmen were given "in advance to the Continental politicians who adopt the name of Liberals."

Meanwhile, "the insolence and violence of the French Radicals...[began] to open the eyes of Englishmen as to their true character." Whatever the harm of the Ferry bill, it "proved too much for the common sense" of the people in England, where even the most advanced Radicals had "found themselves under necessity of disowning it." A sobering effect was contained in the fact that the leaders of the anti-Christian movement invoked liberty once too often, whereas their multitudinous speeches and writings showed that the

---

43 Editorial "English Public Opinion and Article Seven", Tablet, LV (March 13, 1880), 326 f. The Times "perhaps has helped more than any other of our public prints to spread the misconceptions prevailing in England about foreign politics." Editorial "The French Decrees of the 30th of March", Tablet, LV (April 3, 1880), 421.
only liberty they desired was "a liberty of unbelief, of im-
piety, of obscenity: a liberty to oppress the Church, to
demoralize the people, and to bring up the next generation
with the hatred of GOD."

Article seven was not directed exclusively against the
Jesuits, maintained the Tablet, but "against the whole Church
-- against the Christian religion itself", and even English
public opinion seemed to have recognized this. The speeches
of Jules Simon would "hardly have been pitched in the key" in
which they were, if he were not aware that his words "would
find an echo in the great Protestant country recognized through­
out Europe as the stronghold of liberty." At any rate, Simon's
"oration had much to do with the rejection" of article seven,
and the Tablet expressed its gratitude:

We are thankful indeed that a monstrous wrong, which
must have been fraught with the most disastrous conse­quences to France, has been -- at all events for a
time -- averted. We are grateful to the non-Catholics,
whether English or French -- whose exertions and influ­
ence have contributed to this result. 44

The confidence which the Chamber expressed in the
Cabinet after the Senate rejected article seven indicated
further steps which the government would undertake, and the
Tablet wrote that a regular persecution was therefore immin­
ent. Discussing the precarious existence of the Jesuits, the
Tablet came to their defence without hesitation or reserva­
tion. It turned its pen against French Radicalism, which had
put the present Cabinet in power, and fired a scathing salvo:

44 Ibid., LV (March 13, 1880), 327.
French Radicalism, instinct with the spirit of HEBERT and CHAUMETTE, demands the proscription of the Church in France, the destruction of Christianity, the effacement of the idea of GOD; and following the precedent of the last century, it begins with those who bear the sacred name of Him who is the supreme object of its hatred. The real master of the situation in France at the present time is not M. GREVY, nor M. de FREYCINET, nor even M. GAMBETTA, but M. CLEMENCEAU — the coming man, the MARAT or ROBESPIERRE of the new era. 45

The element of surprise at the publication of the March Decrees was absent from the pages of the Tablet, which could only express sorrow and disappointment that its earlier predictions had come true. 46 De Freycinet and his colleagues were helpless, because they took the office as "the servants of French Radicalism; as the instruments of that blind hatred of GOD which is the most distinctive note of what terms itself the party of progress in France." If the Tablet could not help the proscribed Jesuits, it could offer its admiration:

To the illustrious confessors against whom these iniquitous measures are specially directed, we offer no word of condolence. It is said that their holy Founder prayed for them that persecution might be their lot. His prayer has been abundantly granted. It has been their glorious privilege to be hated of all men for the sacred Name which they bear; and it is congruous that they should be singled out as the first victims of the new outburst of the spirit of

45 Editorial, "French Radicalism and Catholic Church", Tablet, LV (March 20, 1880), 358 f.

The Tablet fully understood the position of the Pontiff: "...with the prospect of still worse evils looming above the darkened horizon, it cannot be wondered at that the Holy See should maintain an attitude of saddened resignation." COW, Ibid., LV, (March 27, 1880), 386.

MARAT and HEBERT. They have ever been the advanced guard of the Christian army, and their brethren in France, as elsewhere, know that it is in this character that they are attacked. 47

From this time on, the writing of the Tablet was almost anti-climactic. It reported events, but its vigour seemed to have been spent earlier in its efforts to stigmatize these governmental steps. Now that the steps had come, there was little that could be done. 48 There remained only to wait for the expiration of the period of grace granted to the Jesuits.

VIII

When the wholesale expulsion of the Jesuits took place across France, the news became dominant in the pages of the Tablet. There was no violent reaction, no fire nor brimstone in its editorial pages—only a spirit of sadness permeated subsequent issues. Nor was there a great stir among the English Catholics, whose organ the Tablet presumably was. There was a "unanimously and enthusiastically adopted" resolution of the Catholic Union of Great Britain at its annual meeting, and its president, the Duke of Norfolk, was requested to communicate it to Cardinal Guibert. The motion read:

That the Catholic Union of Great Britain desired to express its deep sympathy with the religious orders in

47 Ibid.

48 Editorial "Further Consideration upon the French Decrees", Tablet, LV (April 10, 1880), 454 f. This article was mostly a criticism deploring the position of the Prince Napoleon, who, of late, had condoned governmental policy.
France, and its respectful admiration of their heroic constancy, in the face of the anti-Christian persecution now directed against them. 49

Somewhat later, disapproval of French religious policy was expressed by the English Church Union in a letter addressed to Cardinal Guibert. The Tablet printed an English translation of the text of that communication. 50

This weekly paper was interested in reaction elsewhere, and endeavoured to transmit information about it to its readers. It reported solemn protests made by the Catholic inhabitants of Montreal against governmental measures in France. Over 7,000 inhabitants had demonstrated by making a procession to the Church of Gésu, where Senator Trudel had read the protest. 51

Also, there was a move by the Irish Members of Parliament, signing a letter of solidarity with the French Catholics. The Tablet printed the full text of the lengthy document in which the central thoughts were:

We deeply deplore this action on the part of the French Government.

...we believe that in the present conflict the cause of the Jesuits is the cause of freedom, of education, of civilization - aye, and of religion itself.

49 Diocesan News, "The Catholic Union of Great Britain", Tablet, LVI (July 3, 1880), 22. The resolution was proposed by Mr. Henry Stourton, seconded by Mr. T. W. Allies, and supported by Lord Arundell of Wardour and the Earl of Gainsborough.

50 "Address of the English Church Union to Cardinal Guibert", Tablet, LVI (November 20, 1880) 654. For the text, see below, Appendix IV, E.

51 COW, Tablet, LVI (July 24, 1880), 97.
We commend thus our views to the great mass of the French nation — proud, generous, and brave — not in a spirit of rebuke or reproach, but combined with the assurance that the heart of Catholic Ireland watches with absorbing interest all that concerns the prosperity and happiness, the strength and liberty of France.

The Tablet continued to observe with interest where the expelled Jesuits were finding new homes. It was able to report the welcome arrival of a group at Constantinople, where the Jesuits were to found a college, and where "by a strange irony, the religious driven out by Christian nations were constrained to find an asylum with the Ottomans." A week later, the Tablet announced that "by kindness of J. G. Riddell, Esq., of Swinburn Castle, a number of Jesuits expelled from France will find a home at Swarland Hall." A little later at Hales-place, near Canterbury, another group of Jesuits was about to open a French College.

Meanwhile, the Tablet impressed upon its readers the necessity of extending all manner of help to the members of religious orders driven from their houses in France. When persecution began, many Catholics were so impressed by its injustice and impiety that they were convinced, in accordance with a belief "not uncommon amongst" them, that Heaven would

---

52 "Correspondence": IRELAND, Tablet, LVI (July 31, 1880), 151.
53 "General News", Tablet, LVI (August 21, 1880), 249.
54 "General News", Tablet, LVI (August 28, 1880), 281.
55 "General News", Tablet, LVI (October 9, 1880), 474.
"interfere almost immediately to put a stop to it". Such was not "usually the way in which Divine Providence" acted, and the Tablet added:

It is more...than probable that the persecution of Religious Orders which is now beginning in France will not come to an end so very soon. And the Catholics of England may be called upon for persistent generosity, and even for no little self-sacrifice, in order to fulfill the whole duty of Christian hospitality to their prescribed brethren. But they are to look forward to the imposition upon them of this burden, not only with cheerfulness, but with positive thankfulness. 56

IX

Having surveyed developments in the mounting crisis during the first half of 1880, and writing on the eve of the expulsion of the Jesuits, it seemed certain, to the Dublin Review, that the government would carry out the project "with a ruthless hand". 57 It saw an indication that the persecution was unavoidable, as well as imminent, in the uproar in the Chamber over the rejection of article seven by the Senate, and the Prime Minister's declaration that no other solution remained but to enforce the existing laws in regard to non-authorized religious orders. 58 Unofficially, the République

56 COW, Tablet, LVI (July 24, 1880), 98.

57 Article "The Suppression of the Congregations in France", DR, 3rd ser., IV (July, 1880), 155 - 183; 175.

58 This article reproduced, inter alia, a generous portion from a speech by Madier de Montjau, and this appears to be its central thought: "...and that you promise to bring us home soon the spoils of the vanquished, the spoils of these detestable Congregations." Cited, ibid., 159.
Française, on March 16, 1880, expressed the situation very succinctly: "No legislation is required. An administrative ordinance is enough; and the administration depends on the Cabinet, and the Cabinet on the Chamber." 59

Noting public protests occurring all over the country, the Dublin Review was pleasantly surprised to see the "perfect unanimity of the French pastorate in making common cause with the threatened Congregations and especially with the Society of Jesus." 60 A pastoral declaration that the religious orders among other things, were 'necessary' for the Church's well-being came as a direct result of the Decrees, and that was a positive by-product which the promoters of the Decrees neither desired nor expected. 61

Deploring the whole process undertaken by the French Government, the writing of the Dublin Review, in general, was sustained, sober, explanatory and accurate. The attitude with which it approached the whole matter which it discussed was summed up by its own conclusion:

We cannot be sure that God will deign to humble the persecutor or to open the eyes of the blind. But we trust and know that He will give to His confessor

59 Cited ibid., 155 f. The D.R. published the full text of the March Decrees, which are reproduced below, Appendix III, C, 1 - 3.

60 Ibid., 169.

61 Ibid., 170.
strength in the hour of trial and triumph.62

The Tablet was unaware of any negotiations under way regarding orders other than the Jesuits. Only after La Guyenne broke the story of the Declaration did that fact become known. The reaction of the French republican press was a furious outburst of recrimination against the Catholics, and the Paris correspondent of the Tablet supplied an intelligent digest of writings from the more representative papers.63 The denouement was rapidly approaching, as the resignation of Constans, followed by that of Cazot, Minister of Justice, and General Farre, Minister of War, brought about the crisis which resulted in the demise of the De Freycinet Cabinet. The Tablet ascribed this to Gambetta's disapproval of De Freycinet's speech in Montauban, and suggested that with his dismissal, the prospect "never very certain, of a policy of conciliation" thus ended. No longer was there any reason "to expect forbearance" as it was obvious that the Republicanism of "the Gambettist type

62 Ibid., 183. There was a very interesting article by Cardinal Manning in which two distinct types of Liberalism are described for the Catholics in England. One, the English, was a Just Liberalism: it abolished slavery, emancipated Catholics, reformed Parliament, abolished corn laws, etc; it may be said that it was "a Catholic Liberalism". The other, "the Liberalism of 1788 of 1830 or of Gambetta or Jules Ferry or Paul Bert or Clemenceau is a French Liberalism, which is at this moment violating all liberty...from such Liberalism it is the duty of all Catholics to preserve this country at whatever cost." Henry Edward, Cardinal Archbishop, "How Shall Catholics Vote at the Coming Parliamentary Election?" DR., 3rd ser. XIV (October 1885), 401 - 411; 407 f.

63 Cf. "Paris", Tablet, LVI (September 18, 1880), 366.
considers itself incompatible with religion." 64

The expulsion of the Carmelites and the Barnabites was an "indelible stain" on the Republican government of France, and the Tablet saw in this action an omen that the suppression of the remaining orders was to follow. 65 The last sweeping operation by the prêtrephobes, in early November, was the anticlimactic coup-de-grâce on the religious orders. No less sweeping was the coverage of the event by the Tablet. A special feature was introduced, in which a detailed story was given of the expulsion in the provinces. 66

Apart from certain occasions when coverage of French events was proportionately larger, the average amount of space

64 Editorial "The French Ministerial Crisis", Tablet, LVI (September 25, 1880), 389.

65 Editorial "The Execution of the Decrees", Tablet, LVI (October 23, 1880), 517.

A curious deviation and contrast, as the Paris correspondent wrote: "As the government is giving us a moment's breathing space in the chasse aux moines, which has absorbed us to the exclusion of all other topics of late, I shall... clear myself and the Tablet...[of a] rather serious accusation...of not making your readers acquainted with the new winter fashions." Whereupon the whole dispatch continued with a description of the latest Paris fashion. "Paris", Tablet, LVI (October 30, 1880), 555. A dull detail in itself, this dispatch was indicative of the general exhaustion with affairs in France and the return to normalcy, such as it may have been, at the moment.

66 "The Execution of the Decrees in the French Provinces", Tablet, LVI (November 6, 1880), 585 ff; "The Persecution in France", Tablet, LVI (November 13, 1880), 616-20; (November 20, 1880), 649 - 654; and (November 27, 1880) 681 f; and then the silence fell.
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devoted to them fluctuated between five and ten columns. Excluding advertisements, each issue of the Tablet carried approximately fifty columns of printed text. Immediately after the final expulsion, the Tablet was filled with reports of it and several issues contained a concentration of news from France. All this was in consequence of the event on November 5, "one of the most disgraceful dates which Paris has yet inscribed." 67

Two separate editorials were dedicated to the affair. One was filled with excerpts from various British papers, all censuring the action of the French government. The other was a general reflection upon the deterioration of spiritual values in France, and the corresponding meaning of the consequences of the drastic governmental measures: the expulsion meant the removal of the last barrier of belief in spirituality. 68

Soon after the storm had passed, and being helpless to avert it, the Tablet accepted the fait accompli, and resumed normal coverage of the French scene without lessening any of its own basic sentiments. Much more was to transpire in France, which the Tablet continued to report without the slightest change in that basic approach.

67 "Paris", Tablet, LVI (November 13, 1880), 627 f. The combined news of France covered no less than twenty-one columns, or a little better than 40% of the whole of this issue. The section COW alone filled six and one-half columns of the total of seven.

CHAPTER V
ATTITUDE OF FIVE OTHER BRITISH PERIODICALS
1879 - 1880

I

If the dominant spirit of Catholic periodicals in Britain can in the abstract be called Ultramontane, then the pervasive principle of other publications which are to be considered in this chapter was esoterically Liberal.

The writers of the journalistic quintet to be studied here voiced their respective opinions in the same Liberalistic key, although they were of a different timbre. Concerning the subject of French contemporary affairs during these two years, one remained absolutely silent, while another wrote only a very brief passage.

Observing a degree of unanimity in its writings, an anonymous reviewer in the Anglican-inspired Church Quarterly Review, the latter of these two mute periodicals, noted that in England the periodical press had deemed the Ferry measures "an act of illiberality and petty despotism which [was] likely to bring once more the Government of the French Republic into

---

1 Periodicals consulted: Church Quarterly Review; Edinburgh Review; Nineteenth Century; Saturday Review; and The Times of London. [Hereafter cited as COR, ER, NC, SR, Times] In all cases the citations are articles, except in the case of The Times and where otherwise indicated.
serious difficulties," Then, speaking editorially perhaps, he added:

We do not care to examine whether the new measure is directed against Jesuits, Jansenists or Gallicans, Dominicans or Oratorians, Lutherans or Calvinists; the principle which has inspired it is the only point about which we are concerned, and we exclaim for the hundredth time, vous voulez être libres, et vous ne savez pas être justes. ²

Of the periodicals which followed developments in France closely, The Times stated: "Englishmen at large have no love for Popery, and still less for Jesuitism." ³ It was the weekly Saturday Review which probably summarized best the dominant feeling of its compatriots when it wrote:

Englishmen have not hitherto looked with much admiration at the Education Bill which bids fair to make M. Ferry immortal. Neither the consciousness that it is no business of theirs which is pretty general among them, nor the disposition to sympathize with the French Republican Government which is almost universal among Liberals, nor the approbation of anything that tends to injure the Roman Catholic Church which is common among a large number of Protestants, has prevented them from speaking with their usual freedom in condemnation of it. ⁴

The political barometric pressure of these two very influential newspapers, while more difficult to ascertain beyond the basic sentiment, was thus easier to read. Their

² Book review of G. Compayré, Histoire Critique des Doctrines de l'Education en France depuis le seizième siècle, in COR, VIII (July 1879), 503. Except for the passage cited above, this review had no other mention of the actual events in France.

³ Editorial, Times (July 1, 1880), 11

⁴ "M. Edmond About on the Ferry Bill", SR, XLVIII (September 6, 1879), 284.
printed columns displayed it overtly and proudly. Their Liberal outlook showed a high degree of consistency and dedication. Finally, the two were interrelated, mutatis mutandi, in the fundamental aspects of the same political heritage and reverence.

II

The tongue-tied behaviour of the Edinburgh Review and the Church Quarterly Review did not disturb the harmony of the other three.

A quarterly established in 1802 and calling itself a "Critical Journal", the Edinburgh Review printed within its pages an inexhaustive number of articles treating an equally wide range of topics. The writings of the Church Quarterly Review covered a variety of subjects, but articles of what might be broadly called a theological nature, certainly covering the wide field of religious thought, were the dominant staple of its journalism.

Objectively speaking, events in France at this historical juncture were not of such an inconsequential nature as to have been totally ignored. It is not possible to insist that these two periodicals ought to have voiced some opinion regarding the contemporary situation in France. Nonetheless,

5 The first issue of the COR appeared in October 1875, and soon came under the editorship of Canon Arthur Rowson Ashwell, who died at the end of 1879. Cf. the necrology In Memoriam, ibid., IX (January 1880), 540 - 542. Though not an official organ of the Anglican Church, its Anglican spirit and inspiration was obvious.
when their writings are contrasted with those of their journalistic colleagues, the absence of such comment remains conspicuous, to say the least.

When it is known that the Edinburgh Review was the traditional organ of the Whigs in Britain, who cherished no sympathy for Roman Catholics wherever they were to be found, it would be realistic to deduce that ipso facto, Whig sympathies were on the side of the French Republicans. Moreover, when one bears in mind at least three specific articles appearing in the Edinburgh Review during this period, its silence on the immediate problems in France becomes still more indicative of its attitude.

It can only be suggested, speculatively, that most likely the political constellation in France did not warrant preoccupation on the part of the Edinburgh Review. To defend the Catholic cause in France would not have been within its persuasion, and to censure the Republican excesses would have been outside of its desire. Faced with such a dilemma, it is plausible to conclude that the Edinburgh Review adopted the attitude, for whatever reason, of si tacuisses philosophus mansisses.

The above argument cannot be offered, however, for the silence of the Church Quarterly Review. In view of its

---

6 Cf. "Germany since the Peace of Frankfort", ER, CL (October 1879), 301 - 338; "The France of Mirabeau", ibid., 471 - 498; and "The Schools of Charles the Great", ibid., CLI (April 1880), 380 - 411.
writing on other subjects, particularly those bordering on religious questions, it may be said that this periodical most likely had its own viewpoint in the matter. The sentiment cited earlier in this chapter may at least be considered as its echo, but why its columns did not include wider comment is difficult to answer.

III

Somewhat apart from its colleagues was the brilliant monthly review, Nineteenth Century, edited by James Knowles. A literary outgrowth of the eminent Metaphysical Society, from its sensational debut in 1877, Nineteenth Century endeavoured to translate "the spirit and method of the Society into terms of popular journalism." From that desire to examine the political implications of new trends in thought came the primary object of the review: to seek, among the elements of contradiction, a common ground of veracity. With the exception of letters to The Times, no other printed

7 For example, cf. the article "The Present Position of the Gallican Church", COR, VII (January 1879), 434 - 442, in which some recent correspondence between a former priest, Hyacinthe Lyson, and the Archbishop of Canterbury is printed.

8 In the case of these quarterlies, the issues of both ER and COR prior to 1879 and after 1880 have been examined in vain for possible specific comments on the French scene. See Bibliography, below.

platform commanded so wide an audience in England, for those
spokesmen who rightfully desired a hearing from the public,
than the pages of the Nineteenth Century.

With particular reference to this period in France,
the Nineteenth Century was a tribune from which French defen-
ders of the belligerent parties in the conflict over educa-
tion sought to present to the English public the pleas and
explanations of their respective groups.

The spokesman for the Catholics was Abbé Martin,
Professor of Holy Scripture in the Catholic Institute of
Paris, whose three articles during this period were published
in the Nineteenth Century. Specifically, the first one was
intended to clarify for English readers the current educa-
tion question.

His presentation of the subject to the audience was
interesting. With a feeling for British distinction in the
world of commerce, Abbé Martin began his article by a hypo-
thetical analogy, choosing an apt illustration from that
field. Supposing, he wrote, that a political revolution in
some country placed in power a merchant company, which in
turn published a decree stipulating: (1) Trade is, and is
to remain free; and (2) The manufacture and sale of articles
by all companies but our own is prohibited. Such a pro-
scription was aimed only at its rivals, whose competition

10 Ibid.
was intolerable, because they manufactured goods of better quality, which they sold at a much lower rate. This, added the Abbé, was precisely what was happening in respect to education in France.

The repudiation from the 'merchant company in power' was not long in coming, perhaps testifying to the effectiveness of the Abbé's presentation. It came from the pen of Edmond About, one of Jules Ferry's staunchest supporters, and an irreconcilable opponent of the Catholics. His contempt for the latter was obvious in the tone of his reply: "It has pleased the French Clericals to summon M. Jules Ferry before the tribunal of English opinion." As if indignant that, in the "very pages" of the Nineteenth Century, these clericals had "put forward...a clever, eloquent and ardent advocate"; and in condescending to them the right to do so, About insisted on something he denied them at home. He concluded his opening paragraph: "I demand that both sides be admitted free, on a footing of perfect equality." In keeping with its inclination to hear from both sides of an issue, the Nineteenth Century granted the request, but M. About used this privilege principally to reiterate the overworked

---

11 Abbé Martin, "The Education Question in France", NC, VI (July 1879), 23 - 44; 23.
He called the Ferry Bill unjust, anti-Liberal, and tyrannical. Ibid., 44.

12 Edmond About, "The Clerical Education in France", NC, VI (September 1879), 447 - 460; 447.
contempt for the Jesuits and invoke the right of the State:

But directly they lay hands on education -- when they turn their convents into schools and entice thousands of children of the middle classes for the purpose of moulding their young minds and inculcating their particular ideas -- it behooves the State, not merely as a right, but as a bounden duty, to be up and doing. [sic] 13

Beyond these two articles bearing on education, the Nineteenth Century carried nothing else specifically on the same subject during this period. Therefore, with the exception of hospitality offered to the penmanship of opposing French debaters, it may be said that the Nineteenth Century kept aloof from the conflict in France. If it had a private opinion, it was not made known within the covers of the publication during this period.

IV

In view of the preceding discussion, it becomes obvious that, in voicing opinion in Britain concerning events in France, the Liberalistic twins, Saturday Review and The Times, remain as the leading instruments.

With the first day of 1879, the Paris correspondent of The Times expressed high hopes for the Republican future and found praise for the contemplated changes in education.

13 Ibid., 456. The SR, XLVIII (July 5, and September 6, 1879) commented on both articles by these two defenders: "Abbé Martin on the French Education Question", 14 ff; and "M. Edmond About on the Ferry Bill", 284 ff. While the criticism of the first article was mild, the second one exposed the weakness and wickedness of the arguments presented.
Minister Waddington, save some salutary restrictions, "adjusted his immense educational machinery so as to inspire liberal ideas into the rising generations." Only a few days later, reporting on the Senatorial election, The Times, in editorial ecstasy, considered it a "red-letter day for the Republic... great and decisive victory." The following day, uttering approval that the "Ministers of the Republic shall be Republican", The Times stated that "the leaders of the French Republican party now have an admirable opportunity of showing that they know the supreme political value of prudence."

A report came from Paris that the Legitimist papers there were "chagrined at the satisfaction expressed in England" with the result of the recent elections. The Times endeavoured the next day to elaborate on the reasons why the English welcomed republics, and among other things, claimed that Parliamentary institutions were the best and only safeguards as well as the best protection "against priestly influence with civil government, an evil from which no country has suffered more than France."

---

14 "France", Times (January 1, 1879), 5.
15 Editorial, Times (January 6, 1879), 9.
16 Editorial, Times (January 7, 1879), 7. Its correspondent added: "What yesterday's election really means is the maintenance of the Moderate republic, and it is precisely this that vexes its adversaries." Ibid., "France", 3.
17 "France", Times (January 8, 1879), 5.
18 Editorial, Times (January 9, 1879), 9.
The 'priestly influence' had all but vanished, but the parliamentary institutions in France immediately seized an early opportunity to display their temperament, and quickly attracted the notice of apprehensive admirers across the Channel. It would be folly if the sudden Ministerial crisis resulted in its overthrow, moaned *The Times*. If a Ministry were to offer greater reforms, that could only be an extreme Left Cabinet. The correspondent was well aware of the consequences if the radical demands were met:

Beyond the present programme there is nothing but the expulsion of religious communities, the abolition of judicial irremovability, the separation of Church and State, a full amnesty...in a word, a profound derangement of society by revolutionary measures, against [which] France has been protesting since the beginning of the century. 19

Expressing the fear that a "fit of disappointment" among the Radicals might cause the demise of Dufaure's Cabinet, *The Times* considered such a move erroneous; the Ministry should be given an opportunity to prove itself, since its moderation was satisfactory. 20 In all this apprehensive speculation, the ring-leader of behind-the-scenes French politics was soon recognized. It was Gambetta, and "on him must lie the share of the responsibility, because with him lay the chief share of power." 21

19 "France", *Times* (January 16, 1879), 5.


21 Editorial *Times* (January 22, 1879), 9; also cf. "M. Gambetta and the Republican Majority", *SR*, XLVII (January 25, 1879), 100 f.
The peaceful election of Jules Grévy to replace MacMahon as President of the Republic was evidently not anticipated, as it was not in keeping with French character so to effect major changes at the helm of the State. To have done so was regarded as proof of national stability and "the most striking evidence that has yet been given of the stability of the new institutions in France."

The Presidency of Grévy and the election of Gambetta to the Presidency of the Chamber were endorsed, while the new Cabinet was no less warmly approved: ..."it is a good omen that if it has lost the services of M. Dufaure, it will have a Prime Minister of unimpeachable moderation in M. Waddington." Having found the new Ministry "such as it will be pleasing" beyond the boundaries of France, The Times added particular praise for Education Minister Jules Ferry, who gave the Cabinet "the benefit of a vigorous Liberal" and was "a good debater".

When, within a little better than a month, Ferry

---

22 "Marshal MacMahon's resignation", SR, XLVII (February 1, 1879), 128; and also Editorial, Times (January 31, 1879), 9; as well as both "France" and Editorial, Times (February 1, 1879), 5, 9.

23 Editorial, Times (February 3, 1879), 9.

24 Editorial, Times (February 5, 1879), 9. While..."as regards to political prospects of Catholicism in Europe, things seem on the whole likely to be worse before they are better." "Liberal Catholic Party in France", SR, XLVII (February 8, 1879), 166.
introduced two bills on education, he proved vigorous indeed. He neglected, however, to remain a 'Liberal' as well, to the chagrin of admirers in London, who reluctantly withdrew their liberal applause. Recognizing the bills for what they really were, the *Saturday Review* saw:

...all the difference in the world between the imposition of such restrictions by a government which has the character of being friendly to the Church, and a similar imposition by a government which is strongly, even if unjustly, suspected of being hostile to the Church.\(^{25}\)

The object of the Ferry measure was "probably not to improve Catholic education, but to destroy it", and the French government was prepared "to go further than the most anti-Catholic English government would go in Ireland."\(^{26}\)

Surprisingly early, the *Saturday Review* did not think that Ferry would have well-wishers outside of the Left. It held: "No profession of good will, no assurances of protection, no disclaimer of hostile designs, can avail to rebut the overwhelming testimony of actual facts." The Bill on education was the first great blunder of which the Republican party was "guilty, but it [was] a blunder of which it [was] not likely soon to exhaust the ill effects."\(^{27}\)


\(^{26}\) "The French Cabinet and M. Ferry Bill", *SR*, XLVII (March 22, 1879), 354.

\(^{27}\) "The French Government and the Education Bill", *SR*, XLVII (April 12, 1879), 449. And "even if the Bill should be thrown out by the Senate, the main part of the mischief will have been done past recall." *Ibid.*
Coolness toward the Ferry Bill began to spread through the Liberal press in general. When debate upon it continued to exacerbate bitter emotions in the opposing camps of the Chamber, this press in Britain took an almost unanimous stand in criticizing the Bill and its promoters. The Bill was to disturb the Falloux Law, "a settlement nearly thirty years old, and one against which nothing can be urged except that it has worked too well." 28

No amount of eloquence on the part of its advocates was "able to make the Bill anything but inopportune, illiberal and inapplicable", because: (1) no-one asked for the measure, which had aroused the most inauspicious of struggles; (2) there was not a liberal worthy of the name, whatever his religion, who did not condemn Article seven as an attack on the liberty of human conscience; and (3) nothing would prevent the Bill from being inapplicable when passed, "for passed it will be." 29 Experience showed that religious suppression was never effective, and least of all fool-proof.

28 "The Left Centre and the Ferry Bill", SR, XLVII (May 10, 1879), 575.

29 "France", Times (June 10, 1879), 7; also op. cit. "Ferry Bill and its Defenders", SR, XLVII (June 14, 1879), 731 f: "The people are left free to do everything except what they wish to do....They may get their education from whomsoever they like, only they must not get it from a member of religious orders....Catholics are to be permitted to do anything they like, except what the great majority of Catholics think their duty by their children"... Op. cit., 732.
Analyzing Ferry's argument for his Bill, the *Saturday Review* saw that he had "not brought forward a single fact to sustain that the legislation...[was] indispensable for the safety of the Republic." Violence of teaching surely bred its own antidote, and Ferry would be well to remember it. Unfortunately he yielded to panic, "and his policy is characterized by all the shortsightedness which panic commonly brings with it."  

Most of the remaining writings on the subject of education were variations on the main theme of the Ferry Bill, indicating an overall realization of the fundamental principles involved. The British press, at least these two papers, ceased to burn incense before the French Republic with their former piety. Though without a particular inclination to side with the cause of Catholicism, they took a more realistic attitude, expressing the hope: "If the Senate is well advised, it will show to France that all Republicans are not carried away by anti-Catholic enthusiasm."  

VI

The vote of the Councils-General on a rejection of Article seven held hopes for the *Saturday Review*, and occasioned a discussion of French Radicalism. When he could

---

30 "Ferry's Bill and Religious Orders", *SR*, XLVIII (July 5, 1879), 9.

31 "The Senate and the Ferry Bill", *SR*, XLVIII (July 19, 1879), 71.
not get his own way in secular politics, the Radical was "all the more determined to get it in ecclesiastical politics"...and it was..."some consolation to him to concentrate all his irritation upon the religious orders."  

In another article, the Saturday Review recalled "an evil hour for the political tranquillity" of France, when Gambetta had asserted that clericalism was the enemy to be feared by the Republic. From that time, this declaration was accepted by the Left "as the expression of an indisputable truth." Ever since, at every available occasion for reconciliation between the Church and the State, the Left had endeavoured to render realization of it more difficult. On her side, the Church had been "equally industrious".

Such conditions discouraged Englishmen who were "anxious to see the Republic remain the established government of France." Then, alluding to the current controversy, the Saturday Review stated that it was a mistake to identify a single bishop with the Church; nor was it any better to take vengeance upon one for the sins of the other. The

---

32 "French Councils-General", SR, XLVIII (August 30, 1879), 253.

33 "Church and State in France", SR, XLVIII (November 8, 1879), 554 f. A little earlier, on the occasion of the funeral of General de Lamorcière, Bishop of Angers, Mgr. Freppel delivered a scathing oration, which the Republicans understood as a flagrant case of clerical effrontery. They at first demanded prosecution; but letting calmer views prevail they decided to treat Mgr. Freppel's utterances as those of a private speaker, and not as of a Church official.
government was only too prone to effect retaliation and there-
in lay the danger: "The wisdom of leaving the Church alone and of disproving the arguments of the clergy by the indisputable evidence of facts, is altogether unappreciated by the Republicans." No sooner had some Bishop made an improbable forecast of the effect of the Republic on the Church, than the Republicans eagerly set to work to make his prediction come true:

"What yesterday was a calumny invented by the Church to injure the Republic, today [became] a simple statement of what the Republic proposed to do to the Church." \(^{34}\)

The political tremor caused by the Republicans in their concentrated drive to humble Catholicism was recognised by the *Saturday Review* as being beyond the immediate controversy: "It is not freedom of education only that is challenged, the independence of the Senate is threatened at the same time. The way to retain this independence is to use it." \(^{35}\)

The proposed educational reforms were a little too strong to soothe Liberal feelings. But, in a way, the expressed objections to the Ferry Bill were informal

\(^{34}\) *Ibid.*, *passim*. The *Tablet* greeted these words with satisfaction and added, somewhat ambitiously, its own comment: "It would be well if these words of a periodical which has but little sympathy with Jesuits or Catholics in general, were well pondered by M. Waddington and his colleagues, before they finally resolve to drive the last nail into their own coffin by pressing the obnoxious"...article seven. *Op. Cit.*, LIV (November 14, 1879), 611.

\(^{35}\) "Republican Divisions", *SR*, XLVIII (November 15, 1879), 590.
disagreements with deviations from the more upright Liberalism which both The Times and the Saturday Review professed. When discussion in the Senate on the Ferry Bill was pending, the furor seemed to have lessened. In the last half of 1879, the Liberal voice of these papers almost ceased preaching to the French Republicans.

The sporadic signals of caution contained in their writings at this time seemed rather to indicate resignation, under a degree of protest, to the anti-Catholic measures which the French Chamber and the government were adopting. The French Liberals had a different conception of Liberalism. They had "passed beyond those elementary ideas which teach Liberals to respect the right of individuals to do what they please", insofar as the exercise of this right did not abuse the same right of others. The French Liberals had "substituted a definition according to which Liberalism means the right of Liberals to make other people do what they please: "Worst of all, the golden rule of French Liberalism had become: "To do to your enemies that which you think they would do to you."36

VII

The spring of 1880 brought new developments and a new emphasis, substantially changing the whole complexion of the education question. The mask was down: what purported to be

36 "French Liberals and Education", SR, XLIX (January 31, 1880), 137.
a modernization and reform of education, became an overt act of religious persecution. Article seven went "beyond the sphere of the higher grades of instruction" and could "only be regarded as an injudicious and tyrannical expression of anti-clerical animosity". If the threatened revival of archaic laws against the Jesuits was to take place, it would only strengthen their position. In such a case, the sympathy of the English public must be given to the Jesuits:

It seems a gratuitous exhibition of one of the most unfortunate characteristics of French legislation that the Government should go out of its way at the present time to make enemies of a powerful body of public opinion in order to wage war against a particular religious society. 37

The resignation and Liberal patience of the two papers was taxed to the limit, and from March, 1880, when the Ferry Bill went to the Senate, their pulse quickened and their comments became more frequent and more agitated. The Saturday Review did not hesitate to say that it should not be doing the authors of the Bill much injustice if it assumed:

...they will view a merely educational loss with considerable indifference. Provided that they can prevent Catholic parents from sending their children to Catholic Colleges, they will not much care whether the education given in the State Colleges is better or worse than what used to be given them. 38

The Ferry Bill could only shock "true Liberals, for under the pretence of combatting prejudices, it strikes a

37 Editorial, Times (March 6, 1880), 9.
38 "The French Education Bill", SR, XLIX (March 6, 1880), 304 f.
fatal blow at the most precious form of independence -- moral independence."39

Observing it, and commenting on the debate in the Senate, The Times assumed an attitude so strikingly similar to that of Jules Simon, that it would not be presumptuous to say that they were almost identical. 40 The rejection of article seven by the Senate was greeted in England with distinct relief. In doing so the Senate "certainly served the cause of liberty; for whereas the Jesuits would certainly have managed to evade it, it was liberty which would have been the sufferer."41 The Times expressed without reservation its satisfaction with the outcome of article seven and hoped that the controversy which "occupied the public mind of France for nearly a year will be brought to a close."

When, a year previously, a distinguished Protestant pastor like M. Bersier voiced his "emphatic protest", in an appeal addressed to Jules Ferry against his "illiberal proposals"; when an avowed Free-Thinker like academician Emile Littré abstained from voting on the Bill in the Senate, though "known to be opposed" to article seven; and when "an approved Liberal" like Jules Simon was found voting with the majority

39 "France", Times (March 8, 1880), 7.

40 Cf. Editorial, Times (March 6, 1880), 9, and a generous extract from J. Simon's speech cited in "France", Times (March 8, 1880), 7.

41 "France", Times (March 10, 1880), 5.
which rejected the same article; then all these facts left no doubt in the mind of The Times that the measure was widely abhorred by those who were eminently qualified to pronounce upon it.

Such evidence so impressed The Times that, while not applying to the Cabinet as a whole, it openly speculated that Ferry "himself may decide to retire in consequence of the failure of a measure to which he so deeply committed himself." Ferry was too compromised, in the eyes of this paper; his reputation was at stake, and the condemnation of the article by the Senate was condemnation of him personally. When the controversy over the article had again subsided, The Times hoped prematurely, "It will be acknowledged by all parties to be one which it would have been much better never to have raised." 42

Almost identical was the stand taken by the Saturday Review. Estimating that the Senate's rejection had spelled a final epitaph to the whole unfortunate episode of Ferry's article seven, and that a return to the monarchy might be expected, this weekly reasoned:

After every allowance has been made for the folly and the fanaticism which have traditionally distinguished French Radicals, we cannot believe that they would have the strength to push any Government into so disastrous an enterprise as a conflict with the Church would certainly prove. 43

42 All this in perhaps the strongest editorial to date, Times (March 11, 1880), 11.
The Republicans stood to gain very little by attempting to engage their adversaries "with some of the rustiest weapons borrowed from their armory", if they contemplated fighting the Church in the name of their traditional anti-clerical slogans. The Times considered such a method obsolete, because it knew that time itself was "against the priest."

Roman Catholic propaganda did very little harm, and did not require all the preoccupation the Republicans gave it, because "even the dreaded Jesuit is hardly in real life the theological Machiavelli depicted by M. Ferry and M. Paul Bert." It would be childish to dread the influence of the Catholic priest. "The average Romish ecclesiastic, instead of being fairly abreast of the culture of his age", was falling to the rear of it; furthermore, his theology was obsolete and his philosophy scholastic.

This "unworthy fear" of the priest and the Jesuit in education was a sign "either of weakness or intolerance" among the Republicans. Surely it was intolerance, if the purpose of their measures was to "repress by force an influence which is certain to succumb sooner or later to reason and common sense." The Times reiterated that even the Jesuit was to be little feared, and the use of force against them was "the most effective way of strengthening their waning influence."

44 Editorial, Times (March 11, 1880), 11.
Shortly afterwards when the Decrees were clearly expected, The Times rationalized the proposed expulsion of the Jesuits, reconciling itself to this fact by echoing old accusations against them. The Jesuits had rendered themselves very unpopular in France. Their expulsion would not provoke the shedding of too many tears. But "the rest of the clergy whether secular or regular, [were] far from being unpopular."

If the current clerical question in France therefore were to remain within the boundary of suppression of the Jesuits alone, it would create little ill-effect; but if it went beyond these limits, it might do the Republicans much harm. This seemed probable, in view of the fact that the clerical question had united all the anti-Republicans, "without distinction of the party or even the creed." 45

From this condescending attitude toward the expulsion of the Jesuits, the Paris correspondent of The Times began to qualify the situation, and wrote, more accurately, that the Jesuits had "become the scapegoat of irreligious

45 "France", Times (March 29, 1880), 3. The Paris correspondent wrote in this dispatch (dated March 28, which was Easter Sunday, 9:30 p.m.) that the Government was to publish in the Journal Officiel of Tuesday (March 30) the Decrees which had been ready for some time now, and "in respect to Easter," the Government refrained from publishing them earlier. The irony of it, the correspondent indicated, was hardly 'respect', but rather fear of the convulsion the Decrees would cause if published before Easter. The Government could anticipate that the Decrees would have been discussed from every pulpit on Easter Sunday, when the churches would have been full of worshippers. Ibid.
fanaticism and if they were not sacrificed, worse than their dissolution would result."\(^{46}\) When the Decrees were published the following day, the correspondent exclaimed: "The thunderbolt has fallen."\(^{47}\)

An editorial in *The Times* saw the Decrees in their full light. Saying that neither friends nor foes disguise their real object, it added: "They have nothing to do with public teaching. They are not part and parcel of the new Act with respect to education; they form no substitute for Article 7."

Analyzing the undoubted advantages that ecclesiastical schools offered to parents, and acknowledging an equal preference by parents for those schools, *The Times* sensed the eventual futility of Ferry's measures, and reflected that Ferry might "learn by experience that the decrees [would] have done little to withdraw the young of France from the influence of clerical instructors."\(^{48}\)

\(^{46}\) "France", *Times* (March 30, 1880), 3.

\(^{47}\) "France", *Times* (March 31, 1880), 5; this dispatch carried the full text of the Report to the President and of the first Decree, and a digest of the second. It added that the Jesuits, at this time, had 56 establishments in all, with 1,400 members, but that 22 of these establishments, with 475 members, were not schools open to the public.

\(^{48}\) Editorial, *Times* (March 31, 1880), 9. The vision of *Times* was not absolutely clear. Speaking of other religious orders, it said that they "fare better". They may apply for authorization and "when this is granted -- and it is not likely to be refused if it is sought -- they will be free to remain in France." *Ibid.*
The reaction with which the Saturday Review met the publication of the Decrees bore a striking resemblance to that expressed by The Times. "The blow against the Jesuits has at last been struck", it announced, and went into an analysis of the constitutional implications of the obvious rivalry between the Senate and the Chamber. Besides giving a digest of the overtones of this particular measure, most of the article was devoted to a discussion of the reasons and advantages which induced parents to send their children to the Jesuit schools. It agreed very closely in this with the similar comment of The Times already mentioned above. In addition, wrote the Saturday Review, "this particular attack upon the Jesuits will only arm the reactionary and Ultra-montane section of French society with very much better argument than any they have had yet." They had for the past year insisted that the Republic would, in the end, attack the Church; and now that this had occurred, the Saturday Review concluded with melancholy: "there can be few worse policies than to fulfil the predictions of an adversary."

As an aftermath of the publication of the Decrees, The Times's correspondent analyzed the reaction of the French press on both sides of the conflict. And having reflected upon it, the next day he informed his readers of the main

49 "The Decrees against the Religious Orders", SR, XLIX (April 3, 1880), 429 f.

50 "France", Times (April 1, 1880), 5.
grounds to which issuance of the Decrees were ascribed. Two reasons dominated the government's decision: (1) The prevalent national feeling was adduced as justifying the expulsion of the Jesuits; and (2) the Decrees were an execution of the will of the Chamber of Deputies, which by this act of violence protested against the negative vote in the Senate of a measure which the Chamber proposed. 51

The Saturday Review delayed for a time, and then saw the culprit in the temperament and character of French Radicalism. Referring to some articles in Gambetta's paper and the pronouncements of Jules Ferry which were designed to calm spirits, the Saturday Review retorted: "No matter what M. Ferry or the République Française may say, the object of Radical hostility is not any specific aspect of Catholicism, but Catholicism itself." It was, maintained this weekly, Catholic dogma, Catholic practices, and Catholic persons that the French Radicals disliked, and concluded:

The Radicals will look with favour on no Cabinet which will not allow them to shake their fists at the Catholic Church, and so long as a Cabinet leaves its supporters free to amuse themselves this way, it will not hold its own with any section of the Catholic clergy. 52

After the comments of this journalistic pair, a curtain of silence seemed to have descended over the columns of these papers in respect to the question of education and

51 Based on "France", Times (April 2, 1880), 3.
52 "French Clergy and the Radicals", SK, XLIX (April 24, 1880), 527.
the fate of the religious orders. True, the dull summer routine had as usual taken hold everywhere, and little remained but to wait and see whether the French Government would enforce the Decrees.

IX

As the end of June 1880 brought with it the expiry of the Jesuits' period of grace for vacating their establishments, commentary in anticipation of the event quickened. The reports from France were not encouraging, despite lectures all over the country in defence of the religious orders. The Times's correspondent predicted fairly accurately that "the masses will not be aroused from their indifference." 53

Soon, it became clear that the Jesuits alone would be "called upon to close their non-scholastic establishments." 54 The Times's correspondent was ignorant of governmental steps toward the Declaration for the remaining Orders, because he wrote that the Government would wait, and that its method of proceeding further was a secret. This might have indicated his awareness that something may have been under consideration. Nonetheless, he expressed his appreciation of the situation in a way which distributed the blame among various quarters, pointing a finger at Gambetta without naming him:

53 "France", Times (June 28, 1880), 7.
54 "France", Times (June 29, 1880), 5.
Whatever may be said, this campaign against the clergy is a bad affair, and reflects no credit on the reputation of the Government that has entered upon it, the country which is looking at it, the particular orders that have provoked it, or the leader of the Left, who gave the signal for it. 55

Thus this journalist summarized his distaste for the impending operation, from the very scene of the events he was chronicling. His newspaper was in complete agreement and, probably echoing his reports, wrote with reference to the recent amnesty of the Communards:

[While]...the convents are being closed, the prisons are being opened. The step is of more than doubtful justice. It hardly accounts with the principles which the Republicans are the loudest in extolling. [The expulsion] has been demanded by the most eloquent voices in France; and it has been defended in a half-hearted manner by M. de Freycinet. 56

On the eve of the expulsion, June 29, an immense crowd of pious Catholics thronged to pray at the chapel of the main Jesuit establishment at Rue de Sèvre, in Paris. Having witnessed a "strange and impressive spectacle", and reported it for his readers, the correspondent of The Times wrote about his own anguish:

This strange and afflicting spectacle must be brought before public notice, for it is impossible to encourage by silence the execution of decrees which are

55 Ibid.

56 Editorial, Times (June 29, 1880), 9. Speaking of the appalling indifference of the masses, it added: "The peasantry decline to manifest any indignation. The pamphlets and addresses on the subject with which they have been pilled ever since Article seven was proposed have been curiously unproductive of results."
inevitably mischievous both to their authors and to the country... 57

The next day, the anguish reached its crescendo after the correspondent had seen the manner in which the Decree was executed. Describing the event in Paris in much detail, he lamented: "Such are the victories achieved by the Republic today -- victories over unarmed, and, in many cases, aged men." This newspaperman estimated the dispersion of the Jesuits to be an act of despotism, and if the Republicans revived the laws "violating personal liberty, it is only the substitution of their tyranny of the multitude, for the tyranny of an individual."

To have exhumed obsolete enactments against the Jesuits "for the purpose of oppressing inoffensive citizens" was a worse governmental deed than to pass new laws, while their aim was "even worse than the means". Why were the Jesuits being expelled, asked the correspondent rhetorically. Because "their teaching is contrary to the present system of government", he answered himself, hastening to add: "Such a theory is monstrous."

Aghast with the revelation of brutality with which the Decrees were forced upon the Jesuits, and indicating a certain obfuscation of its author on some intrinsic points, the editorial comment in The Times was nonetheless a strong

57 "France", Times (June 30, 1880), 5.
58 "France", Times (July 1, 1880), 7.
protest. It stated:

...Jesuits and all other orders are perfectly free in this country, not because we have any sympathy with their methods and aim, but because we have learnt by experience that the suppression is a less effective weapon than toleration and indifference.

But this professed 'indifference' showed its own limitations when it stated that if Pius IX had been a "statesman and not a fanatic, he might have known how to reconcile the spirit of his Church with the great social and intellectual forces at work in modern society." In spite of this jeer at the author of the Syllabus, the editorial "deeply" regretted that the French Government "should have felt itself compelled" to enforce the Decrees. Again, the defence of the Jesuits had its particular quality peculiar to The Times (and Saturday Review), for the step just undertaken seemed to the editorial writer "to be retrograde and antiquated, because it allows those who suffer by it to represent themselves as martyrs and oppressed, and therefore enhance their real influence."

Above all, the action of the French government could not "but be condemned, at least in the abstract", probably because the first "stage of the contest is manifestly one which little credit will be gained by the victors and much sympathy will be accorded to the vanquished." 

---

59 Editorial, Times (July 1, 1880), 11
The Saturday Review, while not much different in spirit from its colleague in respect to the expulsion, refrained from a long exposition of its opinion. It considered the action as a "glaring error", while "its injustice and its violation of the elementary principles of personal liberty [were] so conspicuous." In all, for the deed of expulsion "the French Government may claim the prize of unwisdom."\(^{60}\)

As any storm in nature abates, so that of the expulsion of the Jesuits quietly died down, at least as far as these two papers were concerned. Only occasionally, a brief paragraph or an article gave a reflection of the most recent occurrences in the drive to suppress the remaining orders.

The Saturday Review followed the development in France, but more as a matter of carrying out its journalistic purpose, than outspokenly expressing its personal feelings. When the incident of the Declaration and the agitation it caused became known, this weekly appeared disappointed that the path toward conciliation undertaken by De Freycinet should be stamped out by lack of understanding for his move. When the Ministerial crisis became acute, the Review wrote: "If the Frenchmen are determined to carry the quarrel with

\(^{60}\) "Conflicts with Rome", SR, L (July 3, 1880), 5.
the Church to the last extremity, they will do so in the face
of the largest concession that the Church has made for a very
long time." 61

The Times was ruled by a similar inspiration. It
wrote about France almost daily, but there were other things
to report; the religious question was somewhat below the erup­
tion stage. It once printed the full text of two lengthy
letters addressed by Cardinal Guibert, one to the President
of the Republic, and the other to the Prime Minister, inter­
ceding for the religious orders. The Times considered these
letters "important", and published them with no comment. 62

The fall of De Freycinet's Cabinet made clear that
there would not be any conciliation, and the first wave of
expulsion of the remaining orders in mid-October was calmly
reported by both papers, without an undue display of concern. 63

When early November brought the completion of govern­
mental suppression of the remaining orders, The Times's cor­
respondent took it without surprise, almost as though it
were merely a pre-arranged sequence in a certain natural dev­
lopment. He expressed the hope that the details which he

61 "Freyecinet and the Chamber", SR, L (September 18,
1880), 350. Also cf. "Freyecinet and Religious Orders" and
"Freyecinet's Policy", ibid., L (September 4, 1880), 286 f
and (September 11, 1880), 321 f., respectively.

62 Cf. "France", Times (September 25, 1880), 5. For the
text of those letters see Appendix IV, A and B below.

63 For example see "France", SR, L (October 23, 1880),
504 f.
supplied of the expulsion proceedings in Paris would "kindle a feeling of indignation." Anticipating that the female orders would be next, he wrote with calmness which was indicative of his acquisition, through previous exposure, of a certain degree of immunity: "Pending the commencement of 'la chasse aux femmes', to-day's proceedings have thus virtually completed, as regards Paris, the scandalous scenes entitled the execution of the decrees."64

Other acts of the French government appalled this journalist, as well. No government of a great country, except during revolutionary times, had ever before "stooped to such an enterprise" as had the French Minister of Justice, presiding over the Tribunal of Conflicts and while there, "deciding in his own favour." This was a climax, for this newspaperman, of a series of outrageous blunders which for months had stupefied the world. Of those in France who applauded governmental measures, he had an opinion filled with contempt:

The excited mobs who cheered the Decrees, hoot the victims, are largely composed of those whom the country holds in horror, who are advocates of all revolutions, and would overturn all society to­morrow, had not France the protection of a vigilant army.

To these, he contrasted others, "all reflecting and sincere men" in France, who without distinction as to "party, class, or creed, witness with consternation this violation of

64 "France", Times (November 6, 1880), 5.
The Saturday Review was more laconic, stating, in regard to the renewed expulsions, that the French government "is going forth conquering and to conquer." Projecting the current religious question in France beyond its geographical boundaries and admiring the remarkable self-control of the Pontiff, it questioned the wisdom of French official policy: "Is it worth while for the Republic to quarrel with the Church, when the Church, in the person of its head, cannot be induced to quarrel with the Republic."  

The aggregate of events in the hostile religious policy proved unbearable for The Times, which levelled its liberal guns directly at the corresponding target in France. The outbursts it had chronicled in recent weeks were "simply local, on the part at any rate, of French Liberals." There was neither reason nor apology for the "moment chosen by the Liberal chiefs to expel monasticism" from France. Having run out of patience, the extent of The Times's irritation may be seen from this passage:

No palliation, or even explanation, can be offered for the campaign to which M. Jules Ferry has compelled his friends, except the imagined necessity of demonstrating the vigour and supremacy of 'Liberal' convictions. The

---

65 Ibid. The Tribunal of Conflicts is a court which rules on certain cases when the lower courts cannot bring about a decision. It is presided over by the Minister of Justice.

66 "French Government and the Pope", SR, L (November 6, 1880), 568.
religious have been expelled, not so much because their hostility to the Republic was dreaded, as that the advanced section of French Liberals might be taught its ascendancy.

As if this were not enough, The Times offered its own diagnosis of Liberalism in France. It found it to be "dogmatic and centralizing; it could never tolerate permanently the attractions of a rival centre." The religious orders, said The Times, were not the first to draw swords. More painful, still, the machinery to replace the expelled orders in the education of youth "was, and still is practically wanting." 67

Before the dust had a chance to settle on the final expulsion of the orders, Ferry introduced his laws designed to complete the design to render primary education gratuitous, compulsory, and totally laic. Commenting on these latest developments, the Saturday Review wrote aptly:

> It is difficult to look at the new educational project, without a suspicion that it is the indirect injury it will inflict on Catholicism, rather than the direct service it will render to Protestantism that makes it dear to its authors. 68

Whatever sympathies and approbation, criticism or condemnation, the segment of the British press, just examined, may have had toward the Legislation of 1879 - 1880 in France,

---

67 Editorial, Times (November 8, 1880), 9. The correspondent reported that the expulsion carried out in Paris on November 5 expelled a total of 113 religious, with this breakdown: 23 Dominicans; 15 Capuchins; 14 Augustinians; 14 Marists; 12 Franciscans; 10 Oblates; 10 Fathers of the Sacred Heart; 5 Sionists; 5 Cordeliers; and 5 Redemptorists. "France", ibid., 5.

68 "Secular Education in France", SR, L (December 11, 1880), 725.
one generalization may be made. Aside from the particular
reaction of the individual papers to the course of events,
the press did not remain blind. It saw clearly the funda­
mental issue which, from the spring of 1880 on, no-one tried
to conceal. The question of education was only a minor issue
in a much larger conflict. The words in an earlier Times
editorial succinctly expressed the situation in France, and
the picture it conveyed to the eyes of the press in Britain:

There is no longer much hypocrisy about the nature of
the contest. It is admitted to be not the fight for
a new system of education, but an episode in the war
against clericalism. 69

69 Editorial, Times (March 31, 1880), 9.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Educational Question in the first decade of the Third French Republic was a particular manifestation of the wider conflict between the Catholic Church and the 'Principles of 1789'. It was, therefore, inextricably interwoven with contemporary religious and political policies. A survey of the internal development leading up to the enactment of the Ferry Laws reveals no single factor as the exclusive cause of the ensuing clash between Church and State.

Study of this controversial question is handicapped by a dearth of objective investigation and commentary on it. Each scholar who investigated the problem has at least a trace of inclination for one side, if not emerging as an unreserved apologist for it. The treatment of the problem by various scholars in the field makes derivation of an abstract judgement exceedingly difficult.

1 For example, there are two standard works by reputable and authoritative scholars; one by A. Debidour, and the other by R. F. Lecanuet. The former is as distinctly anti-clerical as the latter is a defender of Catholicism. In English, two of the most penetrating works are almost the oldest and the most recent publications, respectively. J. E. C. Bodley's two-volume work on France is still very useful, although published over sixty years ago; the recent one is by Professor D. W. Brogan. Both works lack scholarly apparatus, and both authors seem, on occasion, to lack an absolute appreciation for the Catholic position.
However, it is clear that neither of the opponents can claim an absolute monopoly on vice or virtue in the conflict over education. This is inherent in the nature both of the conflict itself and of the individual participants. The clash was, in essence, between two dogmatic and diametrically opposed concepts of life. For whatever reasons, the incarnate parties representing particular political sentiments long ago adopted what they believed to be advantageous tactics — exaggerating the picture of their opponent.

In 1872, when the episcopate petitioned the government to alleviate the difficult position of the Pope, the Republicans fully exploited the occasion for political purposes. Another strong political factor which antagonized the Republicans against the Church was the virtually unanimous support given to the royalist coalition by the French clergy.

The reorganization of the High Council of Education in 1873, and the Law of July 12, 1875, empowering Catholic universities to grant degrees, were two important concessions wrested from the government, and eventually contributed appreciably to the passing of the Ferry Laws.

After the Vatican Council, the rapid growth of Ultramontanism doomed any other attitude within the ranks of the Catholic clergy. The devotional renaissance and the large number of religious orders engaged in various projects of a philanthropic nature gave enemies of the Church further cause.
for concern. In all, the secular and regular clergy held an influential position in French national life of which the Republicans were openly apprehensive.

Despite the appearance of a strong Church position, there were distinct weaknesses within Catholic ranks. In the National Assembly of 1871, the great majority of deputies were, by their origin, Catholics and believers, but in their political actions they were inclined to be realistic and materialistic, and they could not be considered as having been practising Catholics. In general, the Catholics as a body had very few constructive proposals in their program; they could not find a formula for a modus vivendi with the Republic; above all, they were divided among themselves by political, doctrinal, and social views.

The thinking in the ranks of the visible Church was regressive. Finding itself attacked from all sides, it adopted a rigid strategy of defence in its sterile protest against the spirit of the times. By becoming militant and intolerant, the Church lost most of its diminishing influence over modern culture. By clinging to its own system in education, it wanted to stem contamination of the faithful by the modernistic and damming methods of the rising scientific thought. Finally, its ultramontane spirit tended to compromise the Church further in France, as its opponents considered it unpatriotic. The smallest manifestation of any of these qualities was eagerly awaited ammunition for its enemies,
and was used effectively.

The Catholic press, particularly Louis Veuillot and his organ L'Univers, was the prime example of aggressiveness and intolerance. This sincere but rabid Catholic must be counted among the major single contributors to an equally rabid enmity toward Catholicism in France.

Attacks on the political influence of the Church, or Anticlericalism, became one of the cardinal principles of the Third Republic. Channelled into active resistance, it burst forth, in the drive against the religious orders, in the guise of educational reform. The State claimed a monopoly in education, but it first had to legislate participation of the Church out of that field.

Republican anticlericalism was a manufactured product as well as a result of the specific circumstances which fostered its growth, and was not used solely for the sake of excluding clerical interference in political struggles.  

\[\text{In this decade, the Republicans used their anticlericalism: (1) As a weapon against the monarchists, who were united in loyalty to the Church. (2) To serve as a way of retaining the allegiance of the radicals. Gambetta was the best example. (3) As a red-herring; as a substitute for the abrogation of the Concordat, which the extremists demanded; and also to deter the people from asking social reforms. (4) In education, so they could, in the name of reform, effect the expulsion of the Jesuits, to which the episode of article seven and subsequent decrees testify. (5) To assure peaceful relations with fearsome neighbours. Italy, being on rather weak foundations herself, rather feared France for championing the Pope. Germany under Bismarck was having an anticlerical campaign of its own in the Kulturkampf, and the French equivalent would only have pleased the Man on the Rhine; and finally: (6) As a policy to which other great powers, such as Russia, Austria and particularly England, were essentially sympathetic.}\]
Positivism was the ideology which prepared the mind for attacks against the Church. Claiming the supremacy and absolute validity of scientific knowledge, its principles were strong enough to inspire a whole range of laic laws, including those in education. Positivism under many names was taught by many independent masters, and was a dominant influence in Europe throughout the second half of the century. In addition, the ideas of Condorcet and Quinet had great bearing on the philosophy of education and thereby on the reforms introduced by Jules Ferry.

Two active and powerful institutions in particular were the main propagandists of anticlerical feelings in education: Freemasonry and The League of Education. A great many Masons held high positions in the government, from the Prime Minister downwards; conversely, a great many members of the Chamber were lodge-members. The close cooperation of the lodges with the League of Education testifies to their interest in the problem; together or alone, each advanced the work of the legislators. In spite of the conspicuous role played by the Masons, it would be as presumptuous to ascribe widespread influence to them as to the Jesuits. The apologists of the two sides were only too prone to propagate such an exaggeration.

Diverse as they were in their tenets, the opponents of the Church were all partisans of laicization, united on the
basis of their anticlericalism. As Free-Thinkers or as Comtean Positivists, they negated everything supernatural, asserting a natural ethics within easy access to all men endowed with reason. They respected science and denounced Catholic education for neglecting it in its curriculum. In the matter of instruction, more than any other, their rallying cry was: 'Clericalism, there is the enemy!'

Almost from its inception, the League of Education advocated a gratuitous, compulsory, and laic system of primary education, thus paving the way for the legislation of 1879 and 1880. Jules Ferry was representative of both the League and Freemasonry. When he became Minister of Education the program was already well-formulated. Within three months of taking office, he was thus able to introduce various bills which laid the axe at the root of all three educational levels. All enacted by 1886, they became known as the Lois scélérates, the 'Wicked Laws'.

The Republicans became increasingly intolerant, and launched their offensive against the Church as soon as their victory in the Senatorial election of January 1879 was consummated. Extremists of the Left like Clemenceau, Mathier de Montjau, and Naquet, openly demanded separation of Church and

3 Reminiscing about those days, Ferdinand Buisson wrote: "En matière de l'enseignement plus qu'aucune autre, nous avions un mot de railliment: 'le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi!'" Bulletin du Parti radical et radical-socialiste (September 3, 1910), cited in part in idem, op. cit., 253.
State, suppression of the religious orders, secularization of Church property, and greater liberty for all except the Church. Among the leaders of the parliamentary majority were Paul Bert, Ferdinand Buisson, Jules Ferry, Gambetta, Spuller, and Waldeck-Rousseau. The smaller group of Liberal Conservatives was represented by Bardoux, Dufaure, Laboulaye, Lamy, and particularly Jules Simon, all of whom opposed Jules Ferry's educational measures and the laic legislation in general, insofar it was handicapping the freedom of education, as violations of liberal principles. The subsequent expulsion of all non-authorized religious orders demonstrated the ulterior motive for educational reform: To provide a long-sought revenge on the clerics. Interestingly enough, those most affected, the proscribed religious orders, were the least engaged in politics in this period.

Roman Catholicism as a body of religious dogma never was a system of secular policy, and as such, it is indifferent to particular forms of government. The servants of that Church, its clerics, were entitled to civic rights and therefore to personal political opinions. If in times of crisis, their opinions from the vantage point of posterity appear obsolete, impractical, or impolitique; if the clergy failed to reach its intended objectives; they still do not deserve ostracism for having held an opinion. Least of all should their individual political opinions be ascribed to or identified with the
teachings of the Church they represented. In spite of an occasional declaration to the contrary, whatever their quarrel with the clerics, the Republicans of the day usually made it synonymous with the Church.

Everything concerning the manner of execution of the legislation of 1879 – 1880 demonstrated the use of education, as a pretext for fulfillment of an antagonistic religious policy, made by the current government in the Third French Republic.

II

The attitude of the British lay periodicals examined for this monograph showed a certain underlying similarity, though not for the same reasons, nor from the same motives.

Journalistic first cousins, the Tablet and the Dublin Review were as similar in attitude as they were dissimilar in form. The Dublin Review published only two articles bearing directly on the situation in France, and these articles indicate a basic agreement with the Tablet. The Tablet therefore remains more or less the sole Catholic source examined, and it may be assumed that the opinions of one represent those of the other.

At the outset, the Tablet accepted the Republican victory in January 1879 and counselled its co-religionists in France to patience and moderation, as the cause of the monarchical restoration seemed untenable. But after the
Republicans showed their intentions, and Ferry had introduced his bill in the Chamber, the Tablet changed its attitude and espoused the cause of the French Catholics. From issue to issue, as the plight of the French Catholics became worse, the writings of the Tablet became more gloomy, while its sympathetic clamour rose accordingly. Occasioned by the expulsion of the religious orders, that clamour reached its crescendo in the Tablet's compassion for the Catholics and resentment against the Republicans. This principle, in the abstract and mutatis mutandis, may be applied to the Dublin Review.

The Tablet's line of reasoning from then on seems fairly straightforward: Republicanism and Radicalism were the chief enemy of the Church; Gambetta represented all the protagonists of that villainy; there was a deplorable process of de-Christianization in France, caused largely by an equally deplorable upsurge of Comptism, atheism, and anticlericalism, which fostered overt attacks on religion and Catholicism. Above all, there was a warm bond of sympathy for the religious life of the French people. All these were variations on the main theme: a defence of all manifestations of Catholicism, theological and secular, stemming from the unquestionable spirit of Ultramontanism with which all the Tablet's writings were inspired.

The Tablet never had a harsh word for the Catholics in France, lay or clergy. It appears that the Tablet failed
to recognize the French Catholics' share of the guilt. The writings of this periodical were constantly pitched in the same key, until its monotonous tone acquired the quality of a cliché. Allowing the Tablet the right to a partisan attitude on the political reality of France, objectively speaking, it was purely defensive; its writings showed an unfortunate lack of originality and breadth. Its editorials seemed to follow, never to lead. The stereotyped attitude in these particular writings never represented a thesis, but invariably an antithesis: they expressed a reaction to the events, and never contributed to the action itself.

In this manner, salvaging from other publications, the Tablet was prone to borrow the smallest utterance from divers sources, if they conformed to its own opinion. A welcome was offered to anyone who condemned or reproached the French Republicans for their policies. It gave prominence in its editorials to any hopeful sign from others not considered pro-clericals: the Saturday Review and the Fortnightly Review, for example. Jules Simon was treated sympathetically when he attacked article seven.

On the other hand, seeing The Times and other English publications side more with the French government, the Tablet deplored these occurrences time and time again. The progress of the bill on amnesty of the Communards was given prominence and watched apprehensively. A correlation to the religious problem was always drawn. French Radicalism and its adherents
were a particular subject of the Tablet's ire, especially after the Decrees of March 1880, which, in the eyes of this periodical, manifested hatred for Christianity, not love of liberty. Henceforth, the Tablet unceasingly decried the new demonstration of militant atheism.

In the government's drive to suppress the religious orders, the Jesuits primarily gained a great champion in the Tablet. It wrote that no civil or political offence was alleged against the Jesuits and other orders; their only crimes were their religion, their devotion, and the fact that they were..."obnoxious to French Radicalism simply because they [were]...'les serviteurs d'un nommé Dieu.'" ⁴ The resolute defence of the Jesuits was constant and extensive in the Tablet.

On the other hand, the Tablet's straight reporting was faithful and detailed. Sometimes it ventured into prediction, showing an amazing degree of accuracy. In discussing French affairs, it showed apprehension, concern, and restraint. But when commenting and criticizing editorially, it did so within the bounds of its own persuasion, and was of the quality described above. In addition, the Tablet for this period is a mine of documentary deposits. Texts of various speeches, pastoral letters, allocutions, interviews from the Vatican,

⁴ Editorial, "The French Decrees of 30th March", Tablet, LV (April 3, 1880), 422.
France, and England, mostly in their entirety, fill virtually every issue.

While the attitude expressed by the Catholics in England is discernible, that of the non-Catholic press is more difficult to define with precision. But the emerging pattern is sufficiently rich as to indicate their reaction. While it may be said that The Times reported on France regularly and with fair detail, the Saturday Review commented prolifically although its attention was more diffuse. The Nineteenth Century contains much valuable material, but requires a great amount of discretion and sifting in order to penetrate the truth.

The most puzzling was the Edinburgh Review, because it contained no reference to the situation in France. When contrasted with most other English publications of the day, which wrote at least occasionally on France, the absence of comment in this one becomes conspicuous. It might be suggested that the silence implied lack of concern, or perhaps endorsement of the French governmental measures.

The silence of the Church Quarterly Review must be noted as well. The wording of a brief passage in a book review facilitates speculation that its Anglican editorship disapproved of the anti-religious measures exhibited by the Third Republic. Furthermore, the prevalent attitude of the Anglicans behind this Quarterly, from historically inherent
theological considerations vis-à-vis the Church of Rome, may have been a key factor in its lack of comment. The issue in France was highly controversial, the theological reality in England very delicate, and both were coupled with political implications. To comment on French affairs would require a pronouncement of judgement, all of which probably contributed to the abstention in the Church Quarterly Review.

As pointed out in the previous chapter, the Nineteenth Century had no distinct attitude to events at home or abroad. It granted the hospitality of its pages by impartially publishing an article each by Abbé Martin and Edmond About. But there remained unanswered a subsequent contribution of two articles by Abbé Martin, in which he convincingly defended the Church and the clergy in France.5

The remaining two heralds among the press in Britain, the Saturday Review and The Times, were journals of a different timbre. A weekly and a daily respectively, both wrote abundantly and almost constantly on French events. The Times had a permanent correspondent in Paris, and carried his dispatches six days a week. Editorial comment appeared irregularly, presumably when the occasion warranted. In contrast, the distinction of the Saturday Review was in its short articles, where divers comment on many aspects of French

5 Abbé Martin, "On the Present State of the French Church", NC, VI (December, 1879), 1093 - 1117; and idem, "The French Clergy and the Present Republic.", NC, VIII (July 1880), 119 - 139.
life was aired. In respect to the situation in France, both The Times and the Saturday Review shared very similar views. Both were enthusiastic toward the Republic, in which they saw the fulfillment of individual liberties. They did not favour Catholicism or the Catholics. In a limited sense, their initial attitude was akin to that of the French anticlericals.

The Times and the Saturday Review wrote under the banner of liberalism, which served as the basic principle for their censure or their defence of the belligerents in France. In this spirit, they directed their barbs against the expulsion of the religious orders. It is important to notice that these papers objected or counselled, continuing to disapprove, but always stopping short of categorical ostracism of the French Republicans.

Keeping their liberalism in mind, they asserted the right of the Catholics to freedom of religion and conscience. They claimed that Catholic theology was inevitably being overtaken by the new, fresh spirit with which these papers themselves were imbued, and that action was therefore unnecessary. The regime was rendering itself unpopular by dealing harshly with those who represented a dogma essentially on the decline. Both papers, The Times in particular, censured the excesses in treatment of the religious orders, and candidly expressed their disapproval of the ruthless demonstration of intolerance by the Third Republic.

Most of all, they condemned the violence with which
the Decrees were enforced, although they appeared to accept the prescribed measures. Their liberalistic conscience repeatedly deplored the brutality being committed in France, finding the government to have usurped privileges and suppressed liberty. They expressed the fear that such deportment would popularize the Jesuits, the religious orders and Catholicism in general, by making martyrs of them.

Like Jules Simon, these papers did not object strenuously to the Ferry Laws, but they clearly saw the arrière pensée of article seven. Recognizing it as a measure having little bearing on reform in education, they were disappointed with its anti-religious context, and saw thereby the handicap placed upon the undeniable right of the Catholics to religious liberty. In the opinion of these papers, the controversy over the proscribed religious associations assumed a specific anti-religious form. Despite a professed lack of love for Catholicism in France and despite an overt sympathy for the Republic, a segment of the British press under unspecified editorship, particularly the Saturday Review and The Times, did denounce the violence of the anticlericals during the contest in 1880.

The educational question in the first decade of the Third French Republic was an integral part of an organic whole, inseparable from the multitude of elements which conditioned it. It did not begin in 1870, nor did it end in
1880. But, in this decade, it did represent a historical unit possessing certain distinct characteristics which allow of inquiry. During the last two years of that decade, a massive legislative program was introduced, in and out of education, which left no doubt as to its inspiration, nature, and purpose. Some of the proposed laws were: the projects of Barodet and Bert on the subject of public instruction; the Ferry laws on the Higher Council of Education and on higher education; the abolition of military chaplaincies; laws on divorce, cemeteries and funeral rites; the liability of the clergy for military service; suppression of the budget for Public Worship; the abrogation of the Concordat; and many others.

Long after the clash had taken place, the bitter memories remained, creating one of the most tender wounds on the French soul. Over fifty years after the event, which left an ominous legacy of internal weakness, the scars had not quite healed. Perhaps because of the manner in which it was executed, the event brought only a temporary triumph to the Republic; perhaps the seed of discord which it implanted germinated into its destruction; for the resulting internal weakness was partly responsible for the collapse of the Third Republic in 1940.
APPENDIX I

The following is from the French text cited by J. E. C. Bodley, The Church in France, (London, 1906), Appendix I, pp. 115-120, where the parallel Latin text is given as well:

CONVENTION AGREED UPON BY THE PLENIPOТЕNTIARIES IN PARIS ON JULY 15, 1801, ENTITLED: THE CONCORDAT BETWEEN PIUS VII AND THE FIRST CONSUL.

"His Holiness the Sovereign Pontiff Pius VII and the First Consul of the French Republic have appointed for their respective plenipotentiaries:

"On behalf of His Holiness: His Eminence, Mgr. Hercule Consalvi, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, deacon of Saint Agathe ad suburram, his secretary of State; Joseph Spina, archbishop of Corinth, domestic prelate of His Holiness, assistant to the Pontifical Throne; and Father Caselli, consulting theologian of His Holiness, all equally provided with powers in good and due form.

"On behalf of the First Consul: citizens Joseph Bonaparte, Councillor of the State; Crétet, Councillor of the State, and Bernier, doctor of theology, curé of Saint Laud and Angers, all provided with full powers.

"They, having exchanged their respective credentials, have settled the following convention:

Convention Between His Holiness Pius VII And The French Government

"The Government of the Republic recognizes that the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion is the religion of the vast majority of French citizens.

"His Holiness equally recognizes that this same religion has received and receives at this time the greatest benefit and prestige from the establishment of Catholic worship in France, and the individual profession
of it which is made by the Consuls of the Republic.

"Consequently, after this mutual recognition, they have, for the well-being of religion and the maintenance of internal peace, agreed on the following:

ARTICLE 1. The Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion shall be freely practised in France; its worship shall be public, in conformity with police regulations which the Government shall deem necessary for public tranquillity.

ART. 2. In conjunction with the Government, the Holy See shall make new boundaries for the French dioceses.

ART. 3. His Holiness shall declare to the titular holders of French bishoprics that he expects with firm confidence, for the sake of peace and unity the utmost sacrifice from them, even that of their Sees.

After this exhortation, if they refuse this sacrifice prescribed by the good of the Church (a refusal however which His Holiness does not expect), the appointment of new nominees to the government of the bishoprics in accordance with the new boundaries, shall be proceeded with in the following manner

ART. 4. The First Consul of the French Republic shall within three months following the publication of a Bull by His Holiness, nominate archbishoprics and bishoprics in accordance with the new boundaries. His Holiness shall bestow canonical institution according to the forms established in regard to France before the change of Government.

ART. 5. Nominations to bishoprics which shall become vacant in the future shall also be made by the First Consul, and canonical institution shall be given by the Holy See in conformity with the preceding Article.

ART. 6. The bishops before beginning their duties, shall take personally at the hands of the First Consul, the oath of fidelity, which was in use before the Change of Government, and expressed in these terms:

'I swear and promise to God on the Holy Gospels to retain obedience and fidelity to the Government established by the Constitution of the French Republic. I also promise not to have any knowledge, not to participate in any scheme, not to associate in any conspiracy, be it internal or external, which may be inimical to the public tranquillity, and if, in my dioceses or elsewhere, I learn that something prejudicial to the State is plotted, I will make it known to the Government.'
ART. 7. The ecclesiastics of subordinate rank shall take the same oath at the hands of civil authorities designated by the Government.

ART. 8. The following form of prayer shall be recited at the end of Divine service in all Catholic Churches of France:

'Domine [salvam fac Rempublicam]'
'Domine [salvos fac Consules]'

ART. 9. The bishops shall nominate parish priests. Their choice shall fall only upon persons approved by the Government.

ART. 11. The bishops may have a Chapter, in their Cathedral, and a seminary for their diocese, without an endowment by the Government.

ART. 12. All metropolitan Churches, cathedrals, parish churches and others not alienated, which are necessary for worship, shall be placed at the disposal of the bishop.

ART. 13. His Holiness, for the sake of the peace and the happy restoration of the Catholic religion, declares that neither he nor his successors shall disturb in any way those who have acquired alienated Church property, and that in consequence of ownership of such property, the rights and revenues attached thereto shall remain unchallenged in their possession or in that of their heirs.

ART. 14. The Government shall guarantee a suitable salary to the bishops and clergy whose dioceses and incum­bencies shall be affected by the new boundaries.

ART. 15. The Government will also take measures to enable French Catholics, if they so desire, to make bequests in favour of the churches.

ART. 16. His Holiness recognizes to the First Consul of the French Republic the same rights and prerogatives which the former Government enjoyed from the Holy See.

ART. 17. It is agreed between the contracting parties that in case any of the successors of the present First Consul shall not be a Catholic, the rights and preroga­tives mentioned in the previous Article and the nomination to the bishoprics shall be regulated in collaboration with him by a new agreement.

"The ratifications shall be exchanged in Paris within forty days.

"Concluded in Paris, 26 Messidor, Year IX of the French Republic."
APPENDIX II


1. The 'Cahiers' of the Electors:

"In the name of universal suffrage, basis of every political and social organization, let us instruct our Deputy to re-affirm the principles of Radical democracy and to demand with vigour: the most radical application of universal suffrage, both for the election of mayors and municipal councillors, with no local differentiation, and for the election of Deputies; re-partitioning of constituencies according to the actual number of electors entitled to vote and not according to the number of electors on the register; individual liberty to be in future protected by the law and not left at the mercy of arbitrary administrators; repeal of the Law of General Security; suppression of Article 75 of the Constitution of the Year VIII, and the direct responsibility of all fonctionnaires; trial by jury for every kind of political offence; complete freedom of the Press unrestricted by stamp-duty and caution-money; suppression of licensing of printers and publishers; freedom of meeting without let or hindrance, with liberty to discuss all religious, philosophical, political and social affairs; repeal of Article 291 of the Penal Code; full and complete freedom of association; suppression of the ecclesiastical budget and separation of Church and State; free, compulsory, secular primary education with competitive examinations for children of greatest intelligence for admission to higher education, which shall likewise be free; suppression of town dues, suppression of high salaries and pluralities, and modification of our system of taxation; appointment of all public fonctionnaires by election; suppression of standing armies, the cause of ruin to the nation's
finances and business, a source of hatred between peoples and of distrust at home; abolition of privileges and monopolies, which we define in these words: 'A bonus to idleness'; economic reforms are connected with the social problem, the solution of which - although subordinate to political change - must be constantly studied and sought in the name of the principles of justice and social equality. Indeed this principle alone, put into general application, can cause social antagonism to disappear and give complete reality to our slogan: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!"

2. The reply of Gambetta:

"Citizen Electors - I accept this mandate.

"On these conditions I shall be especially proud to represent you because this election will have been conducted in conformity with the true principles of universal suffrage. The electors will have freely chosen their candidate. The electors will have determined the political programme of their delegate. This method seems to me at once right and in line with the traditions of the early days of the French Revolution.

"I therefore in my turn adhere freely to the declaration of principles and the rightful claims which you commission me to press at the tribune.

"With you, I think that there is no other sovereign but the people, and that universal suffrage, the instrument of this sovereignty, has no value and basis and carries no obligation, unless it be radically free.

"The most urgent reform must therefore be to free universal suffrage from every tutelage, every shackle, every pressure, every corruption.

"With you, I think that universal suffrage, once made the master, would suffice to sweep away all the things which your programme demands, and to establish all the freedoms, all the institutions which we are seeking to bring about.

"With you, I think that France, the home of indestructible democracy, will know liberty, peace, order, justice, material prosperity and moral greatness only through the triumph of the principles of the French Revolution.

"With you, I think that a legal and loyal democracy is the political system par excellence which achieves most promptly and certainly the moral and material emancipation of the greatest number, and best ensures social equality in laws, actions and customs.

"But - with you also - I consider that the progressive achievement of these reforms depends absolutely on
the political regime and on political reforms, and it is for me axiomatic in these matters that the form involves and determines the substance.

"It is, furthermore, this sequence and order of priority which our fathers have indicated and fixed in the profound and comprehensive slogan beyond which there is no safety: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. We are thus in mutual agreement. Our contract is completed. I am at once your delegate and your trustee.

"I go further than signifying agreement. I give you my vow: I swear obedience to this present contract and fidelity to the sovereign people."
APPENDIX III


ARTICLE 1. The examinations and practical competitions which determine the conferring of degrees can only be gone through before the establishments of higher education belonging to the State.

ART. 2. The pupils of public and private establishments for higher education are all subjected to the same rules of study, especially as regards the conditions of age, degree, matriculation, practical labours, attendance in the hospitals and laboratories, the compulsory delays between each examination, and the fees to be paid to the public treasury.

ART. 3. The pupils of private establishments for higher education matriculate in the State faculties and dates fixed by the rules.
Matriculation is gratis for the pupils of the schools of the State and for free pupils.
The Superior Council of Public Instruction will, after hearing the Minister of Finance, decide on the tariff of the new examination fees.

ART. 4. Private establishments for higher education cannot assume the title of Faculty or University.
The Certificates they can judge fit to grant to their pupils cannot bear the designation of Bachelor's degree, Licentiate's degree, or Doctor's degree.

ART. 5. The titles or degrees of Fellow, Doctor, Master of Arts, Bachelor of Arts, &c., can only be granted to persons who have obtained them after competition or regular examination before the faculties of the State.

ART. 6. The opening of courses of lectures is subject, without any other restriction, to the rules prescribed by Article 3 of the law of 12th of July, 1875.
ART. 7. No person belonging to an unauthorized religious community is allowed to govern a public or private educational establishment of whatsoever order, or to give instruction therein.

ART. 8. No private establishment for education, no association formed for the purpose of instruction, can be recognized as being of public utility, except in virtue of a law.

ART. 9. Every infringement of the provisions of Articles 4, 5, and 7 of the present law will be punished by a fine of 100 to 1,000 francs, and a repetition of the infringements by a fine of 1,000 to 3,000 francs.

As regards Article 7, the infringement will entail the shutting up of the establishment.

ART. 10. Are abrogated the provisions of laws, decrees, ordinances, and rules contrary to the present law, and especially the last paragraph but one of Article 2 and Articles 11, 13, 14, 15 and 22 of the law of the 12th of July, 1875.


ART. 1. Religious instruction will no longer be given in the primary public schools of various Orders. Regulation of the public schools, enacted by the administration of Public Instruction, will determine the hours which shall remain free, so that the children may go, at the pleasure of their parents, to receive, outside of scholastic premises, religious instruction from the ministers of different denominations.

ART. 2. Rescinded are: the provisions of Articles 18 and 44 of the Law of March 15 and 27, 1850 [Falloux], insofar as they give to the ministers of the denominations the right of inspection, supervision, and direction in the primary public and private schools and in the wards of asylums.

ART. 3. Instruction is compulsory for children of both sexes aged between six and thirteen; it is given in public or private schools, or in families.
ARTS. 4 - 13. [These were of a general nature, mostly
determining certain rules regarding the new system; e.g.
they required the school to report absenteeism in monthly
reports to the authorities; or placed the obligation on
parents to advise the authorities, fifteen days before
school opening, to which kind of school they planned to
send their children].

C. The Decrees of March 29, 1880. The text
of all four items that follow was printed
in the article "Suppression of the Congregations in France", Dublin Review,
Vol. XXXV, Third Series [Vol. IV], July,
1880, pp. 155-183, passim.

1. Report to the President of the French Republic:

"Monsieur le President: -- It is a principle of our
public law that no religious corporation, whether of men or
of women, may establish itself in France without authorisa-
tion. This principle is particularly laid down in Clause 11
of the Organic Law of the Concordat of the 18th Germinal,
Year X. -- 'The Archbishops and Bishops may, with the autho-
rization of the Government, establish in their dioceses
cathedral chapters and seminaries. All other ecclesiastical
establishments are abolished', as well as in Clause 4 of
the Decree Law of the 3rd Messidor, Year XII. -- 'No aggre-
gation or association of men or women may henceforth be
forced under pretext of religion unless it has been ex-
pressly authorized by an Imperial decree, after inspection
of the statutes and regulations according to which it pro-
posed to live in that aggregation or association.'

'Notwithstanding these precise dispositions, a
large number of corporations, both of men and of women, have
been formed in France, especially under the Second Empire
and since the events of 1870. A census of 1877 showed the
existence of 500 non-authorized corporations, comprising
nearly 22,000 religious of both sexes. The public powers
have sometimes tolerated and sometimes sought to put an end
to this state of things, according to the exigencies of the
cases and the demands of public opinion. Who does not
recollect, for instance, the celebrated interpolation ad-
dressed by M. Thiers to the Ministry of M. Guizot in 1845,
and which resulted in the almost unanimous adoption by the
Chamber of Deputies of an order of the day requesting the
Government to enforce the existing laws on the non-authorized
corporations?

'A similar case has just occurred. After the discus-
sion of the Bill on higher education, and the declarations
that the present Cabinet were led to make before the Senate,
the Chamber of Deputies voted on the 16th inst., by an immense majority, the following order of the day:

"The Chamber, confident in the Government and counting on its firmness in enforcing the laws relative to the non-authorized corporations, passes to the order of the day."

"The duty, therefore, of the Executive is to bring the various non-authorized congregations scattered over the territory of the Republic, to conform to the tutelary rules marked out by the legislation in force, and to furnish the proofs without which a longer sufferance cannot be maintained. On these proofs being furnished, the public authorities will have to judge which of these communities can be authorized. Among the non-authorized congregations, however, there is one, by far the most important, the special position of which it is impossible to disregard. We mean the Society of Jesus, which has been at various times prohibited, and against which the national sentiment has always been pronounced. There is not a Government which would venture to propose its recognition to the Legislative Assemblies. To ask this society now to fulfil the formalities preliminary to its authorization, when it is known beforehand that that authorization would be refused, would not seem either becoming or dignified. It is certainly preferable to accord it at once a reasonable interval, after which it will cease to exist as a community. The object here is not to persecute its individual members, and strike a blow at individual rights, as it has been attempted, but in vain, to show, but solely to prevent a non-authorized society from exhibiting itself by acts contrary to law. We are, therefore, induced, M. le President, to propose to you two separable decrees to put a stop to the abuses pointed out by the vote of the Chamber, the first decree fixing the interval on the expiration of which the establishments of the Order of Jesuits in France must be closed, and the second decree settling the formalities to be fulfilled by all the other non-authorized communities. We beg you to attach your signature thereto. Accept, Monsieur le President, the homage of our respectful duty.

Jules Cazot, Minister of Justice
Ch. Lepere, Minister of the Interior and of Worship."

2. Decree No. 1, against the Society of Jesus:

"Whereas Article 1 of the Law of the 19th of February, 1790, provides that 'the Constitutional Law of the kingdom shall no longer recognize solemn monastic vows of persons of either sex; consequently the regular orders
and congregations in which such vows are taken are, and remain, abolished in France, so that similar ones cannot in future be established;
"That, thus, under the different regimes which have followed each other, as well as before as after the Revolution of 1789, the public powers have constantly affirmed their right and their will not to endure the existence of the Society of Jesus, when the Society, abusing the toleration accorded it, has attempted to reconstitute itself and extend its influence;

"It is decreed:

"Article 1. — A delay of three months, from the date of the present Decree, is accorded to the so-called aggregation or association of Jesus, to dissolve, pursuant to the above-named laws, and to evacuate the establishments it occupies over the territory of the Republic. This delay will be prolonged to the 31st of August, 1880, for the establishments in which literary or scientific instruction is given by the association to the young.

"Article 2. — The Minister of the Interior and of Worship, and the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice, are charged — each in his own province — with the execution of the present decree, which shall be inserted in the BULLETIN DES LOIS, and in the JOURNAL OFFICIEL.

"Given at Paris, the 29th of March, 1880.

Jules Grevy
Ch. Lepere
Jules Cazot"

3. Decree No. 2, against other non-authorized congregations:

"Whereas Article 1 of the Law of the 13th and 19th of February, 1790, provides that: 'The constitutional law of the kingdom no longer recognizes solemn monastic vows of persons of either sex; consequently orders and regular congregations in which such vows are taken are, and remain, suppressed in France, and like ones may not be established in future';

"Whereas Article 1, Chapter 1, of the Law of the 18th August, 1792; Article 11 of the Concordat, Article 11 of the Law of the 18th Germinal, Year X., provides that: 'The Archbishops and Bishops may, with the authorization of the Government, establish cathedrals, chapters and seminaries in their dioceses. All other ecclesiastical establishments are suppressed';

"Whereas the Decree Law of 3 Messidor, Year XII.,
decides that: 'All congregations or associations formed under pretext of religion, and not authorized, shall be dissolved'; that 'The Laws which oppose the admission of every religious order bound by perpetual vows, shall continue to be enforced according to their form and tenour'; that 'No aggregation or association of men or of women, can for the future be formed under pretext of religion, until it has been formally authorized by an Imperial decree, based on the Statutes and Regulations according to which it is proposed to live in such aggregation or association'; that nevertheless the aggregations there named shall continue to exist in conformity with the Decrees authorizing them, 'provided that the said aggregations do present, within six months, their Statutes and Regulations, to be examined and verified in the Council of State, on the report of the Councillor of State charged with all affairs regarding Worship';

"Whereas the Law of the 24th of May, 1825, provides that 'No religious congregation of women shall be authorized until the Statutes, duly approved by the Diocesan Bishop shall have been examined and registered at the Council of State, in the form required for the Bulls of a Canonical Institution';

"That 'The Statutes cannot be approved and registered if they do not contain a clause that the congregation is subject, in things spiritual, to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary';

"That 'After the examination and registration, authorization shall by a Law be accorded to such of these congregations as did not exist on the 1st of January, 1825';

"That 'With regard to such of these congregations as did exist prior to the 1st January, 1825, authorization shall be granted by an ordinance of the King';

"That, finally, 'No establishment of an authorized religious congregation of women shall be founded, unless previously it have been informed of the expediency and the difficulties of the establishment, and unless the consent of the Diocesan Bishop, and the Notice of the Municipal Council of the Commune in which it is to be founded, be produced on demand, and the special authorization to found the establishment shall be granted by an ordinance of the King, which shall be inserted within fifteen days in the BULLETIN DES LOIS';

"Whereas the Decree Law of the 31st January, 1852, provides that: 'Religious congregations and communities of
women shall be authorized by a Decree of the President of
the Republic:

"1. — When they shall declare that they adopt, what-
ever the epoch of their foundation, the Statutes already
examined and registered at the Council of State, and
approved for other religious communities;

"2. — When the Diocesan Bishop shall attest that the
congregations which will present new statutes to the Council
of State existed previously to 1st of January, 1825;

"3. — When it shall be necessary to unite several
communities which cannot longer exist separately;

"4. — When a religious association of women, that was
at first recognized as a community ruled by a local superior,
shall show that it was really directed, at the date of its
authorization, by a general superior, and that it had formed
at that date establishments dependent on her;

"And that in no case shall authorization be accorded
to religious congregations of women, except after the consent
of the Diocesan Bishop has been shown';

"And whereas there are Articles 219 and 292 of the
Penal Code and the Law of the 10th April, 1834;

"It is Decreed:

"ART. 1. — Every non-authorized congregation or community
is bound, within three months from the date of the promulga-
tion of the present Decree, to take the steps above speci-
fied, in order to obtain the recognition and approbation of
its Statutes and Regulations, and legal recognition for each
of its establishments actually existing.

"ART. 2. — The demand for authorization must, within the
interval above granted, be lodged at the general secretariat
of the Prefecture of each department wherein the association
possesses one or more establishments.

A receipt will be given for it.
It will be transmitted to the Minister of the
Interior and Worship, who will examine the matter.

"ART. 3. — As to congregations of men, a Law will be
enacted. As to congregations of women, following the rule and
distinctions established by the Law of the 24th May, 1825,
and by the Decree of the 31st January, 1852, either a Law
will be enacted or a Decree made by the Council of State.

"ART. 4. — For those congregations which according to the
terms of Art. 2 of the Law of the 24th May, 1825, and of the
Decree of the 31st January, 1852, can be authorized by a
Decree of the Council of State, the formalities to be
followed in the examination of their demand, shall be those prescribed by the 3rd Article of the afore-cited Law of 1825, in which no change is made.

"ART. 5. -- For all other congregations, the documents to be produced on the demand for authorization shall be those named above.

"ART. 6. -- The demand for authorization must name the superior or superiors, their place of residence, and assert that such residence is, and shall remain fixed in France. It must point out whether the association extends beyond France or is confined within the territory of the Republic.

"ART. 7. -- To the demand for authorization must be appended: (1) A list of the names of all the members of the association; this list must specify the native place of each member, and whether he is a Frenchman or a foreigner; (2) The assets and liabilities, as also the revenues and duties of the association and of each of its establishments; (3) A copy of its statutes and regulations.

"ART. 8. -- The copy of the statutes, the production of which is thus required, must bear the approbation of the Bishops in whose dioceses the association has establishments, and must contain the clause that the congregation or community is subject, in things spiritual, to the jurisdiction of the ordinary.

"ART. 9. -- Every congregation or community that has not, within the delay above granted, made the demand for authorization together with the informations on which it rests, will incur the application of the Laws in vigour.

"ART. 10. -- The Minister of the Interior and Worship, and the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice, are charged, each in his own province, with the execution of the present Decree, which shall be inserted in the JOURNAL OFFICIEL and the BULLETIN DES LOIS.

"Given at Paris, the 29th of March, 1880.

Jules Grevy
Ch. Lepere
Jules Cazot"
4. [Addenda] Articles 291 and 292 of the Penal Code:

"ART. 291. — No Association of more than twenty persons, for the purpose of meeting together daily or on certain appointed days for purposes, religious, literary, political, or other, shall be formed except with permission of the Government, and on such conditions as the public authority shall impose upon the Society. In the number of persons indicated in these Articles are not comprised those domiciled in the house where the Association meets.

"ART. 292. — Every Association of the kind described above, which shall be formed without authorization, or which, after having obtained it, shall infringe the conditions imposed, shall be dissolved. The heads, directors or administrators of the Association shall moreover be punished by a fine of sixteen to two hundred francs."
APPENDIX IV

A. Text of the letter by Cardinal Guibert to the Prime Minister de Freycinet. It was dated August 13, 1880, but was not forwarded until September 6. Printed in The Times, No. 29,996, September 25, 1880, p. 5.

"When the Decrees of the 29th of March were issued the Bishops of France expressed to you the grief and apprehension so serious and unexpected a measure occasioned them. Being near the seat of Government I, in turn, thought it incumbent on me to point out to you the serious consequences it might entail. The execution of the first Decree only too fully justified my expectations. You, perhaps, thought the enforcement would be facilitated by, no doubt ill-founded, but widespread, prejudices among certain people against the Society of Jesus. Experience was contrary to this supposition, for the opinion of all religious, and even of indifferent men has pronounced very warmly in favour of the cause of the Jesuits. Men's souls were seized with deep trouble, as always happens when questions are stirred up that infringe the rights of conscience. We had hoped that, warned by the untoward effects of the execution of the first Decree, the Government would pause in the path on which it had entered. Nevertheless, those public organs which are reputed to be the best informed as to the Government's intentions, announce the early execution of the second Decree, and these rumours, which are not contradicted, keep up among the Religious Orders and among Catholics the most painful anxiety.

"Amid this universal anxiety it would be wrong were I not to address another appeal to your moderation and wisdom. In my diocese I have a very large number of non-authorised communities. These useful institutions are mixed up with everything that is done in France, and more particularly in Paris, for charity and education. The prejudices against the Jesuits, to which I have referred above, do not exist as regards the other Orders. Consequently, still greater agitation, which this time will extend to the entire country, may be expected.
"We shall be told it depended on these Orders themselves to avoid the danger by soliciting the authorization required of them. I will not revert to a question which has been so often dealt with already and which seems to me exhausted. I confine myself to reminding you that hitherto the legal recognition conferring corporate rights on communities has always been looked upon as a privilege which had to be merited by prolonged services; never has it been imposed as an obligation. De facto existence of necessity preceded legal existence. It could not, therefore, be considered as an abuse or misdemeanour. Now the decrees of the 29th of March not only call upon Orders to get themselves recognized, they oblige them to make their submission within a brief period, under penalty of dissolution. In such circumstances could they make such a demand without avowing that hitherto their existence had been irregular, and without abdicating for their members the right to live en famille under the same roof, a natural right which the law allows all citizens?

"But in default of legal recognition, might they not at least perform an act of deference by soliciting a police authorization? Assuredly, if the Orders had thought that such an authorization was a necessity for them, they would not have hesitated to ask for it. They thought their existence was sufficiently authorized by long years devoted to the public weal, for during more than half-a-century these institutions of education and charity have been working in broad daylight. The State has been a witness of their rise and progress, and has confided to them, in France and in the colonies, important missions of civilization. A large number of communes have intrusted with them the care of the poor and the instruction of the young; and the contracts made with them have received the sanction of the supreme authorities. Now, after so long an existence, always encouraged, never contested, could the Orders have deemed it necessary to solicit afresh what they thought they had long possessed?

"Lastly, it has been sought to justify the rigorous measures taken against them by an alleged hostility on their part to the existing political institutions. But before accepting so serious an accusation it would be necessary for some proof of it to be adduced. I have been a Bishop nearly forty years, I have seen the working of the communities in three dioceses, and I know their temper, which is that of the Catholic Church itself. Now, the Catholic Church has received from its Divine Founder a constitution which does not allow it to identify its cause with that of any political system, and thereby does not exclude any from it. It has lived in all times under very various governments, and its relations have been pacific and even cordial with all the Powers which have shown
themselves just and friendly. No doubt, when it is con­fronted by those men of disorder who respect nothing, who, under pretense of social reforms, dream only of destruction and violence, it is obliged to condemn, in the name of the truth and morality it teaches, their errors and crimes. Such are the excesses of the men I speak of, who have twice ruined the Republic in France. But a Republican Government, considered 'per se', if administered with wisdom and justice, cannot encounter any prejudice among the regular or secular clergy. If among religious men there are some who evince repugnance for the present form of Government, that oppo­sition arises from the recollection of the persecution to which the religion was exposed when the partisans of that system have held the reins of power. This time a Conser­vative Republic was announced which would protect all social institutions. The first institution called for by the wel­fare of society is religion. Why do we see the public Powers so little mindful of fulfilling the hopes we were made to conceive?

"The President of the Republic in a recent speech said religion was a great force. Nothing is more certain. With it great things can be done, without it a risk is run of failing in the most generous designs. Is it wise to set this power against you when it would be so easy to oblige it to serve your interests? For this it would be enough to respect our sacred beliefs and accord them the protection they obtained under former Governments. At this price you would win the adhesion of a large number and the submission of all. Let the Government make the experiment. Let it renounce measures which disquiet the conscience, and the present crisis will promptly be allayed. The communities will prove that their resistance was inspired by no idea of political opposition. It may be believed that a good number of them, assuming confidence in the justice of power, will then solicit legal recognition. But they will do so freely, without abdicating any right, without acknowledging wrongs they do not believe they have committed, without marking out for the rigour of the public authority the other societies who may not think fit to make the same request."

"Twenty of my colleagues in the Episcopate lately met in Paris, as they yearly do, to settle the affairs of the Institute of Higher Education founded by us. The infor­mation and reflections they exchanged ended by convincing me of a fact I have already called to your attention, -- namely, that despite protestations to the contrary, the Catholics of France feel themselves menaced in their reli­gious liberty. The attitude of the dominant party is palp­ably unfriendly towards institutions and persons represent­ing religion. This ill-will is betrayed on every occasion, as, for instance, in connection with schools, the Budget,
hospitals, and Bureaux de Bienfaisance, religious edifices or priests officiating in them, out-of-door ceremonies of worship, etc. The inhabitants of our provinces, much attached to their religion, think they see in all these indications a general system of distrust or hostility not far removed from persecution. The measures taken against the Religious Orders have intervened to confirm and increase these just apprehensions. Such is the impression made upon the Bishops in traversing their dioceses and communicated by them to me. I think I am performing a duty in calling your attention to this state of men's minds.

"By pushing the execution of the decrees further the Government would end in strengthening an opinion which is tending to be formed in a sense quite opposed to the interests of the public peace. Has it not a wiser and more generous part to play? Is it not its true part to encourage good under all its shapes instead of withstanding it when effected by generous and devoted men, denounced without reason by party passion? The Religious Orders have no other object than the welfare of society. They have been slowly created at the cost of many sacrifices, without claiming any privilege, without shirking any duty. They have become, for the secular clergy and for the Bishops, necessary auxiliaries for their ministration; for education and charity, valuable instruments which Christian society can no longer dispense with. To trample upon the work of fifty years, in which all the Catholic families of the country have co-operated, would lead a whole class of French citizens to believe that the Republic, a system which admits everybody, is closed to those who seek the free expansion of Religious life. Is it thus that their confidence will be gained?

"The moment seems to have come when the Government might adopt a policy more conformable to the spirit of concord and peace. We ask for no favours; we only ask for time. Let the emotion caused by recent events calm down; remove that permanent cause of uneasiness which the menace of the decrees keeps up in the country, and you will not be long in reaping the fruits of this moderation. When the Orders are no longer treated as enemies and rebels they will not fear to enter into relations with the Government; and, as I have already stated, they will be drawn by their own interest in seeking the advantages of legal recognition.

"To your equity, your prudence, your love of the public weal I confide these reflections. I cherish a hope that they will find an echo in your elevated feelings, and that you will render justice to the sentiment which animates me in communicating them to you."

"On the 13th of August last I wrote to the President of the Council of Ministers to represent to him the inconveniences and perils of the measures taken against the Religious Orders, and I adjured him at least to suspend the execution of the second decree, so as to have time to examine more thoroughly a question touching on the sacred domain of consciences, and settled precipitately, without account of consequences, by the decrees of the 29th of March. At the moment, my letter was about to be sent I learned that the Minister had himself entered on this path of conciliation and was making overtures to the Holy See to elicit from the Religious Orders a declaration of respect and submission to the existing institutions of the country. I then kept back my letter, but I have since despatched it to the President of the Council in order to back up, if necessary, his good will, and influence in this sense the other members of the Government.

"You are not unaware that the Orders have not made the slightest difficulty in responding to the invitation addressed to them. The Minister of Worship has all their replies in his hands. Though it was impossible for them to solicit legal recognition, for reasons explained in my letter to the President of the Council and understood by all, it was easy for them to express once more their sentiments, which are those of the Church itself — viz., respect and submission for established powers. Party passions alone could have misrepresented the attitude assumed by ecclesiastics in attributing to them a character of public hostility.

"It became necessary to get rid of this misunderstanding, and the declaration fully attained that result. We were persuaded then that the Government, satisfied with the assurances given by the Orders in that document, would abandon the prosecution of an enterprise already pushed much too far. The events which happened on the 30th of June have caused perturbation in the country. The tribunals are divided, and the majority of those which have had to decide on their jurisdiction have clearly shown an inclination to disavow the act of the Executive. The public prosecutors are moved, and 200 magistrates have confirmed by the sacrifice of their career the judgement pronounced by their judicial conscience as to the decrees. The Bar has given more than 1700 adhesions to a learned opinion contesting the legality of these measures. And observe, too, that it was
then a question of only a single category of Religious persons. Now, however, there is a talk of going much fur­ther. All the Orders, of both sexes, are to be struck at. The numerous works of charity are, throughout the whole territory, to lose their best and most powerful agents.

"When these rumours began to revive I refused to believe in them; I thought they were set in circulation by violent men interested in disorder, with whom Governments disclaim all solidarity. I could not suppose that on the morrow of a step by which the Orders evinced so great a deference their members could be treated as enemies. Yet these rumours seem to gain ground. It is stated that the question is soon to be settled in Cabinet Council. Before, on so serious a subject, you take a resolution, the consequences of which may be very far-reaching, I come to you as a Bishop to declare to you once more that the Episcopate, the regular clergy, and the Catholics of France regard the co-operation of the Religious Orders as necessary. These institutions form part of the Church, and are, as it were, the complement of its organization. The proof of this is that nowhere does the Catholic Church exist and freely develop itself without religieux being found alongside pastors. It has been so since the Church issued from the catacombs when, therefore, we are told that the Orders may be abolished because the Concordat does not mention them. It is forgotten that the Concordat stipulates in its first line for the free exercise of the Catholic religion in France, and that the existence of the Orders is the result and condition of that free exercise. It is, moreover, no exaggeration of language -- I am adhering strictly to the reality of things -- when I say that in the Act said to be in preparation I see the commencement of a persecution. So Catholic opinion will understand it. The Church is not persecuted merely when its members are placed by tyrannical laws between martyrdom and apostasy; it is persecuted also when the public power deprives it of what is necessary to fulfillment of its mission. Allow me to say, it is not the interest of the Government to agree to such a role. States­men worthy of the name have always turned aside as perilous conflicts of the religious conscience. To estimate that peril it does not suffice to fix one's attention on the present moment; one must look into the future.

"There will, perhaps, be excited and shallow politi­cians who will try to reassure you by the result of the late departmental elections. Your own experience has taught you how little one must reckon on these manifesta­tions of opinion, of which it is not always easy to esti­mate the significance. The currents of that unstable power change so rapidly, and the millions of votes which a plebiscite gives sometimes precede only by a few months the fall of Governments which seem the strongest. Believe me,
the best established powers are those which repose on the
esteem and confidence merited by the respect of all rights
and by the exercise of the most impartial justice. Hence
I still hope that your wisdom will stop the Government in a
most dangerous course. The true enemies of the present
Government are not humble and peace-loving monks who, in the
depths of a monastery, are devoted to prayer and study, who
instruct children in a school, or tend the sick in a hospital.
Its enemies are the men who seem to make a task of stirring
up the Government to hostile sentiments or extreme measures
against all that is respectable -- men who attack the tradi­
tional religion of France as if it were an enemy of society,
who, sometimes by stratagem, and others by force, labour to
exclude it from education, to banish it from charity, to
expel it everywhere, and to drive from public office those
who profess it. If those men prevail the opinion will gain
credit and the country that the system of government they
represent is incompatible with religion, and when the nation
has been made to believe that the two institutions cannot
subsist together, nothing will remain but to await the issue
of its struggle which prudence commanded you to avoid. Cath­
oblics will this time, as they have done for eighteen centu­
ries, wait with calm and confidence.
"In addressing this last and respectful appeal to
your wisdom I have sought to exculpate my conscience as a
Bishop and satisfy a duty of patriotism."

C. Text of the letter by Cardinal Guibert
to the Minister of the Interior, Constans.
It was dated October 7, 1880. Printed in
the Tablet, vol. 56, No. 2115, October
23, 1880, pp. 531f.

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 18th Sept.,
in which you accuse me of having received the declarations
which I transmitted to you on behalf of the Religious Con­
gregations, and you now communicate to me your answer to
them.

"In this reply you sum up in a few words the declara­
tion, and, although doing justice to the sentiments which it
expresses, you seem to announce your intention of executing
the Decrees of the 29th March.

"Since you have done me the honour, M. le Ministre,
of communicating this circular to me, permit me to express
some of the reflections which it suggests to me.

"The heads of the Congregations, on receiving it,
must have been very much surprised, for they had the right
to expect a very different reply.

"It was the head of the Ministry who took the initia­
tive of the negotiations opened with the Holy See, not at
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Paris but in Rome, to induce the Congregations to sign the declaration which you have received.

"Making use of an authorisation which proceeded from the Head of the Church, and which, under the circumstances, carried the authority of a counsel, the Congregations have accepted the project of a formula the sense of which had been agreed upon between the Holy See and the representative of the French Government. The pourparlers exchanged in order to arrive at this result sufficiently showed that this declaration would be regarded as satisfactory and would have the effect of avoiding the disastrous measures with which the Religious were threatened, by dissipating misunderstandings and silencing calumny.

"It was with a view to this pacific solution that the Congregations decided to sign the declaration. It imposed no sacrifice of their convictions, since in every point it is conformable to truth and the constant tradition of the Church.

"But, precisely because it contains nothing new and at any other time would have seemed useless, in requiring it from the Religious at this present moment did not the Government take upon itself the moral engagement not to press further the rigorous measures which the Religious feared?

"Nevertheless, your circular and the best-authenticated rumours give reason to believe that the prudent policy which proposed the declaration is on the eve of giving way to a policy of violence. The former President of the Council, enlightened by experience and reflection, who, being a true politician, wished to put an end to the religious conflict, is not only to be replaced by another, but completely disavowed, and the sad scenes of the 30th June are, we understand, on the point of being renewed throughout the whole country.

"Before this sad spectacle is reproduced before our eyes, permit, M. le Ministre, an aged Bishop, who has seen many Governments pass away, to appeal once more to your wisdom in the name of his patriotism and of his long experience.

"It is now three months since you attacked the Jesuits. What did you hope for in dealing those unexpected blows, which fell upon virtue, upon learning, upon the purest devotion? Did you mean thereby to satisfy the hatred of a party? You have seen this first sacrifice did not suffice; and now you are being led to extend these rigorous measures to other institutions which represent in France and in the whole world, faith, devotedness, and charity! I cannot believe that you can do this without reluctance and regret. But is there any real necessity, any serious motive, for completing so much ruin?

"What led the Government to enter upon the fatal course which is pushing it on to extremities? I answer that it was an act in which the passion of the moment had more part than reflection. To the vote of the Senate which rejected Article VII, the Chamber of Deputies replied 'ab\ orton'
by issuing an order of the day, pressing the Government to
ransack the old laws for weapons which they could not any
longer demand from the new law which had just been rejected.
"Thus the executive found itself placed between the
two great organs of the national representation -- the one
which refused to deprive a certain class of citizens of the
rights which belonged to all, and the other which would go
back through fifty years of liberty in order to find in
moth-eaten parchments instruments of proscription.
"It is this second course that the Government has
chosen. It has within a short time improvised the decrees
of the 29th March, the publication of which has sounded
through the country as the echo of a past age. It has there­
by involved itself in all sorts of ways. It has given rise
to litigation of which it is difficult to see the end. By
the authoritative protests of the bar, by the resignation of
200 magistrates, by the preliminary decision of thirteen
tribunals, the Government has seen the legislation which it
had just invoked called in question, and, at the very moment
when it lends itself to the false step of making use of what
they please to call existing laws, in order to annoy thou­
sands of good French citizens, at that very moment the
opinions of the gravest and most competent are agreed in pro­
claiming that these laws exist no longer.
"Does the Government mean to fly in the face of so
many warnings? Does it mean to despise all the representa­
tions made to it in the name of right, of moderation, and
the public peace, only for the sake of obeying a party whose
policy can be summed up in one word, 'hatred of religion'? I
cannot make up my mind to believe that it will, because,
setting aside all consideration for religion, statesmen
ought to interest themselves, above all, in securing the
general good of the country which they administer.
"What will in fact be the result of the dissolution
of the Congregations which are not recognised by the law?
In France you will close more than 300 orphanages and a
large number of asylums of different kinds, and consequently
deprive thousands of children and aged persons of a devoted
care which saves them from abandonment and misery. The
greater number of these establishments are private founda­
tions. You will not then be able just as you wish to re­
place the individuals who direct these houses of charity.
The measures taken against nuns will affect childhood and
old age. I ask, does the interest of the Republic require
this?
"Besides in France you are going to take away from
thousands of free or parochial schools the masters and mis­
tresses who direct them. Are you prepared to substitute
immediately new instructors in these public schools? Are
you prepared to place your substitutes in free schools? And
if the instruction of the people is deprived all of a sudden of a third or fourth part of the teachers, and if this sad result be especially felt in the poorer parts of the country, in the mountainous districts where the scattered population has no other means of education than the humble village school, are you not thereby creating an irreparable void which will not be filled up for many years? By thus interrupting the work of education just where it is most difficult, will you have deserved well of the people? and will you have well served the cause of civilization and progress?

"But charity and education are not the only benefits for which our country is indebted to the Congregations. The apostolate is also a service rendered to mankind; and, in the judgment of those who understand and respect man's moral nature, it is the very highest of services. Now the secular clergy are not sufficient for this task, the regulars render them an assistance which religion cannot dispense with. As pastor of the Church of Paris I ought to be permitted to state what the result will be in my diocese.

"Suppose the churches of the Religious closed in the greater part of our parishes, which reckon forty, fifty, or sixty thousand inhabitants, the parish churches are evidently insufficient; and being too far distant from each other, they no longer supply the spiritual needs of this immense capital. Suppose the Religious themselves banished, then a large number of the faithful will be deprived of the means necessary for the fulfilment of their Christian duties. Suppose the Religious of other nationalities forced to quit our soil, then in Paris alone sixty thousand Germans will regret the absence of the Jesuits and Redemptorists, thirty thousand Italians will ask in vain for the ministry of the Barnabites. The whole of the English Colony will deplore the expulsion of the Passionists, and this population of foreigners, composed mostly of poor mechanics, will be astonished that France, which furnishes them a home so far as their persons and worldly interests are concerned, can show herself so intolerant of their religion and their conscience. Their astonishment will be redoubled when they remember that all French priests are well received everywhere, and open chapels without molestation in every part of the world for Frenchmen. They will ask how the mutual regard that one nation ought to have for another has not been able to protect foreign residents in France against an ostracism imposed on the nation by narrow political passions.

"This is what the effect will be of the suppression of the Religious among ourselves. But what shall we say of foreign countries and far distant missions? Will they not treat as a fiction the prestige of France in the East when the sons of St. Francis shall cease to be the guardians of the Holy Places? or, at least, when there shall not be found
a Frenchman among their ranks. Will our fellow countrymen be more proud of their country when, in the most out of
the way parts of the world, they shall no longer see the French flag float where it did, and that because the French name
has hitherto been wont to make itself known by enterprises of self-devotion and the sublimest charity? When you shall
have closed the Novitiates there will only remain two or
three authorised Congregations to undertake the immense task
of evangelization. The Dominicans will be no longer able to
send their recruits to their brethren engaged in the missions
of China, who maintain at Mossoul a centre of Christian and
French civilisation; who in the English Antilles have won
from a Protestant Government public expression of admiration
and gratitude. The Franciscans of the different branches
will no longer be able to supply the Holy Land, the Missions
of China, Aden, Abyssinia, Mesopotamia, or Armenia. The
Oblates, that wholly French family, will have no more
apostles to send either to the icy regions of the North, to
succour the poor Eskimo, or to the torrid regions of the
tropics, the blacks of Natal and Kaffirland, or to the mixed
races which people the large island of Ceylon. The Marists,
another Society of French origin, who have civilized a great
number of the isles of the Pacific peopled by cannibals
where several of their missionaries have died martyrs to
their zeal, will see their holy enterprise first languish
and then perish, because the houses which prepared the evan­
gelical labourers have been suppressed by you. Who will fill
up these voids? Who will replace these centres of civiliza­
tion which the irrereligious passions of some Frenchmen have
destroyed? Who will restore to us the honour and the bene­
fits of which a proscription without rational motive shall
have stripped our country? You will excuse, M. le Ministre,
the emotion which I feel in presence of the evils with which
we are threatened. Can it be that these evils should come
to us from those who are the guardians of the destinies of
our country? It is possible that the Minister of Public
Worship, whose mission would seem to be to protect the bene­
ficent action of religion, should himself become the instru­
ment of these rigorous measures, which tend to destroy the
Church herself? Can it be that the Government will make no
account of the just complaints and the unanimous representa­
tions of the Bishops? and that it will consent to carry
desolation into the hearts of so many peaceable Christians
and honest citizens?

"Such, M. le Ministre, will be the sad consequences
of decisions which have been come to without necessary and
mature reflection. The Government and the legislature are
certainly more enlightened than individuals, but for all
that they are not infallible, and history records many
errors which have needed correction. I think it is
Montaigne who has said, 'When one has come to the brink of a
precipice the only way to advance is to turn back.' It seems to me, at least in the present situation, that wisdom bids us stop.

"What can the present Government possibly hope to gain by following the present course? It will end, if it continue in its present path, by endorsing the opinion that the Church and the Republic, contrary to what we see elsewhere, cannot live together on French soil. If ever this conviction should really gain possession of men's minds, religion will certainly have a good deal to suffer; but she will not perish. And the Republic, in attacking her, will inflict dangerous wounds upon itself; for France, which owes everything to Catholicism, its origin, its unity, its best glories, will never consent to repudiate this grand and holy religion, to put herself before the eyes of Christian Europe as a nation without God and without worship.

"As for us, our conscience tells us, and the country is our witness, that we have neglected nothing in order to prevent these misfortunes. Before even the commencement of the present crisis, and through all its phases, we have lifted up our voice to point out the dangers, to recommend conciliation, and to give counsels of peace. If our appeal is not listened to, we shall be ready to suffer violence, but it will not be in our power to hinder the evils which an inexorable policy shall have let loose upon the country."


"Beloved Son, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

"We have gladly taken cognizance of the letters addressed by you to the President of the Republic, to the President of the Council of Ministers, and quite recently to the Minister of the Interior, respecting the decrees issued on the 29th of March against the Religious Orders not having what is called legal recognition. These letters are an honourable proof of your firmness, and show that you can combine with it great charity, by the tone of frankness and moderation with which you show that wherever the liberty of the Catholic Church exists Religious Orders rise and form themselves spontaneously like so many branches connected with the trunk of the Church whence they receive their origin. You also justly compare them to auxiliary troops, specially necessary in our times, and whose zeal and activity afford the Bishops assistance equally seasonable and valuable as well in the exercise of the sacred ministry as in the accomplishment of works of neighbourly charity. You also plainly demonstrate the fact that there is no form of government to
which the Religious Orders are enemies or which they reject, but that, on the other hand, the public peace is greatly interested in so many inoffensive citizens preserving full liberty of living quietly without molestation; and, lastly, that politicians, mindful of the public weal, should avoid any semblance of rupture with the religion of an entire nation. Such, moreover, has been the unanimous sentiment of the other French Bishops, such the judgment they have passed on these pernicious decrees. All, indeed, have done themselves great honour by their eagerness in publicly undertaking the defence of the Religious Orders, which they have done with equal moderation and ability. They have felt that they were thereby performing an imperative duty, for they see, and with only too much reason, in the impending evils not only an affliction for the Church, but the menace of serious calamities for France, unjust measures against free citizens, and troubles full of peril for public order. And, indeed, the men worthy of all praise against whom obsolete laws have been revived are sons of the Church whom her maternal breast has nourished for the honour of virtue and humanity. They have more than one claim to the gratitude of civil society -- the sanctity of their manners, which excites populations to the practice of virtue; the breadth of their culture, which reflects honour on sacred and profane learning; lastly, the enduring productions of their genius, whereby they have enriched the common patrimony of letters and arts. Besides this, from the time when the recruiting of the clergy became very difficult, hosts of apostolic workers have emerged from monasteries -- men full of wisdom and zeal -- who came to the help of the Bishops for the training of souls in piety, the diffusion of evangelical doctrine, the initiation of youth in knowledge and morality. Need we missionaries to teach the Gospel to barbarous nations? The greater number of them have always gone from houses established in France by monks. They it is who, in carrying out immense works for the cause of the Catholic faith, have brought to the most remote races, together with the good tidings of Christianity, the name and glory of France. There is not, so to speak, in human existence, in the accidents of this life, a single kind of misfortune which these Orders have not been striving to alleviate or remedy. They have been at work in hospitals, in asylums, in ambulances, in time of peace and public security, and amid the horrors of war and the tumult of combat. They have introduced into these various ministries a mildness and compassion which could only emanate from Divine charity. There is not a province nor a town which has not seen illustrious examples of this beneficence and reaped its precious fruits. It seems as if such
numerous and great services, recognized by the unanimous testimony of the Bishops, ought to have sufficed to ward off the decrees, especially when a multitude of French citizens of every rank, alarmed at the danger to which the Orders were exposed, showed them such marks of respect and devotion; when a great number of magistrates and officials set a memorable example of firmness by resigning their offices rather than co-operate in their destruction or appear as abettors of these decrees, which they looked upon as a serious blow to the liberty of the citizens, which had been rendered legitimate and confirmed by long usage. But an unfortunate inspiration prevailed, and ears were closed to the noble demands of the Bishops and to the complaints of the Catholics. Thenceforward the Orders began to fear that they were doomed to destruction, even were they to solicit the legal recognition, for the progress of events and the disposition of men's minds were unequivocal signs of a fixed resolution to put an end to the Religious Orders. That is why, by common accord, they deemed it right to abstain from any application, there being, however, other motives which counselled that resolution. On a fixed day, therefore, action began and force was employed in the execution of the first decree, which demanded throughout France the dissolution of the Company of Jesus. At once We ordered Our Nuncio in Paris to convey Our complaints to the members of the Government of the Republic, and at the same time to represent to them the injustice of this treatment towards men of exemplary virtue, whose devotion to science, indefatigable zeal, and tried ability, especially in education, have always been recognized and appreciated by the Apostolic See. Frenchmen, moreover, endorse this testimony by the favour and esteem with which they regard these matters, showing delight and confidence when they intrust to them their young sons — those precious pledges of their affection. As, however, the complaints preferred by Our Nuncio had been futile, We were on the point of raising Our Apostolic voice, as it was Our right and duty to do, against the acts already accomplished, or hereafter to be so, with a view to destroy the Religious Orders. It was then represented to Us that there was a chance of staying the execution of the decrees if the members of the communities declared in writing that they stood aloof from political agitations and manoeuvres, and that neither their mode of life nor their acts had anything in common with party spirit. Various and serious considerations induced Us to accept an offer spontaneously made by the rulers themselves, especially as the proposal contained nothing contrary either to Catholic doctrine or the dignity of the Religious Orders, and as it had the advantage of diverting from France a formidable evil, or, at least, as it seemed, of depriving the enemies of the Orders of a weapon often abused against them. Nothing,
indeed, is clearer or more evident to Us and this Apostolic See than the intention and design which induced the creation of the Orders in the Church. It was to lead their own members to the perfection of consummate virtue; while as to the active life exhibited out of doors, and varying in each Order, it had no other object than the everlasting salvation of our neighbours and the alleviation of human misery — a twofold object pursued by the Religious Orders with admirable fervor and daily effort. Without doubt the Catholic Church blames and condemns no form of government and the institutions established by it, for the general good may prosper whether the management of public affairs is entrusted to the power and justice of one man or of several. As, moreover, amid political vicissitudes and changes, it is necessary for the Holy See to continue to transact business with the rulers, it has but one thing in view, — the safeguard of Christian interests. As to impugning the rights of sovereignty, by whomsoever exercised, the Holy See never will or can desire it. There is no doubt, moreover, that Governments should be obeyed in everything not contrary to justice. But it must not be inferred that this obedience involves approval of anything unjust in the constitution and administration of the State. These being the principles of public law among Catholics, there was nothing to prevent the above declaration. Hence there is reason for surprise that a measure based on the gravest grounds and taken in the interest of religion and society should have encountered severe criticism and inequitable judges among men otherwise commendable for their energy and talent in the defence of the Catholic religion. To judge more justly of the declaration referred to, it is sufficient to know that it commanded the authority, counsel, or, at least, the assent of the Bishops, for to direct action and provide for good in affairs interesting the Catholic religion is the function of Bishops, whom the Holy Spirit has set apart to govern God's Church, whereas the part of other Christians is manifestly submission and obedience. The declaration was therefore presented, and it seemed that this step ought to have removed the fears of Religious families. We see, on the contrary, with profound grief that the rulers of French affairs have resolved to carry out what they had begun, and now sad and painful tidings reach Us. The remaining Religious Orders have begun to be dispersed and devoted to destruction; on hearing of which fresh disaster for France Our emotion is great and Our anguish extreme, and We cannot but raise Our protest against the injury inflicted on the Catholic Church. In view, however, of the violent war being waged and the still severe conflicts impending, the duty of Our office requires Us to safeguard everywhere with inflexible constancy the institutions of the Church, and to defend with a courage equal to
the peril the rights intrusted to Our care. In this, We are assured, We shall not lack either your assistance, beloved son, or that of your colleagues, Our Venerable Brethren, who are constantly expressing to Us their deference and devotedness. Thanks, therefore, to your co-operation, and by God's help, We shall be sustained in these troublous times, when everything shows the lack of that admirable unity, the offspring of faith and charity, which should always bind together Christian peoples, the Bishops throughout the world, and the Supreme Shepherd of the Church. In which firm hope, beloved son, We bestow on you, on Our Venerable Brethren the French Bishops, on the clergy and people under your charge, the Apostolic Benediction, as a pledge of Divine favour and in testimony of Our special affection.

"Given at Rome at St. Peter's the 22nd October in the third year of our Pontificate."

E. Text of the letter from the English Church Union to Cardinal Guibert. It was forwarded by Hon. C. L. Wood, the President of the Union acting in the name of twelve bishops, 2,500 clergymen, and 15,800 of the Anglican laity. The following is a translation of this address, as printed in the Tablet, vol. 56, No. 2119, November 20, 1880, p. 654.

"Monseigneur, - In the name of the liberty so dear to Englishmen, we, the undersigned members of the clergy of the English Church and laymen belonging to that communion, desire to express to your Eminence, and through your intermediary to all the Catholics of France, the indignation with which we are inspired by the persecution to which the Religious Orders are at present subjected in France. We cannot hear of violated convents, of chapels profaned, and of men celebrated by their piety and their good works thrown into the streets without a refuge, and remain silent. Allow me, then, to convey through your Eminence to the victims of such an unjust persecution the expression of our warmest sympathy in the trials to which they are subjected, and to assure them that, whatever may be the differences which unfortunately exist between us on many points, and however grave they may be, that in this respect we are at heart and soul with you and the noble war which you are maintaining for the sacred cause of freedom and religion."
F. Reply of Cardinal Guibert on November 18, 1880 to Hon. C. L. Wood, the President of the English Church Union. Printed in the Tablet, vol. 56, No. 2120, November 27, 1880, pp. 681 f.

"Sir -- You have been good enough to transmit to me on behalf of the English Church Union, a protest against the measures now being taken for the suppression and dispersion of the Religious Orders in France. Measures so hostile in their character, and which have no excuse to plead in their justification, directed against communities only given up to good works, and rendering the greatest services to the country, have been condemned by all amongst us who are anxious for the maintenance of peace and order. I have been much touched by such a mark of sympathy on the part of the English Church Union, and my feeling is shared by all the Religious Orders who are the subjects of such unprecedented proceedings and by the whole body of Catholics in France, in whose name I beg to convey to you the expression of sincere thanks. Such a mark of sympathy is all the more valuable in our eyes, coming as it does from the members of a religious communion differing in several points from the Catholic Church. Those divergences will in time end. I long with all my heart for the moment when there shall be only one flock and one shepherd; meanwhile let us all alike contend in defence of religious liberty -- of all liberty the first and the best. May I beg that you will convey to the members of the English Church Union the expression of my gratitude, together with that of the Religious Orders and of the Catholics of France, on whose behalf I write."
APPENDIX V

A. According to La Guyenne of Bordeaux, the following is the text of the Collective Declaration which the non-authorized Congregations were expected to sign. Printed in the Tablet, Vol. 56, No. 2108, September 4, 1880, p. 313.

1. The Declaration:

"On the occasion of the decrees of the 29th of March a portion of the Press warmly attacked the non-authorized Congregations, representing them as centres of opposition to the Government of the Republic.

"The pretext of these accusations was the silence observed by these Congregations, which certainly have not hitherto solicited the authorization which the second decree called upon them to demand.

"The reason for their abstaining, however, was quite a different one from that attributed to them, and political antipathies had no share therein. Convinced that the 'authorization', which in the present state of French legislation confers the privilege of civil personality, is a favour and not an obligation, they did not think they were placing themselves in opposition to the law in continuing to live under a regime common to all citizens.

"They do not undervalue the advantages attaching to legal existence, only they do not think it behooved them to seek these advantages under circumstances which would have led to their so doing being interpreted as a condemnation of their past existence and as an avowal of an illegality of which they did not feel guilty.

"To put an end to all misunderstanding, the Orders in question make no difficulty in affirming their respect and submission with regard to the present institutions of the country.

"The dependence they profess towards the Church from which they derive their existence does not place them in a state of independence towards the secular power. They never had any such pretension, as their respective constitutions and their history will testify.

"The moral and spiritual aims they pursue do not permit them to bind themselves exclusively to any political
system nor do they exclude any. They have but one banner
-- that of Christian charity -- and they deem that they
would be compromising it in placing it at the service of
changing causes and human interests. They thus decline all
solidarity with political parties and passion. They only
deal with things that regard temporal government in teaching
by precept and example the obedience and respect due to
authority, the source of which is God.

"These are the principles which have hitherto in­spired their thoughts and acts, and they are resolved never
to swerve from them.

"They cannot help nourishing the hope that the
Government will receive in a kindly spirit the sincere and
loyal declarations of which they here take the initiative,
and that, fully reassured as to the feelings animating them,
it will allow them freely to continue their work of prayer,
education, and charity to which they have devoted their
lives."

2. The formula which the Superiors were invited to sign at
the foot of the Declaration:

"I, the undersigned, Superior-General of the Congrega-
tion (or community) of ...... after having taken the advice
of my council, declare, in my own name, and in the name of
my Brethren (or Sisters) that the opinions and sentiments
expressed in the above note are those of all our Congregation
(or community), and that we are determined to conform our
conduct thereto."

B. Text of the letter of September 18, 1880,
by the Minister of Interior and Public
Worship, M. Constans, to the Superiors
who had forwarded the Declaration on
behalf of their Congregations. Cited by
R. P. Lecanuet, L'Eglise de France sous
la Troisième République. Nouvelle ed.
(Paris: 1910), II, 80f.

"I have received the declaration which you forwarded
to me on August 31, in connection with the imminent enforce-
ment of the second decree of March 29.

"To bring to an end, as you say, all misunderstanding,
and to answer the accusations of the press, which depicts the
non-authorized congregations of both sexes as a den of opposi-
tion to the government of the Republic; you tell me in your
own name and in the name of the council of your society, that
your abstention does not have the motive which is ascribed to
it, and that political dislikes have nothing to do with it.
"You attest your respect for and submission to the actual institutions of the country. You repudiate the claims that you yourselves make of an independent state vis-à-vis secular power.

"You close by asserting that you are resolved never to swerve from this line of conduct; and by expressing the hope that the government will receive with benevolence the sincere and loyal declaration which you undertake; and that the government will let you continue freely the exercise of worship, of instruction, and of charity to which all of you have devoted your lives.

"The government, Monsieur le Supérieur, can only look with satisfaction upon all citizens who publicly testify their respect and obedience to the institutions of the country, no matter to which class they belong. The government does look favourably upon the items in the resolution by which the congregations express rejection of all solidarity with the political parties.

"As to the hope they express that the government will allow them to continue their work, I must call your attention to the fact that the second Decree of March 29, has precisely as its object to put an end to the state of toleration of which you demand continuation, and to substitute for it a return to legal status."
APPENDIX VI


The following extract, cited ibid, pp. 109f., from Thomas C. Mendenhall and Others (eds.), The Quest for a Principle of Authority in Europe, 1715-Present. (New York; 1948), p. 64.

"To offer to all individuals of the human race the means of providing for their needs, of assuring their welfare, of knowing and exercising their rights, of understanding and fulfilling their obligations. To assure each one the facility of perfecting his skill, of rendering himself capable of social functions to which he has the right to be called, of developing to the fullest extent those talents with which nature has endowed him; and thereby to establish among all citizens an actual equality, thus rendering real the political equality recognized by the law. This should be the first aim of any national education; and, from such a point of view, this education is for the government an obligation of justice.

"To direct the teaching in such a manner that the perfecting of the industries shall increase the pleasures of the generality of the citizens and the welfares of those who devote themselves to them, that a greater number of men shall be capable of exercising the functions necessary to society, and that the ever-increasing progress of enlightenment shall provide an inexhaustible source of help in our needs, of remedies for our ills, of means of individual happiness and of general prosperity. In short, to cultivate in each generation the physical, intellectual and moral
faculties, and thereby contribute to the general and gradual improvement of the human race - which should be the final aim of every social institution. This likewise should be the object of education, and it is for the government a duty imposed on it by the common interest of society, by that of all mankind.

"As the first requisite of all education is that only the truth be taught, all institutions established by the government should be as free as possible from all political control, and, since this independence cannot be absolute, it results from the same principle that they must depend only on the Assembly of the Representatives of the People. . . .

"Above the primary school, education ceases to be absolutely general. But we have felt that the double objective of assuring the country all the talents that could serve it, and of not depriving any individual of the advantage of developing those with which he has been endowed would be attained, if the children who show the most aptitude in a given grade of instruction should be chosen to enter the next higher; and maintained at the expense of the national treasury; they would be called National Scholars."

B. During the debate in the Legislature on the Falloux Law, on February 19, 1850, Edgar Quinet delivered a speech in which he explored for his political friends a plan for laicizing education which became the cardinal inspiration of Jules Ferry and his supporters.

The following extract from that speech is cited by R. P. Lecanuet, L'Eglise de France sous la Troisième République. (Paris: 1910), Vol. 1, p.16.

"To organize primary instruction in particular, and instruction in general, means to organize society itself. From here it follows that in order to found a school on a true basis, it needs to be established on the principle which makes this society live. And what is the principle which underlies all our laws, without which our codes would have been impossible? It is contained altogether in these two words: secularize legislation, separate civil from ecclesiastical power, separate secular society from the Churches. . . .

"How can you resolve the problem of freedom of instruction?...Bring into this problem the vital principle which animates all your institutions; do secularize the
legislation of instruction, and the question will resolve by itself. You will have as a result: at the top of society, in the constitution, the separation of secular and ecclesiastical power; - in the code which rules the state of the people, separation of civil acts and of ecclesiastical extolling; - and therefore in the law of instruction: the separation of the School and the Church, of the teacher and the priest, of instruction and of dogma. . . .

"This solution is one which alone can entirely conciliate the unity of the French nationality and the freedom of conscience. In fact, by any other system one will arrive at one or the other of these two: either to each religion, and each dogma its own school; or the diverse denominations are reunited in the same kind of instruction. In the first case, if each denomination has its own school, the new generations, separated by the opposing beliefs, will form, so to speak, as many nations as there are religions and different denominations....In the second case, that in which all beliefs are in the hands of the same schoolmaster in a mixed school, it is freedom of worship which is overtaken."


"ARTICLE 20. A crucifix will be placed in the classrooms, in view of the pupils.

"ART. 21. The classes will always be preceded and followed by a prayer; morning class will begin with a morning prayer contained in the catechism of the diocese, that in the afternoon will conclude with an evening prayer, from the same catechism. At the end of the morning class, this prayer will be said: 'Holy Mother of God we place ourselves under Your protection.' At the beginning of the evening class, this one will be said: 'Come, Holy Spirit.'

"ART. 22. The teacher will take his pupils to services on Sundays and Holy days to a place which has been assigned to them by the curé; he is required to supervise them.

"ART. 23. Each time when the presence of the pupils is necessary at Church for the catechism, and especially at the time of the first communion, the teacher must take them, or see that they are taken there.

"ART. 24. The teacher will particularly supervise the
behaviour of the pupils during prayers and religious exercises, and will make them conform by his own example.

"ART. 25. For religious instruction only the books approved by the ecclesiastical authority will be used.

"ART. 26. Religious instruction comprises a lecture on catechism and of elements of Holy History. To this will be added daily a part of the Sunday Scripture, which will be recited in entirety on Saturday. There will be a lesson every day in catechism, even for the children who have made their first communion. The lesson on religious instruction will be regulated by the advice of the curé."


"The Free-Thinkers recognize and proclaim freedom of conscience and of self-examination. They consider science to be the unique basis of all beliefs and consequently they reject all dogmas founded on whatever revelation. They demand education at all levels to be gratuitous, obligatory, exclusively laic and materialistic. In matters concerning the philosophical and religious question, seeing that the idea of God is the source and fulcrum of every despotism and all iniquity, and seeing that the Catholic religion is the most complete and most terrible personification of that idea, and that the total content of her dogmas is the negation of society itself, the Free-Thinkers bind themselves to work actively for the speedy and radical abolition of Catholicism and for its annihilation by all legitimate means even including revolutionary violence."

"THE COMMUNE OF PARIS,

"Whereas the first principle of the French Republic is freedom; and

"Whereas the budget of worship is contrary to the principle of conscience as it is imposed upon the citizens against their proper belief; and

"Whereas the clergy has been an accomplice in the crimes of the monarchy against freedom,

"DECREES:

"ARTICLE 1. The Church is separated from the State.

"ARTICLE 2. The budget of Worship is abolished.

"ARTICLE 3. The goods called mortmain, belonging to religious congregations, whether chattel or real estate, are declared national property.

"ARTICLE 4. An investigation of these goods shall be undertaken immediately in order to establish their worth and to place them at the disposal of the nation."

F. Letter of George Clemenceau, to the teachers in his municipality in 1871.

"I hear that your parish priest has summoned you for tomorrow, Tuesday, to assist at High Mass with your pupils in his Church. In the first place I must remind you that, being a civil institution, you are not bound by the orders of your parish priest. It is imperative that every person's liberty of conscience be scrupulously respected. In summoning the children of your school to proceed in a body to any place whatever, over the practice of any creed whatever, without consulting their individual consciences or those of
their parents, you would be bringing or seeming to bring a regrettable pressure on their consciences. It is the Municipality's duty to put an end to these abuses. Like every other citizen, you are absolutely free to practise whatever religion you may choose and in whatever way you choose. Your individual pupils have the same absolute right to go to such church as they wish, with or without their parents, so long as the latter consider it suitable. But it is impossible that you should ever think of convoking them in a body to celebrate any religious rite .... You will observe that you are forbidden to take the children in your school to catechism. The children are free to go to catechism or not, with their parent's consent, during the holidays. But I cannot allow you to devote the time belonging to instruction to the dogmas of any religion whatever."


Specific passages identified thus:

(Leo. X, ).

Abbe Bougard, speaking of the spiritual anaemia among the French middle classes in the 1870's, deplored the small number entering the priesthood and asked: "How shall priests come forth from such homes where God is despised, or mocked, or absent? Alas, not even Christians come out of them." (Bougard, op.cit., 83, cited by Dublin Review (January 1879), 51)

The Church in France, nonetheless, gave the impression at this time of being an incomparable force. "This great army of secular and regular clergy, in complete submission to the Pope and to the bishops, disciplined, active, devoted unto death, animated with a deep and living faith, struggled to defend and develop this faith in the bosom of the society which engulfed it." (Lec. I, 309)
In 1876, the ecclesiastical organization, including the personnel of the three Algerian dioceses, was as follows:

**The Secular Clergy**

Eighteen Archbishops and sixty-nine Bishops. Under their direction: 185 Vicars-General, 750 paid Canons, 130 unpaid, 5,463 curés, 4,578 habited priests, 29,308 officiating priests in succursales, 10,670 Parishvicars, 2,659 Chaplains, 3,589 Directors and Professors of the great seminaries and of ecclesiastical schools; total of 57,439 members of the secular clergy. (Lee. I, 228)

Recruitment of this personnel was assured by the seminary annexed to each of eighty-seven Dioceses. In 1876 these had a scholastic enrolment of 11,666, a figure rarely reached, and in 1880 it fell to 8,400. Direction and teaching in the seminaries was entrusted, besides to secular priests, to special congregations, notably the Lazarists, Sulpicians, Marists, Oratorians, Eudists, and Picpuciens. The Lazarists managed twenty-two great seminaries; the Sulpicians twenty-four. The latter also managed the most important seminary in France (in number of pupils and standard of studies), that of Saint-Sulpice in Paris. (Lee. I, 292)

**Regular Clergy**

(a) Authorized societies: five congregations of men in 224 establishments, with 2,418 members; and twenty-three associations of men with 20,341 members, plying between 3,086 schools.

Of women, there were 259 congregations and 644 communities in 3,196 establishments, with 113,750 members, plying between 16,478 schools.

(b) Non-authorized societies: 384 establishments of men with 7,444 members; and 612 establishments of women with 14,003 members.

The total for both groups: 30,287 [this figure is wrong; should be 30,203] male and 127,753 female religious for a grand total of 157,956. (Lee. I, 299)

The combined total value of these orders in 1880 was estimated by the administration of direct taxation at an area of 40,520 hectares, with a money value of 712,538,980 francs.

The generosity of the faithful was always ready to come to the assistance of the Church. For example, when the Catholic University of Paris was founded after the Act of July 12, 1875, in less than six months subscriptions reached the sum of two and a half million francs. (Han. II, 677 and n. 1)

**Education**

It is difficult to estimate the number of children in the primary schools as the figures vary from year to year.
In 1864, according to an official inquiry by Victor Duruy, there were 2,722,000 children in the state schools and 1,610,000 in the free schools. The teaching congregations had some 44,477 members, 8,635 of whom were men and 35,842 women. They directed, among themselves, 17,206 free schools, 2,502 for boys and 14,704 for girls, or 19% and 56% respectively.

In 1878 there were twenty-four congregations of men and 528 communities of women engaged in teaching and recognized as such. (Lec. I, 347)

The National Assembly authorized three congregations of men and thirty-six of women. Of men, there were: Brothers of the Holy Family, Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, and Fathers of the Holy Spirit. Of women, six communities were authorized in 1872, five in 1873, nine in 1874, six in 1875, ten in 1876. (Lec. I, 300, n.1.)

Of the non-authorized teaching congregations, in 1878–9 there were sixteen congregations, with 1,556 men in eighty-one establishments, with 20,235 students. There were 120 communities with 4,857 women in 555 establishments, with 40,784 pupils, a combined total of 61,019 students. (Dublin Review, July 1880, 167)

In 1880, the number of educational establishments reached 19,574 with approximately 2.2 million children, out of a general total of 4.95 million educated in them. (Han. II, 679)

Of the teaching congregations, the most important was that of the Frères des Écoles chrétiennes de Jean Baptiste de La Salle. At the end of 1872, some 7,864 teaching brothers directed 1,544 institutions, with a total of 325,531 pupils. Of the numerous female teaching orders, the most important was Les Filles de la Charité de Saint-Vincent de Paul. (Lec. I, 348 f)

In secondary education, after 1850 the free schools grew steadily; perhaps too many new schools were opened. In 1876, there were 309 Catholic colleges with 46,816 students, plus 23,000 students in the seminaries, a total of about 70,000 students, as contrasted with 78,913 students educated by the University and another 31,000 in various free laic institutions.

In 1865 the Jesuits had 14 educational institutions with 5,000 students. There were 2,464 Jesuits in France, some 600 of whom were also missionaries. This left about 1850 Jesuits engaged in education in 1878, and they had twenty-nine colleges with 11,144 students. Of the other congregations, mainly Oratorians, Dominicans, Marists, and Assumptionists, in 1876 they had sixty-two institutions, educating 10,830, and they were still growing. The most numerous of the ecclesiastical establishments were those directed by the
secular clergy under the immediate authority of the bishops. Exclusive of students in the seminaries already mentioned, these schools counted more than 12,000 students. (Lec. I, 357 f.)

The overall excellent record notwithstanding, in general the clergy was neither at par in the calibre of education, nor advanced enough in intellectual development when contrasted with the laics, whom it had to fight. Therein lay a great shortcoming of the Church. (Lec. I, 316)

The last census of this kind taken in 1872 gave this account of the form of worship of each individual in France:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>35,387,703</td>
<td>98.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>580,757</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>49,439</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cults</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>81,951</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1880 the number of 'non-practising' Catholics increased sharply, and some terrifying estimates were made. An example of this trend may be seen in the fact that, in 1877 there were in France 2,568 parishes without a priest: 1.5 million Christians without a shepherd. (Han. II, 655)

In contrast to the combined number of Catholic clergy shown earlier, of the Protestant cult there were 639 Reformed pastors and 67 Lutheran Ministers. The Israelites had nine Grand Rabbis, twenty-six Rabbis and twenty-five officiating ministers. (Han. II, 675)
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The issues from the beginning of January to the end of June constitute one volume.

THE TABLET (LONDON: A Weekly)

Volumes LIII - LVI (January 1879 - December 1880)

The issues from the beginning of January to the end of June constitute one volume.

THE TIMES (LONDON: A Daily, except Sunday)

January 1879 - December 1880

III. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Encyclopedias

The Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, Appleton, 1907 - 1912


2. General Histories, Biographies, and Monographs


------- "Reaction and Revolution in France". Cam. Mod. Hist. X, 71 - 103.

------- "The Third French Republic". Cam. Mod. Hist. XII, 91 - 133.


3. Periodicals


VITA AUCTORIS

Family

Milorad Vuckovic, only son of Nikola Vuckovic and his wife Anka Ivancevic; born July 28, 1923 in Yugoslavia; married Helen Isabel Wright at Windsor, Ontario, June 28, 1952.

Education

1929 - 1941 Received elementary and secondary education; graduated from Real Gymnasium in Kragujevac, Yugoslavia, June 1941. October 1941, enrolled as a freshman at the University of Belgrade. Due to war conditions, study interrupted in 1942.


Other Activities

1945 - 1947 In displaced persons camps in Austria, Italy and Germany, and was member of a professional repertory company, Yugoslav Y.M.C.A. Theatre.

1948 - 1953 Landed immigrant in Canada, February 1948. Worked government contract as a miner in Asbestos, Quebec. From arrival in Windsor, June 1949, employed at construction until enrolment at Assumption. Received Canadian citizenship by naturalization on September 28, 1953.

1957 - 1959 During both years of graduate study, granted an assistantship in the Department of English, and during the final year, a fellowship in the Department of History, University College of Assumption University.

Awards and Scholarships

1955 Recipient of the Denis O'Connor award for "outstanding performance in scholarship and co-curricular activities".

1958 - 1959 Holder of a Canada Council Pre-Master's Degree Scholarship.

1959 Awarded a Canada Council Pre-Doctor's Degree Fellowship.