THE CLERICAL REACTION IN EUROPE.¹

BY PROFESSOR G. FIALINGO.

Of a clerical reaction proper in Europe there can be no question whatever. What is really taking place is rather a clerical agitation. A clerical reaction would signify a popular movement of thought, something which does not exist. It would mean such a movement interpreted by leading spirits who, as the product of such a movement, sum up in themselves, and express artistically the new ideas which in the popular mind are more or less latent and unconscious. When in the early part of this century the Latin people, exhausted by continual political revolutions, felt the need of some sort of quietude, even though it be like that of the Middle Ages, they welcomed the action of the Vatican which sanctioned the Holy Alliance, which alliance, however, proved to be holy only in name. And yet this action of the Church was followed by a period of artistic and literary activity unsurpassed, a period in which Chataubriand, Lamennais, De Maistre, and others, provoked admiration which still finds expression. Nothing similar to this intellectual and artistic movement, however, accompanies that which is now designated as the modern clerical reaction. Ettore Ciccotti justly says, "Read the Sagesse of Verlaine, the most noteworthy of the converted poets, and everything new and beautiful there will be found to be but the echo of former times. Even his return to the faith is expressed in verses poor in imagery, coloring, and sentiment. Where are to-day the poets, the apostles of this new vision of the Divine, of this renewed sense of faith?"

To create a new intellectual, idealistic and religious movement something more than one man is needed. Can it be that an article by M. Brunetièrè in criticism of positive ethics has de-

¹Translated from the MS. of Professor Flamingo by I. W. Howerth, Ph.D., the University of Chicago.
strored the results of the scientific activity of the last quarter of a century, and at the same time succeeded in strengthening the ethical movement of Catholic Christianity? The discussion provoked by a few articles published in a well-known review, and by this writer so favorably known as an author, proves just the opposite of what the Catholics believe, or think they believe. They prove precisely the lack of any new Catholic movement whatever; for if such a movement had really existed the articles of M. Brunetière would have appeared as a part of the movement without provoking so much surprise, criticism, and discussion.

There is, then, no new idealistic spirit in the modern Catholic movement. No new intellectual energy is reviving modern Catholicism, or aiding its development. Modern Catholic activity is limited to the old means of propaganda, but it tends rather to organisation than to propagandism. Perhaps it would be more precise to say that it tends towards the regimentation of the Catholic forces so as to put them in correspondence with the modern social environment.

Although it has been a century since the Catholic Church was deposed from all its medieval privileges, it has remained as if stunned, and, failing to comprehend the new social environment, has proceeded timidly and uncertainly and without regaining even in the slightest degree what it had lost. The life of the Catholic Church during the present century consists almost entirely in a series of vain attempts to reacquire political power in the various Catholic countries by such devices, for instance, as the secular alliance which it has always formed with autocratic governments of Catholic countries from the time of Constantine. Since that time it has manifested a constant desire to ally itself with the heads of governments, to become the official religion, and by means of such alliance to avail itself of the power of government to impose itself upon the people by suppressing or forcibly converting all those who are sceptical or who object to its teachings.

Having once gained the support of governments and emperors, the Roman Church has always neglected the people, and manifested the most Cæsarean conduct—a crying and absolute negation of the Gospel. When there were no great nationalities, when all the countries were divided into little states and the great monarchies were merely nominal, such as that of Charles V., who, although he could boast that the sun never sank on his dominions, did not have money enough to pay his Spanish troops, and who for three months was without a page and could not obtain a loan of 415
florins from the Fuggers without mortgaging Tyrol; when Venice compelled the respect of the King of France; in such times the Pope with his temporal power and his Italian allies, some of which had always represented political powers of the first order, was feared, and his friendship and allegiance were much sought after by other potentates. Even the Byzantine emperors, when they were exposed to the attack of the Turks, and at the same time pressed by Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily, and threatened by the dethroned emperor, Baldwin the II., called on the West for aid, and explained to the Pope the dangers that would befall Christianity if it should lose the protection of the Bosphorus. More than once the ambassadors of Michael Paleologus had said the same thing at Rome. And the Pope turned a willing ear to them, and promised to excite the zeal of the Latin people in protecting the interests of Byzantium, but at the same time he invoked the ambassadors to forget the Photius and the Cerulaire and return to the doctrines of Athanasius and Chrysostom, who had professed the Catholic faith and recognised the Pope as head of the Church. Even Gregory the X., in 1274, believing that the favorable moment had come, convoked at Lyons a general council chiefly for the purpose of discussing the questions pending with Byzantium. In June of the same year a religious peace between the Orient and Occident was solemnly concluded. The Greeks recognised the primacy of the Pope and took the oath of fidelity.¹

Notwithstanding the transient and unstable character of this peace, which lasted no longer than the reign of the Emperor Michael, it is of exceptional importance as showing how in the past century the Papacy imposed itself upon the Courts, and through them upon the people, less by the beneficence of the religion which it represented and professed than by its military and political power. The alliance which the Papacy celebrated with the powers was more a contract of solidarity established between two theocracies than an agreement between a political and a religious power.

The French Revolution deposed the clergy and consequently religious authority, and these principles of the French Revolution are embodied in the famous code of Napoleon I., which still exists in France, and they have been carried to other countries and have been expressed in the formula "A free church in a free state," precisely because the political and military power of the Pope, now

that the great monarchies are formed, has become nil, or almost so, and therefore the enmity of the Papacy has, so far as the great modern states are concerned, an importance much less than what it had in former times. The French Revolution restricted the Papacy to a considerable extent. It took away the social dominion which the clergy, together with the aristocracy exercised, as well as the more or less royal semblance of its representatives. Considering what the French Revolution took away from the Papacy, and what Italy has taken away, the few square kilometres which now constitute its temporal power represent a very small thing in comparison with the social sway which it formerly exercised and of which the French Revolution deprived it. But if the French Revolution dethroned the Papacy from its social dominion, and if Napoleon was able to satisfy his whim of proclaiming himself Emperor of Rome, thus suppressing the temporal sovereignty of Pius the VII., it was because the Papacy had no longer that political and military power which it formerly enjoyed and which seemed to assure it a supremacy in Europe, where especially it played the part of a powerful monarchy.

As a matter of fact it is not true that in the beginning the hierarchical constitution of the Catholic Church was an imitation of that of Imperial Rome. As the Church developed it was necessarily influenced by the character of the people. If little by little there grew up a hierarchical constitution of which there is no trace in the teachings of Christ and the apostles, it was principally due to the conditions of its environment. When the masses of the people were subject to a single man the task of winning individual souls was made easier for the Church by its possessing the conscience of the prince who dominated his people politically and spiritually. As is well known, many strange hypotheses are advanced concerning the early development of the Episcopacy, and yet there is no agreement as to whether it developed at the end of the first century or not until the third. The latter is the opinion held by Hatch. Some maintain that at first bishops were identical with presbyters and gradually developed from them, while others hold an entirely different opinion. We are thus left in a field perfectly free for induction. Now if there is one induction more valid than another, and in complete correspondence with the historical conditions of the social environment, it is this, that the Episcopacy was developed, and determined the hierarchical constitution of what Ignatius first called Catholic Christianity, precisely because in that social environment the masses had no importance,
and exercised no influence, and all was synthesised and absorbed in a few personalities who decided the destinies of the world. Christianity, in order to make itself felt in that social environment, and in order to infuse and synthesise its force and moral power in a few persons, had to organise and constitute itself hierarchically. The Episcopacy, and especially the bishop of Rome, assumed, therefore, an enormous supremacy, and absorbed the whole life of Catholic Christianity. It was, then, to the Bishop of Rome that the destiny of Catholic Christianity was intrusted, and he it was who protected it by securing, either by diplomacy or force, the friendship of the potentates of the world.

Now the French Revolution and all the social evolution of our century, in diminishing more and more, and in certain cases annulling, the social influence of former potentates, has ended by creating a social environment in which the episcopal and hierarchical organisation of Rome, formerly in perfect correspondence with the times, is now absolutely unadapted to it, and it seeks in vain to exercise an influence for which it lacks the energy and the necessary authority. Deep and cultured minds like Lamennais, who from a partisan of the Bourbons became a liberal monarchist, and finally in 1830 was converted to republicanism, and besides Lamennais other more earnest Catholics as well as the few heads of the Church of Rome, favor and sympathise with the most different forms of government in order to secure their friendship, under the illusion that they may be able to arbitrate between the Church and the State as they did between the mediæval theocratic communities, and thereby regain its former political influence. The clericals cannot conceal their programme. This is the way it is presented in the Voce della Verita notoriously inspired by the most intellectual partisans of the Vatican: "Christianity is not merely a religious institution. It is impressed upon all men and upon universal society, which unfolds itself in a milieu of external relations-combined with spiritual and material acts; which imposes responsibility for voluntary thought in all matters private and public—in promises, in contracts, in conventions, in relations either voluntary or necessary of whatever kind or nature. Christianity, in fine, has created an environment outside of which society can do nothing. The Pope, therefore, is necessarily a political authority from the very fact that he is a religious authority; since outside of the laws of the Gospel there is nothing which can lead to the welfare of individuals or of classes. The intervention of the Pope, then, even in questions called civil and political, must be admitted tacitly at
least, because there is no question either religious or political in which may be ignored the precepts of the Gospel, of which the head of the Church is the guardian and promulgator."

It is hardly worth while to point out that in the Church of Rome the teachings of the Gospel receive an interpretation and explanation entirely subjective, and that the Catholics invoked the Gospel about as Leo XII. renounced his authority in political questions. Here is how Leo expressed himself in a recent encyclical entitled *Immortale Dei*: "Everything which in human affairs is in any respect sacred, everything that touches the salvation of souls and the worship of God, whether directly or indirectly, belongs to the Church. Everything else, that is to say, everything embraced by political and civil law, should remain subject to secular authority." On this point Leo XII., in his encyclical of 1890 upon the duties of Christian citizens, is still more explicit. "The Church," he says, "faithful guardian of our rights and not less respectful of the rights of others, does not pretend that to it belongs the matter of regulating the form of government, or of deciding what civil institutions a Christian people ought to prefer. It does not condemn any form of government provided that under it religion and morals are safe."

At the very time that Leo was expressing himself in this way he counselled the French Catholics, first ambiguously and finally explicitly, to adhere to the Republic. And the intellectual classes of the Vatican who drew up the programme of the Church of Rome on the lines above suggested, and declared it inspired of the Gospel, applauded the passiveness of Leo XII. in respect to the infamies committed in the Orient to the damage of Christianity, at which no human heart could be less than profoundly indignant. This is the very negation of the Gospel and of the pretended non-intervention of the Pope in things which transcend the field of religion and ethics. In all that action there is not a trace of the Christian ethics which Ernest Renan rightly declared the highest creation that ever proceeded from the human conscience, the most beautiful code of the perfect life which any moralist has ever drawn up. In the action of the Vatican such as that to which we have just referred we are able to see that there is in the present Vatican policy a very close connexion with that which was pursued in the time of Julius II., or of Leo X., and this in spite of the fact that times and the social environment have been profoundly changed. The greatest uncertainty therefore still rules in the action of the Vatican.
The Vatican has always wished to attach itself to emperors and kings, and even presidents of republics, in order to continue its authority over the people, but it perceives that such alliances are becoming more and more difficult and less permanent. The Vatican is conscious of the fact that it lacks sufficient authority to impose itself upon rulers. Little by little it is coming to see that it is necessary for it to win the good will of the people and then to utilise the power thus derived to impose itself upon governments. The Vatican at the present moment is oscillating between its old Cesarean policy which offered the co-operation of the Vatican with the rulers in order to dominate the people, and on the other hand to act in a manner directly opposed to this in order to win the friendship of the Catholic population and impose itself upon the governments, a thing which the latter are unwilling amicably to concede.

By Catholic reaction, then, is meant this evolution which the Vatican policy is undergoing, a policy which tends more and more to curry favor with the people in order to avail itself of them in political action exclusively in favor of the Church. At the same time, however, the Vatican is not unmindful of its old policy, and never ceases the attempt to insinuate itself in the good graces of governments. Thus in France, at the time that Leo XII. was encouraging the Catholics to embrace the republican system, when Abbot Gayraud stood as a republican candidate and was therefore supported by the Vatican against another Catholic but royalist candidate, and when Abbot Lemire abandoned himself to subtle distinctions between the religious and the clerical spirit in order thus to place himself under the patronage of the liberalism of Montalembert, that by this republican action the Vatican might win the favor of the republican government,—at this very time, I say, Comte de Mun, inspired by the Secretary of State for the Vatican, organised the French laboring classes into his famous "Cercles," at the head of which were Catholic Vicars, and the republicans "du bon temps," as Deputy Hemon called them, rallied all their forces, and from Deschanel to Girault-Richard united under the old watch word, "Le clericalisme, voila l'ennemi!"

It is in France that the spirit and tendencies of Voltaire are manifested. Alas, it is in France, this favorite daughter of the Church, as Leo XII. was pleased to call her, or at least in a large part of the French population, that the irreligious and sceptical tendencies, prepared and fomented by the revolution of '89, are now widely diffused and deeply rooted. And this is the real cause
for the new policy of the Vatican, by which it attempts to gain at once the friendship of the government and the favor and good will of the people; a policy in which it succeeds indifferently, for the French Government maintains towards the Vatican an attitude of dignified reserve, and yields it few favors, while the influence which the Vatican succeeds in acquiring among the people is very limited, so that the influence of the Catholic party in the French Parliament is very slight, and the French Government may easily ignore it.

The meager results which the new Vatican policy has brought about in France are due also to the factions among the French Catholics, to the strife between those who have accepted the new constitutional order and those who still hope for the re-establishment of the former monarchical régime.

Turning now to Austria-Hungary, we find that the clerical reaction has brought about much greater results than in France. In Austria-Hungary the leaders of the Catholic movement successfully make use of the antagonism between the Christians and the Jews, and thus give to every Catholic movement a purely anti-Semitic imprint. The Imperial Government which at first resisted the election of Lueger, that vulgar reactionary and leader of the anti-Semitic movement in Vienna, to the mayoralty, is now almost forced by the ever-increasing tide of this pretended Catholic movement to sanction his election. But more significant than the election of Lueger as Mayor of Vienna was the election of Dr. Kathrein as the President of the Austrian Chamber of Deputies. Dr. Kathrein is a pure clerical, born in Trent, a German Tyrolese by nationality, and has given his whole life to the service of the mother Church. He fought against the Italians in Trent, and although born on Italian soil, was one of the most violent protestors against the occupation of Rome. In the course of time his Papal ardor cooled somewhat, and to-day he modestly calls himself a conservative, but remains, however, the leader of the clericals "comme il faut" (an expression used in Vienna to designate those clericals who do not participate in the intemperate action of the anti-Semites).

This explains why it was that one of the first prominent people of Vienna to congratulate the new President was the papal ambassador, Monseignor Taliani, at whose table (which has the reputation of being one of the best in the city) Dr. Kathrein often seats himself under the oil painting of Leo the Thirteenth. Badina depends especially upon the support of the German clericals, who
number thirty-five, and are possibly the most formidable party in the Parliament. And there are no less than thirty-three Christian Socialists, or, as the Vatican prefers to call them, Catholic Democrats. There is, then, a powerful force in the Austrian Parliament which the Vatican may depend upon.

The Vatican knows how to make the best of its possessions. Its power is seen in the slightest incident. The oldest deputy in the new Parliament is Zurkan, a bishop of Bukovina. By rights he was entitled to the presidency of the new Parliament until it was regularly constituted, but for fear of making a bad impression upon the Austrian clergy the Emperor was received by a Greek orthodox bishop, and Zurkan was persuaded to stand aside.

But a thing altogether odious and disgusting, was the uncompromising attitude of the Austrian clericals. An attitude all the more conspicuous in the Catholic democracy or the Christian Socialists. The balloting in the first and second districts of Vienna which took place on the 22d of March was favorable to the Liberals. The Catholic candidate, Chaplain Dittrich, having a minority, left the committee accompanied by a crowd of adherents who directed themselves toward the house of the successful Liberal candidate, the Aulic councillor, Kareis. The police attempted to disperse the crowd, but it took another street, committing on every side acts of vandalism. The windows of the houses, shops, and cafés, were broken with stones, clubs, and umbrellas. A few shops were pillaged, and some were saved only by hastily closing them. Any Jews who happened to be recognised were insulted and threatened. A crowd of anti-Semites having injured a Jewish boy who was passing, another Jew attempted his defence, but the crowd turned upon him. He took refuge in a shop into which he was followed by the crowd, one of whom wounded him in the side with a knife. The disturbance continued all the evening, great crowds of people collected in Tabor Strasse and other streets. In the second district the Hebrew merchants who attempted to close their shops were stoned and clubbed. Here also the windows of the houses and shops were broken. Many Hebrews, and even Christians, who attempted to oppose these excesses were threatened and insulted and compelled to flee. The crowd, throwing stones and singing the Imperial hymn, made its way to Brigitenan plundering the shops along the way.

In Vienna the police succeeded partially in quelling this disturbance, but in the smaller towns the crowd had complete sway. At Chodorow, a little town of Galicia, some hundred Catholic rail-
way laborers demolished the synagogues, went through the houses and shops, gave a Jew a terrible beating and killed two and wounded twenty more, and compelled a thousand to leave the city. Compared to this, the Russian persecutions of the Jews pale into insignificance.

In Italy the clericals are organised into a Catholic association having a special political character. Pius IX. forbid the Catholics from taking a part in the political life of Italy, either as candidates or electors. Leo XIII. has also maintained this passive attitude as a protest against the political order as at present constituted, and which has deprived the Pope of his temporal power. And yet the Italian Catholics are encouraged by the Vatican Secretary of State to take an active part in the democratic life of their respective communes. Now, with the wise organisations which the heads of the clerical movement know so well how to bring about, the clericals not only exercise a powerful influence in the communal council of Rome, in which city one would expect to find a special concentration of the clerical powers, but they have also gained the administrative power in many of the other principal cities of Italy, even in Turin, where the fetishism for the ruling house is still very great, and where more than elsewhere there was an enthusiasm for Italian unity which resulted in the acknowledgment of Piedmont and of its capital, Turin. It is said that the news of the victory of the clericals in Turin made a very painful impression upon the royalty of Italy.

In Italy, in Austria, in France, etc., the clergy, while continuing to hold before the mass of believers the ideal of the future life, take care to make the best of the present life.

In Belgium the clericals have organised in the principal centres the so-called "Hotels Ouvriers," as at the Docherie, at Seraing, conducted by chaplains of labor. These chaplains are priests whose duty it is to keep in close touch with the laborers and to watch over their spiritual and corporal welfare. In order to attend their needs these priests establish in the principal industrial centres houses where laborers distant from their families may find good board and lodging. Moreover, the chaplain visits the laborers in sickness and furnishes them all needed assistance. Thanks to their tact and their extraordinary delicacy, these priests have gained the confidence of the laborers and are considered as friends and benefactors. These "Hotels des Ouvriers" are established by the clergy preferably in industrial centres where socialism flour-
ishes. This sort of Catholic action against socialism is very effective. The Belgium Socialists are not a little affected by it.

In Austria, in Italy, in France, etc., the Clericals organise among the laborers mutual benefit associations and savings banks wherever they are most needed. These and many other institutions of a provident nature, all with a character purely confessional, constitute an attraction for the laboring classes, and unites and organises them around the Clerical agitators. And to-day when the middle classes of Europe, who are comparatively uneducated and not in a condition to understand the conditions of their social environment, and are growing more and more sceptical in regard to existing political institutions, which political corruption has weakened more and more, these middle classes, which constitute the majority of the active part of the European population, confronted by the progress of Socialism, which threatens its most vital interests, even its very existence, see no other escape than to return to the Church, that is, to fall in with the Clerical reaction; forgetting the terrible oppression which they suffered under the ancien régime, forgetting that the revolution of '89 and the destruction of that odious anti-labor system was its own work. This middle class seems to remember of that old order only the peaceful times and the stability of its social organisation. Because the Church was then in power, they attribute to it and the religious sentiment the quietism and social stability of the time. And since they wish only to enjoy in peace the relative comfort which France has secured for them, they see the Italy of other days in the re-establishment of the Catholic power and in the environment of what they call the religious sentiment. They therefore not only show themselves devoted and obsequious to the Church of Rome, but they also cooperate with it in its attempt to regain its power. The action of the Catholics, in fact, is to-day understood even by the Vatican as a barrier against invading Socialism. At Milan at the recent elections when the choice was between the Socialists and the Monarchists, and the result very uncertain, the Clericals, disregarding the orders of the Pope, voted for the monarchist candidate. This shows that the Clericalism of the middle class is not inspired by hatred toward monarchy, but by their fear of Socialism. At Vienna the bitterest rivalry is not between the Clericals and the Liberals, but between the Clericals and the Socialists, and the Clericals are always declaring that the great social struggle now accentuated, and more and more defining itself, is between the Clericals and the Socialists.
Those who are favored by the present social order cry out against the dangers of Clericalism. There is nothing strange about that, for the Clerical movement has nothing Utopian about it, and nothing of the absurd abstractions of the socialistic movement, and is therefore all the more threatening. While a well-balanced and average mind cannot believe in the triumph of Socialism itself, it must at the same time be convinced that Clericalism is not a phantasm, nor a giant of the type that Don Quixote imagined in order to give himself the illusion of a fight. The Clerical movement should be understood as one of the various reactions now manifesting themselves against the evils of modern European society. The Clericals say "Liberalism has failed and gone to pieces," and in affirming this of Liberals they are perfectly right. As a matter of fact democracy was instituted in the last century under the weight of the enormous social products of the old régime, a social system parasitical and odious in the extreme. All the victims of this régime, instigated by the increase of evils which oppressed them, and by the identity of those which they lamented and by the similarity of their conditions in this régime of social spoliation joined themselves together. Persons with very different ideas and aspirations thus found themselves in a single class, a class without very definite limits, and without a well determined programme, but in agreement as to the necessity of ridding themselves of the clergy and nobility who exhausted their substance and paralysed their activity. If there was one idea in common among these people who constituted what is called democracy, that idea was a spirit of intolerance toward the aristocracy and the clergy, coupled with the desire for political and economical liberty. Democracy was synonymous with Liberalism.

Now the prominent fact in the social evolution of Europe during this century, a fact which constitutes its principal characteristic, is the continuous ascendancy which Democracy has attained in all countries. The democratisation of all the instincts of all social life is the most salient feature of social evolution in Europe during our century. Only Turkey and a part of Prussia have not participated in this general democratic movement. Little by little in all European countries democracy has attained political power. In England it gained its first great triumph. This triumph was in the extension of political suffrage sanctioned by the electoral reform of 1832. After acquiring the power it succeeded in 1846 in securing the adoption of its liberal programme, a programme of economic liberty. For twenty-five years at least the English Dem-
ocratic party has preserved intact those principles of liberty for which it was formed and for which it has gloriously struggled. The effect of this has been the development of an economic power and the formation of that moral character of the English people which has not even a distant rival in the people of any other country of Europe. In other European countries Democracy having acquired political power, the simple fact of having acquired that power is called political liberty. The large social class which calls itself the democracy, was formed and organised only as a manifestation of protest against that régime which despoiled it. Democracy ought, then, to aspire to a conquest of political power only as a means of sanctioning the abolition of that régime of social spoliation. The true scope of Democracy is precisely the abolition of that régime restrictive of all individual liberty and sanctioned by the exercise of social spoliation, and it ought to establish a just and most generous system of liberty. But having gained the power, Democracy in all the continental countries of Europe forgets its scope and limits itself to establishing an appearance of political and economic liberty. Even this appearance of liberty has been swept away by the reaction brought about by the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 and the other lesser causes of the decade preceding. This war fomented the spirit of nationality and patriotism, and therefore encouraged among European people a spiteful and ruinous spirit of exclusivism. Meanwhile the political power of the principal nations of Europe has been monopolised by autocrats and imperialists of the extremist type, grasping and aggressive beyond expression, as for instance, Thiers of France and Bismarck of Germany. Thiers was at one time President of the French Republic and its Prime Minister. He occupied himself with the minutest details of the administration of war. The army of Paris could not make a movement without his orders. All dispatches passed under his eyes. Thiers wished to know every minute the exact condition of France, as well as that of Europe. Jules Simon, a member of the Government under Thiers, has the following to say concerning him: "While Jules Favre was Minister of Foreign Affairs, Thiers made him live near him in order that he might hear all the news as soon as possible. Thiers, every day, has conferences with the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Finance, etc. He has the Governor of the Bank of France, the principal financiers, etc., coming to him continually." It is well known that Bismarck used to go so far as to take charge directly
of the subsidies of the political journals, which he dispensed with

great profusion.

These are the men who interfere with and paralyse the pro-
gramme of European Democracy. Moved by their imperialistic
and autocratic tendencies these men, such as Bismarck, Thiers,
etc., find themselves at one in their effort to increase the function
of the state, and they extend this action of the state into all
branches of social activity and interfere with laws, regulations,
and with most forms of protection, etc. It is to the work of
M. Thiers or Bismarck, who were soon aped by lesser politicians
of Europe, that the modern state has become the goddess which
decides everything for its citizens, an ideal such as Carl Marx pro-
posed. The modern state dispenses to the various social classes,
or groups of economic interests, various forms of protection which,
however, result in damage to all other citizens. But in order to
obtain this governmental protection it is necessary that the various
groups of interests, or the social classes, avail themselves of the
government. Deputy Waldeck-Rousseau, mentioned for the pres-
idency of the French Republic, recently at a reunion of industrials
and merchants, made a speech in which he advised them to min-
gle actively in the politics of France, to organise a party, to send
representatives to Parliament, in a word, to protect themselves
rather than to implore the protection of others. Not that the in-
dustrials and merchants are entirely absent from the Parliament,
but they are very far from having the numerical strength which
they possess in the parliaments of other countries. The French
agriculturists have known how to obtain in the Parliament an agra-
rian or protectionalist majority. "It is now the turn of the mer-
chant and industrialist," says Waldeck-Rousseau. "We shall then
no longer see the administration and republican press presenting a
diminution of the tax on real estate as a reform measure, while
they forget to tell the landholder to give with his left hand some-
thing of what he has taken with his right."

In the modern social organisation, the "State," is the principal
organ of social protection. It is the "State" which dispenses fa-
vors and the various forms of protection to these social classes and
groups of interests which know how to ask for them and to obtain
them. The modern State has become much more powerful and
much more autocratic than was that of the ancien régime. It is
quite natural that the Clericals should organise and co-ordinate
their forces for the conquest of political power, just as do other
groups of interests and other social classes; and as do in a more
explicit way the Marxian Socialists who make the conquest of political power their sole expedient for realising their social programme.

All this the Clericals now perfectly understand, after a long period during which they hardly knew how to get their bearings in the new social environment created by the evolution of this century.

In the treaty between France and Sweden, at Westphalia, the princes, through the influence of the aphorism "One Country, One Religion," acquired the horrible right of imposing upon all their subjects their own religion. Today, however, the Clericals understand that neither treaty nor princes are any longer necessary to win the conquest of political power. The so-called Liberals cry out against Clerical danger, but the Clerical danger arose only when the principles of Liberalism were perverted, and when the State made itself a monster of activity which interfered with and controlled every action, individual and social, and practised tyranny which could not have been exercised by Cromwell or Louis XI.

The Clerical reaction, like the socialistic, is a necessary result of the perversion of the idea of the function of the modern State. The modern State which should have a safeguard of justice and individual liberty dissipates itself in a multiplicity of functions, in which, however, it shows the greatest aptitude, in fact its action is manifested in continuous offences against justice and individual liberty. So today the various governments of European States are subservient to group interests and social classes which make use of it to the damage of all the rest of society, just as the Clericals wish to do for their own advantage. Consequently the Clericals are at work, and there exists, and it is accentuating itself more and more in the various European countries, that movement which is called the Clerical reaction. By Clerical reaction must be understood the endeavor of the Clericals to obtain political power. To the so-called Liberalists, frightened by the advance of the Clerical tide, one may rightly say: "C'est toi qui l'a voulu, Georges Dandin."

Without a perversion of the conception of the State and its function a Clerical reaction following the downfall of the ancien régime would never have been possible. A true obstacle, the only one possible to the rising tide of Clericalism, is a well understood liberalism which gives to each individual his liberty, and which relieves him from slavery to the State.