# Leo XIII and the Gods of Revolution

**(Rev Fr) Patrick Ford († 31-10-1996)**

An historical study of the rise of the socio-economic ethic in the Catholic Church.

*This work is a grateful tribute to the memory of Frederic Ozanam, a devout and dedicated adversary of the Gods of Revolution, and a founder of the Catholic Social Movement. He was as much a Christian apologist in the gilded halls of the Sorbonne, as he was an apostle of charity in the dark hovels of Paris' poor.*

Elizabeth Carey, Fisher Library, University of Sydney;

Hans Arns, Veech Librarian, St Patrick's College, Manly;

Rev A Caruana, St Paul's Seminary, Kensington.

## CONTENTS

**Preface**

**Part I: The Gods of Revolution**

1. **Revolution**
2. **The Second Reformation**
3. **Men are born free and equal**
4. **The Revolution assaults the Church – *The Dark Goddess***
5. **The Revolution destroys the Monarchy – *The Exterminating Angel***
6. **The Revolution destroys its founders – *Saturn Devours His Children***
7. **Reaction: Empire and Romanticism**
8. **Frederic Ozanam**
9. ***"The Two Camps"***
10. **Joseph Gorres – *A Sorcerer, His Magic Circle***
11. **Karl Marx – *"I hate all the Gods"***
12. **The Occupation of Rome**
13. **Lassalle and Ketteler**
14. **The Divine Natural Law**

**Part II: Leo XIII withstands the Revolution**

15. **Revolution: Political**
16. **Revolution: Socio-Economic**
17. ***Rerum Novarum***

# Appendix

## Footnotes and References

(intended to accompany each page of text)

### Preface

15th May, 2002 marks the 111th anniversary of Leo XIII's encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. Notice of an event so much in the remote past may prompt the thought that this document is no more than history. But it is much more. It is the pivot of two hundred years of papal comment on the problems of society. It is, on the one hand, the bottom line of papal comment on the politico-economic revolution of the nineteenth century and, on the other, it is the foundation document of papal teaching on the socio-economic problem of the last 100 years.

Leo XIII tells of the French Revolution and its effects upon his Church, as its multifaceted story unfolds over a century. That record reveals for him the source of the socio-economic problem of his day, which was the concern of *Rerum Novarum*.

Leo saw in that revolution something that was superficially political, but in its roots a development of the eighteenth century philosophy of the Enlightenment. The latter was a confident doctrine that claimed to replace religion and authority with reason and science. Leo thus took stock of a political revolution in which monarchy fought a century-long rearguard action against various forms of republicanism, the children of the Enlightenment.

The Pontiff accordingly saw in this Revolution something more than an attempt to change the temporal order. Its objective was equally to replace the traditional Christian religious order with a new secular or state religion. Two examples from many suffice to illustrate this. Hébert crowned an actress in Notre Dame as a symbol of the new supremacy, Godless reason. Robespierre chose instead a form of Deism which was no less a substitute for the traditional Christian God.

These leaders, their predecessors, Voltaire and Rousseau, and their successors, Babeuf, Blanc and Marx, came easily to be known by eminent writers such as Christopher Dawson as the Gods of Revolution. But the French Revolution, Leo saw, was no less intent on changing the socio-economic order as it created a free market economy. The socialists saw this as a betrayal of the revolutionary ideal of equality and opposed it.

The Catholic Social Movement, an international development entered the contest and attacked both capitalist and socialist.

Corresponding to these ideological struggles there were creative historical personalities in both secular and Christian spheres. In the latter were Ozanam and Ketteler – to mention only the most prominent of the fore-runners of Leo XIII.

The nineteenth century thus saw the philosophy of history play host to Revolution – the Gods of Revolution – a reality that evoked a very vigorous response from Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum*. 15 May should not be allowed to pass without recalling this history-making document. *Leo XIII and the Gods of Revolution* is a modest endeavour o this end.

## Part I: The Gods of Revolution

### Chapter 1

### Revolution

Irene Pivetti, speaker in Italy's Parliament, has said that the French revolution represents "*the start of the gulags*". – The London ***Times***, 24 February 1995.

The French Revolution is probably best known as an episode of history that brought to an end the

centuries-old French monarchy and the greater part of its nobility. Its earliest enthusiasts had no such intention or expectation. The English poet, Wordsworth, expressed their euphoria. “Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive. But to be young was very Heaven.” They aspired to a monarchy that would be an integral and abiding part of a democratic constitution.

This enthusiasm soon gave way to successive waves of dissenters, who preferred, first, a revolutionary kingless democracy, and finally, a revolutionary dictatorship, borne on the back of extreme violence and bloodshed. The republican or liberal democratic ideal had, obviously, many obstacles to overcome as it battled those recurring waves of change and violence. In the end, it prevailed, but there were some unexpected developments.

Some revolutionary enthusiasts broke away from the liberal democratic line and became the precursors of modern socialism. Indeed, the revolution produced the twin realities of republicanism and socialism. But there were casualties. Both early republicans and early socialists perished at the hands of the revolution’s own creation, the guillotine.

The traditional French Church, the Catholic Church, which was the monarchy’s Church, suffered grievously in these waves of revolution. The entire Catholic Church experienced this fate as the revolution extended to all Europe. It took time to recover, and it was only after a century of upheaval that it produced a leader, Leo XIII, gifted enough to withstand revolution, republican and socialist, and lead his Church into the new liberal-socialist age with a teaching that was tradition-based but adequate to the times.

Leo XIII is one of the great popes of modern times. He ruled at the end of a century of revolution, that had been launched in the late eighteenth century. Its political phase was launched with the spectacular Declaration of the Rights of Man in Paris 1789-1791; and its industrial expression took rise in the correspondingly unspectacular, almost unobserved, invention of the steam engine in 1782 in England.

Indeed Leo (1810-1903) had lived through and felt the sting of much of that revolution. France, in his lifetime, had been an empire (under Napoleon I), a kingdom tending towards a nullification of the principles of 1789 (under the restored Bourbons), a kingdom with a pseudo-acceptance of 1789 (under the citizen-king Louis Philippe), a republic dedicated to 1789, an absolutist empire once again (under Napoleon III) and finally, a republic for a third time. Leo, who spent most of his life in peasant Italy, was probably not so conscious of the technological revolution which took off in England as the Industrial Revolution. But time altered this as that revolution gradually extended, during Leo’s lifetime, to continental Europe. The invention of the steam engine, the application of steam to machine and cotton industry, the new coal-using metallurgy, railways and factories – all gradually substituted a new urban industrial order for the former peasant economy. And there were social consequences. An extremely productive mode of economy, rich in goods and capital, was driven by the capitalist or bourgeois class with its philosophy of economic liberalism. It generated a new antagonistic class, the proletariat, with its philosophy of socialism.

It has been well said that “Leo XIII led the Catholic Church into a world which had risen from revolution.” [1] Much of the Church’s response to that revolution, Leo, as Pope, developed in a series of encyclicals. It is proposed here to examine those encyclicals under one aspect only, their incidental reference to revolution.

Leo became Pope in February 1878, and was met by the revolution in a series of incidents on his own very doorstep. Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), after years of revolutionary activity in Prussia and Austria, was handed over to the Russians who sent him to Siberia. He escaped in 1861, clashed with Marx and Engels in the First International (1869-1872), and participated in anarchist revolts in Lyons (1870) and Spain (1873). His influence extended to Italy; and in the Romagna, Venetia and Naples, it assumed a thoroughly nihilistic character. It sought the abolition of the state, the Church, property and every form of magistracy, by any and every means. It was an oft-quoted Bakunin claim that “the passion for destruction was a constructive passion.”

The trend to anarchism took on a more serious mien for the new Pope when some of his clergy took part in an insurrection in the nearby province of Benevento. This was the area in which he had

commenced his career in 1838 as delegate of the Pope, and in which he had been vigorously active in putting down brigandage and the Carbonari. The renewal of similar, if not worse, crimes there could not but incense him. At the assizes of Capua in 1878 among the thirty seven anarchists on trial were two parish priests. They had marched under a red-and-black flag with fellow insurgents who had not hesitated to throw dynamite into a church full of worshippers. [2]

Leo's response was an encyclical whose English title was *Socialism, Communism and Nihilism* (28 December 1878).[3] It deals with a novel situation wherein an alliance in the general sense, of socialists, communists and nihilists has become a revolutionary social movement, and was everywhere organised as a political party with the avowed purpose of uprooting the foundations of civilised society at large. That movement had its origin in the principles of 1789; and it had been given no little prominence in other incidents similar to those at Benevento. On 13 March 1881, Tsar Alexander II was assassinated in his own capital city. Nihilists were responsible. The revulsion caused by this incident was only intensified in Rome by an attempted act of desecration. In May 1881, the body of Pius IX was being carried in funeral procession for reburial in the cemetery of San Lorenzo, when it was set upon by a group of revolutionaries who almost succeeded in throwing the body into the Tiber.[4]

The encyclical *Diuturnum Illud,* 29 June 1881, (not translated into English) was Leo's response to these incidents. Lengthier by a third than *Socialism, Communism and Nihilism,* it continued its theme. To make authority a product of the people's decision was to give rulership a foundation that was altogether too slender and too unstable. Such theories encouraged all that was most volatile and least subordinate in the people; and when they were popularised they had to increase the danger of blind tumults and rebellion. These theories were embraced by the leaders of the Reformation and were accompanied, especially in Germany, by rebellion. "From that heresy there issued in the last century, the falsely styled philosophy and the so-called 'new jurisprudence', the rule of the people, and that license which knows no bounds which is all that many people understand by liberty." From these have come the last of all the plagues, communism, socialism and nihilism.[5]

The specific subject of political revolution, Leo took up in an encyclical entitled *Immortale Dei,* 1 November 1885.[6] It has been named one of the three most important encyclicals produced by him. The other two were *Aeterni Patris,* August 1879, and *Rerum Novarum* on the socio-economic revolution in May 1891. It refers to the "new jurisprudence" already mentioned in *Diuturnum Illud,* and asks the origin of these theories. It lay, it said, in the rage for novelty, in the ideas and ideals, which reached its climax in the sixteenth century. This passion for change threw into confusion the Christian religion, invaded the precincts of philosophy, spread them into all classes of society, and it has finally shown itself in all its unbridled license of the succession of revolutions from 1789 onwards.

The successive revolutions were visibly, if bitterly, brought to the Pope's attention in the erection of a monument in the Campo dei Fiori (Rome) to Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), a Dominican, who had been burnt at the stake for heresy. The monument was erected near the Palazzo della Cancellaria which belonged to the Pope and had been placed at the disposal of the *Consulta* (Consultative Assembly) granted by Pius IX in 1847 and which had been the scene of the assassination of his Premier, Rossi, in 1848. In the subsequent Roman Republic the Cancellaria was taken over by Mazzini and Garibaldi. After their fall, it returned to the Pope. The provocative nature of the ceremony of protest and mockery, in the shadow of the Cancellaria, was heightened by its display of flags – the red of revolution, the black of anarchism and the green for Freemasonry.[7] The Pope was shaken by the event: a man of prayer he spent that day on his knees. After these demonstrations in 1889 at the unveiling of the Giordano Bruno memorial, papal asylum outside Italy was considered and Spain favoured.

Similar departures had been considered already in 1881-82 and 1888, and would be examined again in 1891.[8] The pressure of revolution on Leo in the 80s was obviously quite sustained.

The doctrines impugned in Leo's encyclicals had as their authors, to mention only a few, Voltaire, Rousseau and Marx. Voltaire had been the recent subject of provocative publicity. The centenary of his death, 30 May 1878, was celebrated in France, and at the behest of the Grand Orient, a national subscription had printed thousands of his most impious works.[9] In this historical context, it was

normal enough that Leo, when he addressed the socio-economic problem, should regard it as one expression of revolution. There has, however, been controversy in this matter. Some translations of the opening words of his encyclical, *Rerum Novarum,* have reflected local conditions. Others have gone much further. For example “The translation into German and its distortions (Herder edition) are interesting”.[10]

Translations varying with circumstances emphasise the necessity of clearly distinguishing the versions from which they came. The original version in Italian, which was not for publication, was translated into Latin by the papal translator, and became the official version. From this the *Osservatore Romano* made the official Italian version on 23 May 1891. What did the papal translator mean by the words *Rerum Novarum*? Dr Smith’s *Latin-English Dictionary,* under the heading *res novae* of which *rerum novarum* is the genitive, [11] lists a number of texts of late Republican authors, which must be considered. They are as follows:

CAESAR, *The Gallic War* Bk 1, 9 ‘*novis rebus studebat*’, translated, ‘He was anxious for revolution’: Bk 1, 18 ‘*cupidus* rerum novarum’, translated, ‘desired revolution’.[12]

SALLUST, *The War with Cataline* XVIII, 4 ‘*novarum rerum cupida’*, translated, ‘ripe for revolution’.[13]

CICERO, *De Lege Agraria 11,* XXXIII, 91 ‘*Rerum novarum causam quaererent*’, translated, ‘seek some excuse for revolution’.[14]

These texts speak for themselves. *Res Novae/Rerum Novarum* mean revolution. (For further discussion on this matter see Appendix.)

There is further first class authority for translating *rerum novarum*, revolution. Philip Hughes, in his work *The Popes’ New Order* (1943), produced a learned commentary on thirty social encyclicals from Leo XIII to Pius XII. In his treatment of *Rerum Novarum,* he writes: “Leo XIII begins by saying that revolution, so long felt in political life, has now passed into the world’s social life”.[15]

Thus both text, and immediate historical context, the 1880s, testify to the concept of revolution in the words *Rerum Novarum*. The remote historical context, one hundred years of European Revolution, political and industrial, only substantiates the claim that Leo, in his encyclicals, addressed not only revolution but its basis, the new jurisprudence and their authors, the Gods of Revolution.

The historical context of Leo’s encyclicals – a hundred years of European revolution – provides for them not only a vivid backdrop but also a convincing *raison d’être*. France, late seventeenth century, was at the zenith of its national prestige, and enjoyed the political and intellectual hegemony of Europe. There had been success at arms and diplomacy and this was reflected in the splendour of the court at Versailles. Economic life was organised on national lines, and French literature and art were, under royal patronage, at unprecedented levels of accomplishment and quality. All this had been fostered and brought to brimming reality under the extensive and impressive structure of an absolute monarch.

But there were blemishes. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1662) compromised religious freedom in an endeavour to subdue French Protestantism. It provoked an angry international reaction as Huguenots fled to England, Holland and elsewhere. A similar royal intervention was experienced by the Catholic Church. The Holy See in 1515 was indebted to the King of France for restoring to it the city of Milan. A consequent Concordat of 1516 gave the King of France the right to nominate bishops and abbots – a concession, made under duress – that practically terminated papal function in France, save by grace of the King.[16] Louis XIV emphasised this situation in the Four Gallican Articles, unilaterally decreed, in 1682. Article 4, e.g., that papal decrees, even in questions of faith, were not irreformable unless the consent of the whole Church had been given it.[17] This was a noted example of the centuries-old effort of the French Church to establish its independence from papal authority. Though the Pope had declared these Articles null and void, they continued to be taught in French seminaries. It was not the intention of the King to destroy the Church but to make it part of the machinery of the new bureaucratic state and to limit its role to education where it would produce useful and obedient citizens. The euphemism for this practice was enlightened despotism. In so linking Church and state, royalty placed the Church in a vulnerable position. Revolt against the state would

necessarily involve revolt against the Church.

In response to these and other examples of the intrusion of the absolute state, freedom of expression sought an outlet in the houses of some nobles and the salons of great ladies, where courtiers and men of letters could meet on equal terms. Here the atmosphere was easy going and light-hearted with an undercurrent of epicurean and libertine thought. [18] It produced a little group of amateur philosophers who had few convictions, but an appetite for the pleasures of life. They forsook despotism for enlightenment – secular enlightenment – which came to be called liberalism. "Voltaire wrote of the ensuing time as the 'pleasant period of the Regency when folly jingled its bells and skipped light-footed throughout France, and people did anything and everything except penance.'." [19]

The Enlightenment had its origin in the sixteenth century Reformation – the first great European Revolution. Its forerunner, the Italian Renaissance, already active in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was a revolt against the barbarism of Northern Germany and a return to the purity of classical culture. The German Reformation was a revolt from what it labelled Europe's medieval superstition to the purity of the Gospel.

The seventeenth century brought a new and different revolution that was to break new ground and create modern rationalism. Aristotle had emphasised the pre-eminence of reason but had linked it to the senses and imagination of man. But a revolution was sparked when René Descartes (1596-1656) divorced the human mind as a thinking substance, from any dependence or relation to the body and all with which it is bound up. The human reason is independent of experience or authority, he argued, and is able to deduce an absolutely certain and complete knowledge from the clear and distinct ideas which are innate to its own being. These it comprehends by a direct act of intuition – inerrant intuition. All former knowledge and culture of Europe was to be set aside, and former experience with other minds to be jettisoned as uncertain, because an admixture of truth and error. Instead a new knowledge with the certitude of mathematics was to be sought which would be derived from the infallible light of human reason.

The infallibility of human reason produced an extraordinarily revolutionary effect on the thought of the age. It brought into being abstract ideas such as Reason, Science, Progress and Civilisation, the idols of the new age.

John Locke (1632-1704), an admirer of Descartes, shared his enthusiasm for reason but rejected his innate ideas, preferring empiricism-experience, sensation and reflection. He was a leading contributor to the fashionable English doctrine of Deism, which retained a God: where there was a watch, there had to be a watchmaker. But that God never interfered in human affairs and exacted no act of faith. Supreme Being, it embraced all creeds without distinction, and, if it imposed a religion, it was a natural religion. For revelation it substituted the infallibility of reason, and for providence, a mechanistic law of nature. It replaced the moral law with practical philanthropy; and for eternal life as the goal of human endeavour, it substituted moral perfectibility and the indefinite progress of the human race.

It is not difficult to see how Deism found corporate expression in Freemasonry, a new, international society, for whom God was the great architect of the universe. This body was an oath-bound secret society, which developed in Protestant countries but was not confined to them. In the first quarter of the eighteenth century, it progressed in the general reaction against religion that followed the death of Louis XIV (1643-1715) and gained a stronghold in France. Thence it spread to Spain, and the Spanish Kingdom of Naples. "While it is true that Freemasonry created a suitable climate for the idea of a 'natural religion', one which frees man from submission to a Church, no respectable historian will defend the assertion that in the lodges of the eighteenth century there existed a systematic conspiracy against the Church." [20]

Concurrently with this development of its Deism, England eliminated its monarch for Cromwell's Puritan Commonwealth. But this revolution was reversed late in the century by the restoration of a monarchy that was now limited by parliament. Locke, the philosopher of this restoration, has been said to have substituted the divine right of the majority for the divine right of Kings.

In the eighteenth century, France took over these developments towards a religion of nature and a

modification of monarchy, and took them to extravagant lengths. The new philosophers regarded the traditional social and religious order as an antiquated Gothic structure which had to be replaced by a new edifice, constructed on Descartes' *tabula rasa* of human reason, that is, those rational principles suited to the needs of an enlightened society. [21]

The second Reformation, in reaction to absolute monarchy and enlightened despotism, was aspiring to a new liberalism, partly by way of a return to Renaissance and Reformation, but mainly by way of a step forward into the new modern philosophy.

## Chapter 2

## The Second Reformation

"*It is no accident that the age which saw the end of French Protestantism was followed by the age of philosophic enlightenment; indeed the latter may be regarded as a second Reformation that carried the revolt against authority and tradition from the sphere of theology to that of secular culture." – Dawson,* ***The Gods of Revolution***, p.22

The greatest publicist of the Enlightenment was Voltaire who was one of the greatest propagandists ever. He was a child of the liberation society of the Regency which made a cult of pleasure and success. His early life of dissipation flawed the legal studies he had commenced when he left a Jesuit college in Paris. Escape from these distractions was sought for him in a post with the French Ambassador in Holland, but an intrigue there sent him home in disgrace. Literature was his choice, and he brought to it a ready wit and a gift of satire. When this skill, however, was directed at the Orleanist Regent, he was committed to the Bastille. A similar misadventure overtook him a little later, and he escaped from the Bastille this time only on condition he accept banishment to England. Here he found his philosophic vocation in a society that was the direct antithesis of all he had known in France. The King had no control over the legislature or the administration of justice; freedom of thought and expression existed in both political and religious matters. This was the world of English Deists and Whig supremacy, and this Voltaire ascribed to the new philosophy of Newton and Locke. It was to become the basis of his own philosophic propaganda in France. "From Plato to Locke", he modestly observed, "there is nothing". [1]

The universal reign of science and reason was to replace that of religion and authority. [2] Yet Voltaire found something more radical than English Deism in the irreligion, indifferentism to all religions, and anticlericalism of the Italian Renaissance. He had rejected medieval Latin, medieval religion and Scholasticism, but in the return of the Renaissance to classical Rome, he saw the values of the *Pax Romana* [3]. One side of it was the imposition of peace by arms, the other was the tolerance of its Pantheon with its Minerva, Apollo, Cybele, Isis and Mithra, to mention some only of its Gods. Such indifference of religion indicated for Voltaire a revival of human intelligence. This was the one item in that benighted period from Plato to Locke he was prepared to accept. Nor did the assassinations ad poisonings of the Renaissance period disturb him. They were distasteful but necessary for the progress of reason. The French revolutionaries of the Great Terror, Marat excepted, could and did claim Voltaire as their mentor. [4]

Despite this radicalism, there was a conservative side to Voltaire. On his return to France, he formed an intimacy with Madame du Chateler in 1734 and made her husband's chateau in Champagne their home. He was, however, in no way dependent. He had already laid the foundation of his great wealth by speculative and judicious purchase of shares. His preference, consequently, was for property, order and the competitive individualism of English economic and social life.

It was during this period that he produced his *Louis XIV,* in which he defended that King's reign as the greatest age of France or any other nation. This amounted to a preference for authoritarian liberalism based on a union of government and intelligentsia. The inconsistency implicit in this position was a characteristic of Voltaire which did not embarrass him or reduce his influence among his followers. On the contrary, he dominated his age and was known as the King. [5]

Acclaim for him arose from his ability to read the popular currents of thought and events, and

sympathise with the feelings that marked the liberation society of his day.

He contributed to a mammoth work of thirty-five volumes called the *Encyclopaedia*. It was to examine and illuminate everything ‘from the infinitely small to the infinitely great’. The Atlas to carry this bible of the Brave New World, which was published between 1751 and 1780, was Denis Diderot (1718-1784). He had abandoned the theists for atheism, became a militant atheist, and made man the centre of the universe. These ideas subtly coloured the *Encyclopaedia,* as it became the engine of war of the philosophers. The *Encyclopaedia* met early opposition, particularly from the Jesuits, Diderot’s old schoolmasters, and was condemned by the *Parlement de Paris* in 1759.

The *Parlement de Paris,* however, was to be the undoing of the Jesuits. This came about very much through the Jansenists, who were strong in the *Parlements* (judicial bodies), and had an abiding antipathy for the Jesuits. Ironically, they brought unexpected Catholic support to the Deists and philosophers.

The Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola in 1540, was to be a new spiritual society that would reflect not only the individualism characteristic of the age, but equally the strictness and rigour of military discipline and authority. It would pay high tribute to academic excellence too. All this was to create a first class defence force for the Holy See.

A contemporary of the Council of Trent, the Society made the propagation of its ideals of reform, its own special mission. One ideal was that at every Mass, all present receive Holy Communion, the effect of which was to purify man of venial sin and strengthen him against mortal sin. This practice of frequent communion was a reform to which not only the Jesuits, but other leaders, such as St Charles Borromeo and St Philip Neri, also subscribed. But it met opposition from Jansenism, a ‘Calvinist’ Catholicism, in the person of Cornelius Jansen, a former professor at Louvain and for a time, Bishop of Ypres (1635-1638). He had developed a deep aversion for the Jesuits and set out to oppose them. His book, *Augustinus,* was published by supporters after his death. Its topic was divine grace and free will. In brief outline, it proposed divine grace, that is, predestination, for some – a tiny minority – and that a practice of the free will, like frequent communion, was futile. Jansen’s work was condemned by the Holy See in 1641-42. But Jansenism in France had become an organised faction, elitist in nature, of priests, nuns and layfolk; all well connected, wealthy and influential. Controversy continued for a hundred years on the relation of free will and grace, the function of the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist; and, in view of the repeated reference of Jansenism to Rome and its censure there, the relationship of papacy and national hierarchy. Inevitably this raised the question of the extent of papal primacy and its control of the Church in France. In 1682, Louis XIV addressed the latter question through the Assembly of the Clergy, a body that met every five years and had a Paris representative in the *Agence Generale.*

He had it declare: “(1) that neither the Popes nor Church have any power over temporal princes as such; they cannot be deposed nor their subjects released from their oath of allegiance; (2) the decrees of Constance (1414) on the superiority of the General Council to the Pope still hold good; (3) the papal primacy must be exercised with due consideration for the customs of local Churches; (4) the papal decrees, in matters of faith, are not irreformable until the whole Church has signified its assent to them” [6] These are the famous Four Articles of 1682. Their significance lay in their explicit, formal assertion of anti-Roman and pro-regal teaching. Dominicans and Jesuits both opposed them. But Jansenists were to play on them. This became clear when Cardinal Noailles, Archbishop of Paris (1708), approved a work that the Pope later censured as Jansenist. In 1713, he countered Jesuit opposition to the Jansenists, by forbidding Jesuits to preach or function in his diocese. He was called to withdraw his approval but refused. In 1717 he appealed, with several others, to a future council relying on the second Article and its reference to the Council of Constance. A year later, the appellants were excommunicated. The cardinal’s conflict with the Holy See was only terminated in 1728, on the occasion of his submission, shortly before his death. [7]

This highly public conflict was taken up by the Parlements, and particularly by the most famous of them, the *Parlement de Paris*. There, regalist and Jansenist lawyers saw in the controversy an opportunity to resist an alleged papal encroachment in the internal discipline of French Catholicism.

The death of Noailles did mark the end of Jansenism as an organised thing. But it survived as a spirit in individuals and in the *Parlements*. For the present, it inspired and encouraged in the long fight now to begin, about the suppression of the Jesuits in France. "Voltaire wrote to his friend d'Argental: 'Jesuits and Jansenists continue to tear each other to shreds; we must fire on them while they are biting each other.' And a little later he wrote to Helvetius: 'Would it not be fair and reasonable to suggest that by strangling the last Jesuit with the intestines of the last Jansenist the whole matter would have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion.' " [8] But Jansenists did survive and in the longer term, they would play a critical role in 1789 in the affairs of the States General.

The occasion for the suppression of the Jesuits in France was the financial failure of a mission in Martinique. Mission cargoes were captured by English vessels at the opening of the Seven Years War (1756). The principal creditor appealed for payments to the Jesuit Procurator for Missions. The reply was that responsibility lay with each house of the Society, in this case, with Martinique. The creditor sued in the French courts which found in his favour. The Jesuits appealed to the *Parlement de Paris,* where for a hundred years there had sat the most influential of their foes. Their appeal was rejected, with costs and damages. Furthermore, the court took the opportunity of instituting an official enquiry into what sort of thing the Society was. During 1761, every accusation ever made against the Jesuits was re-examined and broadcast. In the course of these matters, the Abbé de Chauvelin, a member of the Kings Grande Chambre, and a notorious Jansenist, denounced the Society's constitution as contrary to the laws of France, since the members placed obedience to the Pope above loyalty to the King. [9]

In April, 1762, the Parlement decided that the Society should be suppressed. The final decision lay with the King. It has been said that he was influenced by his mistress, Madame Pompadour, whose adultery the Jesuit confessor had refused to condone. [10] But this has been disputed. [11] The King's words were well chosen: "I have not myself any cordial love for the Jesuits, but all the heretics have always detested them. I say no more on that point. For the peace of my realm, if I expel them against my inclinations, I will not, at any rate, have it believed that I agree with all that the *Parlements* have done and said against them … I say no more or I should say too much." [12]

The suppression of the Jesuits had already taken place in Portugal. It now spread to Spain and Naples. Daniel-Rops' judgement on the acquiescent role of the Papacy in the suppression is severe. "The whole history of the Papacy can show no other example of such craven cowardice." [13]

Voltaire had followed the campaign against the Jesuits with interest. "When we have destroyed the Jesuits", he wrote in 1761 to a friend, "we shall have easy work with the infamy", i.e., the Catholic Church. [14]

*Ecrasez l'Infame* (trample down abuse): this had long been Voltaire's battle cry against the Catholic Church. About 1760, there was in Voltaire, according to Paul Hazard, a "hardening … his opposition to Christianity grew stronger, more exacerbated; it was becoming an obsession … whatever the feelings of hostility which possessed him as a young man, he now whipped to a frenzy; the thing became a mania … he took on a more than human aspect; he was – the word is Diderot's – the Antichrist … But to that extreme, a part at any rate of Europe declined to follow him, beholding in him now nothing but the 'genius of hate' He was losing his friends, he was at last coming to inspire them with fear". [14]

Voltaire had already lost some of his appeal because of an elitism that favoured the intelligentsia. The Enlightenment was not for all. "We have never pretended," he wrote, "to enlighten shoemakers and servant girls, that is the portion of the Apostles." [15] This illustrated a repellent heartlessness in the leaders of the Enlightenment that caused a reaction against it. The dictatorship of reason had to give way to a new religion – that of the heart. Rousseau supplied this and supplanted Voltaire who regarded him as a charlatan and a traitor to the philosophical cause. [16] The blackened Rousseau nonetheless was to outshine the brightest light of the Enlightenment.

Rousseau was a Genevan Protestant, who, after inadequate preparation, became a Catholic, and then an extreme liberal. He retained warm links with the Catholic clergy he had known, but taught the classical indifferentism of the Deists that all religions were acceptable, except the uncompromising

Catholic Church. His principles were Deist. God is good but unknowable. Nor was there divine Revelation. God's law reveals itself in conscience. The soul was immortal, but while eternal life was the reward of virtue, there was no eternal punishment. This was natural religion, based on sentiment and the heart rather than on reason. Rousseau broke new ground when he argued that the ills and the evils of society were not due to the Original Sin of Christian doctrine or to man's own ignorance and sin. They arose from natural causes – social injustice and the corruption of an artificial civilisation. This called for a return to nature, to original goodness and the inspired instincts of one's own heart. [17] The savage child of nature was happier than the spoiled child of civilisation, and the simple faith of the peasant wiser than the science of the philosopher. The obvious conclusion from these ideas was the moral perfectibility of man and the indefinite progress of the human race.

Rousseau's literary works, which developed most of his ideas, supported the individual against society, the poor against the rich, the people against the privileged, love against convention, and intuition and religious sentiment against the reason of the philosophers. The message was simple, even naive at times, "the noble savage", but had its appeal. This was due to the optimism and certainty that inspired it, and its expression in a lyricism that made fine literature. Madame de Stael said, "He inflamed everything". [18] To redeem man in thrall because of the divine right of kings, he proposed the sovereignty of the people. This was a radical departure from Voltaire's liberty without democracy, in the direction of liberty and democracy.

A social contract was the answer. "It struck France with the force of a new gospel". [19] The citizen would enter into a contract with society to surrender his freedom to the General Will. It would regulate his actions as a member of society. This would enable him to serve himself and practice virtue. Good laws governing good citizens would produce a democratic social order. The resultant new way of life and new social creed would foster fraternity and social justice, equality and human rights. It would supplant Christianity. The General Will in these terms was a benevolent abstraction. It was nonetheless tailored to the vital social problem of his day, the peasant. It envisaged peasant citizenship, and the agrarian distribution of peasant ownership. At the same time, it was a dream and a vision, and a source of revolutionary optimism for a century.

## Chapter 3

"***Men are born free and equal"*** – Declaration of the Rights of Man

Rousseau's ideas, with their emphasis on human rights, had crossed the Atlantic to North America where revolution was emerging. Indeed the Deism of the Enlightenment had already been a source of moral and intellectual support to the leaders of the American Revolution. Its American representatives, Franklin and Jefferson, now returned the gift and gave classical expression to Rousseau's democratic principles in the Declaration of Independence.

"All men are created equal … they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights … Among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness … whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute a new government."

Another son of the Enlightenment, a young French aristocrat, Joseph Lafayette, had already played a part in the American uprising. On his white horse, he had led a division under Washington. He mirrored for the rebels the realisation of Rousseau's ideal of a social order based on natural principles and inspired by a spirit of fraternity and equality. The American Revolution thus served to infuse a revolutionary purpose into the democratic idealism of Rousseau.

This found expression in France in August 1778, when Louis XVI called into session in Paris the traditional representative body of the French monarchy, the States General. This body met 5 May 1789. It had not met since 1614. It could easily be said that its convocation was a response to long pent-up political enthusiasm. Later in the life of the Assembly, this was said, and was to play a major role in the proceedings. The immediate compelling cause of the King's call, however, was extreme financial crises.

France, despite great agricultural resources, expanding textiles, excellent roads, and canals, and a spectacularly flourishing export trade, had to wrestle with the fear of national bankruptcy. Revenue was a problem. Those most able to pay taxes, higher clergy and nobles, were tax-exempt. Then at the popular level, discontent was aggravated by insecurity of food supplies not yet reinforced by the potato [1] – and by frequent bread riots. A succession of ministers failed to secure from nobles the one concession that would have averted crisis. Calonne (1734-1802), the most gifted and enterprising of them all, wrote, with fatal results for his policy: "France is a kingdom composed of separate states and countries, with mixed administration, the provinces of which know nothing of each other, where certain districts are completely free from burdens, the whole weight of which is borne by others, where the richest class is the most lightly taxed, where privilege has upset all equilibrium, where it is impossible to have any constant rule or common will; necessarily it is a most imperfect kingdom, very full of abuses, and in its present condition impossible to govern". [2] The States General had a daunting problem to conquer.

Three States made up the States General: the First, the clergy, one of whom was the Bishop of Autun, Maurice Charles Talleyrand (1754-1838), the Second, the nobility, one of whom was the Marquis Lafayette (1757-1834); the Third, professional and businessmen, among whom were lawyers, Gabriel Mirabeau (1749-1791) and Maximilian Robespierre (1758-1794). For Lafayette, Talleyrand and Mirabeau, the States General opened the way to constitutional monarchy; for Robespierre, as events would show, it was a way to revolutionary democracy.

The clergy, the First Estate, belonged to a Church that in the eighteenth century displayed the appearance more of decadence than renewal. [3] This was very much due to the fact that the Church clung to completely obsolete ideas, a condition which was particularly true of the Holy See. In consequence, Europe witnessed the progress of a sentiment hostile to Rome, which was given doctrinaire expression, Gallican in France and Febronian in Germany. Many clergy and laity tended to the belief that the supremacy of the Pope was nothing more than an honorary privilege. A certain ambiguity in the Pope's position contributed to this, as he claimed international competence for his authority from a small temporal power base, an Italian territory, notable for backward administration. [4] This latter was ridiculed by enlightened despots who, obsessed with modernity, sought economic progress and reform of government institutions.

The Papal States, too, as a political power, was the object of the rivalry of the same enlightened despots in Paris, Vienna and Madrid. There was compromise and accommodation, and the Father of the Faithful was hard put to it to rise above factions, and exercise supra-national authority. The temporal power claimed as so necessary for the independence of the papacy became, in fact, an additional contribution to the weakness of the institution.

Added to these factors were the philosophers of the Enlightenment who, attracted by the empirical sciences and repelled by the endless and fruitless Jansenist controversies, outstripped in debate the mediocre efforts of the Catholic enlightenment. Catholicism was thus attacked from without and within. The Holy See, except for the pontificate of Benedict XIV, was less than equal to the occasion. Professor Rogier (a contemporary historian at Nijmegen), well proposed the following assessment of the papacy in the eighteenth century: "In general, the actual influence of Rome on international happenings was extremely small; its contributions to the development of thought exhausted themselves in stereotypes and sterile protest. Surveying the cultural history of the eighteenth century, one repeatedly misses the participation of the Church and its supreme leadership in the discussions of the burning issues of the period. If Rome contributed at all, it did so only negatively with an admonition, an anathema, or an exhortation to silence. Regrettably, Rome not only failed to join in dialogue with a generation so strongly affected by the currents of the age as that of the eighteenth century, it systematically avoided it." [5] This assessment was reflecting a similar judgement from an eighteenth-century author, Charles de Brosses (1707-1771), first president of the *Parlement de Bourgogne*. In 1740, he wrote: "If in Europe the credit of the Holy See is shrinking daily, this loss stems from an unawareness by the Holy See of its antiquated modes of expression." [6]

At first sight, the Church in France in 1789 gives a solid impression of strength and power. The Catholic Church in France was the established religion. Its relations with the Holy See were still

governed by the Concordat of 1516, but there were no major complaints. Rights had been conceded to the King; among these was the right to distribute benefices, and even though those of bishops and abbots required the Pope's consent, the King's choice was decisive. To this right was added the traditional esteem in which the monarch had always been held. At the same time, there was the traditional distrust of all ultramontane demands, and frequent differences of opinion between Paris and Rome in matters of international politics. On the eve of 1789, the rights of crown and Holy See were thus well balanced, and both Church and people were committed to the Holy See. "In reality, though," writes Roger Aubert, "the Church's standing among the educated had been weakened. Debilitated by internal wrangles and new ideas which had found fertile soil, the level of institutions showed indications of arteriosclerosis that became ever more noticeable." [7]

One of the chief sources of ecclesiastical dissatisfaction under the Old Regime was benefices. Benefices were plums, handsome in income for the holder, and flexible enough for absenteeism and transfer of duty to another. The Council of Trent had sought, unsuccessfully, to reform them. Sovereign princes had practised the allocation of them to the sons of nobles, a form of largesse that strengthened the royal hand. The sovereigns were loathe to yield it.

Monasteries were prize benefices. Of these, France had the largest number. Religious life in them was mediocre. This was particularly the case in monasteries whose abbot was a royal appointment. Most courtly favourites did not take up residence. In the eyes of the world, monasteries were ecclesiastical sinecures. Even so, many of them were empty. In 1768, a commission of Regulars suggested a number of steps to the King, and 426 monasteries were dissolved and the lands transferred to the dioceses. In 1789, 645 out of 748 monasteries had been awarded as prebends. [8] Through all France, the Church owned 10% of the land, with an income of 100 million livres. Much of this land was monastic. There were 20 to 25,000 monks and 30 to 40,000 nuns.

The French Church was divided into 135 dioceses with some 50,000 parish clergy. In addition to these were 15 to 18,000 canons. [9] Some bishops led scandalous lives, but most were devout men. Bishops from the nobility and aristocracy, who owed their position to birth or connections, were often incompetent and worldly. They guarded jealously their privileges and regarded an accumulation of benefices as necessary for the kind of life their position entitled them to expect. They appeared as nothing more than a caste system to the parish clergy, who were drawn from the middle class, resented their arrogance and despotism, and angrily contrasted their wealth with their own meagre incomes. Some agreed with Edmund Richer (1539-1631), who contended that the "real ecclesiastical body is a body of officiating pastors which is merely presided over by a bishop." Many priests were therefore prepared to accept radical changes in the position of the oligarchy; an oligarchy which had established a leadership monopoly in the Gallican Church. A noted historian of the Church in the French Revolution concluded; "a sizeable portion of the clergy was convinced of the injustice of its established order and was spontaneously to rise against it." [10] It is obvious that the Church in France, at the meeting of the States General, in its own First Estate, was severely lacking in homogeneous unity.

The clergy representation at the States General was 296 in number, of whom 208 were parish clergy and 47 were bishops. The others were canons or monks. The Third Estate was the equal in numbers of clergy and nobles combined. Mirabeau astutely proposed a vote by heads rather than States and had the support of a small group of priests. They convinced two thirds of their brethren to support the proposal. The King attempted to thwart the move by closing the meeting hall. But about eighty priests joined members of the Third Estate and refused to disperse. [11] In this action, they contributed to the success of the revolution. Mirabeau had had a victory and was the man of the Assembly. Despite his aristocratic origin, he had proved himself a great populist leader. The fact that he was France's most famous debauchee did nothing to dampen the cheers of the crowds. [12]

An early act of great significance in the Assembly occurred when Lafayette laid on the table a Declaration of the Rights of Man, based on the American Declaration of Independence. Jefferson was conveniently in Paris to discuss the matter privately and contribute the benefit of the Philadelphia experience. The Declaration said: "Men are born free and equal in rights … These are liberty, property, security and resistance to opposition". This Declaration became the creed of the ensuing

Revolution, and gave the political and economic discontent of the French people a philosophical basis for a new social order.

The revolutionary element in Paris meanwhile gave vent to its enthusiasm. It found outlet in political clubs, the earliest of which was the Cordeliers. This name originated in the thirteenth century when Paris was the theological capital of Europe. The Franciscan friars, who helped make Paris that capital, wore a cord about the waist as part of their religious habit, and were known as Cordeliers. They gave this name to their convent, which came to be known as “le Grand Convent” – it had eighty four friars in residence about the year 1300. Among its most prominent members were St Bonaventure who was at the University in 1250, and Duns Scotus who resided there in the late thirteenth century. Both these men were rated as extremely eminent scholastics. The Franciscans gave their name to the district, and when they were disestablished in 1789-1790, a newly formed political club took over their nationalised convent as headquarters, and the name they had given to the convent and its district. In 1789, Cordeliers was the smallest of sixty electoral districts into which Paris was divided. It was the habitat of lawyers and students, and occupied the outskirts of the Latin Quarter. The ground floor of a house there was occupied by Georges Jacques Danton (1759-1794) and his wife, while Camille Desmoulins (1760-1794) and his wife occupied the first floor. Danton, with three years standing at the bar in the highest branch of his profession, was the centre of the Club’s oratory and debating life. He was to become the tribune of Paris.

In response to a request from the States General for suggestions of reform, the Cordelier Club proposed the destruction of the Bastille. [13] This was a royal fortress a little to the east of Cordelier territory. In this proposal, Camille Desmoulins was most prominent. An ardent revolutionary and patriot-poet, he had interpreted the red and blue colours of Paris that had been added to the white of the Bourbons, to make the tricolour of citizen-soldiers. The red in the uniform represented the blood of freedom; the blue represented the celestial constitution that would be the eventual blessing. [14]

History has its ironies and has presented an excellent example in the contradiction between the Cordeliers of 1250 and those of 1789. The former, followers of the Poverello, St Francis of Assisi, with his love of life and nature, sought the revolution of the human spirit; the latter, given to insurrection and the ‘blood of freedom’, aspired to the revolution of the body politic. On 12 July, Desmoulins called the people of Paris to arms at the Palais Royale, a popular gathering place for oratory and debate. The call received a response that approached hysteria. One mob raided the arsenal, *Les Invalides,* and the other the Bastille, for arms. The fourteenth of July witnessed the destruction of the Bastille. In this venture, Desmoulins and the rebels of Paris had given notice to the elected lawyers and businessmen at Versailles that Paris was not to be overlooked.

Cordeliers was one of those districts that did not disperse after the States General elections. With other electoral colleges, it met at the Hotel de Ville and provided a rough government for Paris during the Bastille disorders of 12-14 July. [15] In this development, the Paris Commune and the municipal movement in all France had its beginnings. Danton’s office was just behind the Hotel de Ville. After 14 July, the Cordeliers met daily at nine in the morning in response to the bell above the church. The Royalists referred to them as the *Republique de Cordeliers*. All sorts made up its membership: the pedantic but accurate Sieyès, (1748-1836), the fastidious radical and poet, Fabre d’Eglantine (1750-1794), the coarse, brutal and atheistic Hébert (1757-1794), and the gifted but half-mad Marat (1743-1793). In October, the Cordeliers published a manifesto calling for an insurrection. It carried Danton’s signature. [16] The Hotel de Ville was the starting point on 5 October, of the ‘Bread march of the women’ of Paris to Versailles to demand, successfully in the outcome, the King’s return to Paris. The Assembly followed him there mid-October. Paris had assumed control of the Revolution. This was confirmed when Danton was elected to the Paris Commune, January 1790, to represent the Cordelier district. It was to be his stepping stone to becoming a political supremo. The States General had sought suggestions for reform. It got them, but it got more. It had unleashed emotions that would transform Rousseau’s General Will and make it anything but a benevolent abstraction.

## Chapter 4

## The Revolution assaults the Church

"*The Dark Goddess*" – André Chenier

The primary reason for convening the States General had been France's economic and financial problems. It fell to the Bishop of Autun, Talleyrand, to address the matter. Backed by Mirabeau, he proposed, October 1789, with the *sang froid* of one who was to become an ex-aristocrat and ex-cleric, that the "goods of the clergy be placed at the disposal of the nation." Mirabeau, normally the frowning, pock-marked and passionate orator was, on this occasion, less than true to form. He said that, in return, the nation would be responsible for defraying reasonable expenses of worship, sustentation of ministers and relief of the poor. [1] The Abbé Maury (1748-1817), whose eloquence matched that of Mirabeau, played some light on the announcement, when he congratulated his colleagues on their progress in the science of embezzlement. [2]

Priests were to be paid an annual minimum of 1,000 livres for curates, 2,000 for parish priests and 20,000 for bishops. Monks and nuns could either return to public life and draw a pension from the state or gather in a number of houses which would remain at their service till death. Many of the regular clergy were prepared for this as they were led to believe that monastic vows were incompatible with the Rights of Man. A decree of February 1790 forbade such vows for the future and, simultaneously, dissolved all orders and congregations with solemn vows, which were not engaged in education or care of the sick. In August 1792 the Legislative Assembly dissolved all congregations, including those serving the poor, and completely dispersed the monastic orders. As the sale of monastic and other Church lands progressed, much to the opposition of Church leaders and people, a certain anticlericalism developed among purchasers, which would have a long term effect on the Church, as the revolution progressed.

Mirabeau had been, and continued to be, on friendly terms with Talleyrand, but with reservations. "Talleyrand", he wrote, "would sell his soul for money and he would be right, for he would be exchanging dung for gold." [3] Talleyrand typified the cleric that could issue from the consequences of the Concordat of 1516. Rendered lame in childhood, he, though firstborn, was unfitted, in the opinion of his parents, to inherit his father's many titles. It was decided that their second son should be heir, and that the elder son should enter the Church. They were looking to his temporal needs. Bishoprics and abbeys were well endowed and eagerly sought after. Talleyrand had no inclination for the Church and his acquiescence in the wish of his parents was merely a matter of convenience. He trained for the priesthood at St Sulpice, a seminary at that time for sons of the nobility destined for priestly office. In his early twenties, he left St Sulpice for the Sorbonne, and the society of the most intelligent, free thinking, free speaking and free living people in Paris.

It was vintage Enlightenment society. At this time, the apogee of the philosophic period, Voltaire, the patriarch of philosophy, came to Paris to receive the adulation of disciples, who had refused to yield pride of place to Rousseau. One of his last acts (he died soon afterwards) was solemnly to bless Talleyrand who knelt at his feet, to the loud applause of the company. [4] Talleyrand was ordained priest a year later, and became Bishop of Autun two years later in 1788. The only time he ever said Mass was on the occasion of his ordination. Talleyrand's elevation to the episcopate arose from a request by his dying father, a former equerry of Louis XVI, to the King that his son be made a bishop. The request was granted despite protests from Talleyrand's mother and others, who were shocked at his licentious way of living. [5] The incumbent of Autun enjoyed a salary of 20,000 livres, even though he came to his episcopal see only to be elected to the States General. With the income from his old benefice of St Remy and the new one at Poitiers, his total income was now 50,000 livres a year. [6] Talleyrand's emoluments certainly reflected royal favour and the Concordat of 1516. The royal favour of 1788 bestowing a bishopric was to benefit neither crown nor altar.

Talleyrand was president of the National Assembly in 1790, and presided over another secularisation that far outstripped his expropriation of Church property. It was argued that if the State had to pay the clergy salaries, it needed to control the number and recruitment of the clergy. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was, therefore, necessary. The formulation of this constitution was placed in the hands of the Church Committee of the National Assembly, whose composition had been changed in favour of Gallican Jansenists, in order to assure a majority for the proposed constitution. [7] The

creation of the Civil Constitution was in the hands of a prominent member of the Assembly, whom Talleyrand had defeated for the presidency. This was the noted Cordelier, Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, an ex-Oratorian priest, who, like Talleyrand, after ordination, never said Mass or preached. At the time of his election to the States General, he was chancellor and vicar-general of the diocese of Chartres, positions that gave him excellent insights for his wholesale reconstruction and secularisation of the Church in France. His Civil Constitution of the Clergy established a new state Church, and made the existing clergy its officers. It reduced the dioceses of France from 135 to 83, and provided for the appointment of bishops and priests by way of elections similar to those for other civil officers. [8] This law rationalised the organisation and personnel of the Church. All this was done without consultation with the Holy See. It, therefore, constituted a unilateral revocation of the Concordat of 1516. Thirty bishops in the National Assembly dissented. It could be said that the Civil Constitution was the culmination of eighteenth-century Gallicanism, and that it belonged more to the Old Régime than the new, and that it was not specifically revolutionary. But it was not to stay that way.

Two days after this matter became law, the Assembly promoted the Feast of the Federation which was to glorify the Revolution so far. It was no doubt intended also to generate support for the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. A Mass in the Champ de Mars would precede the oath of allegiance and the blessing of national flags. There was present only one bishop, Talleyrand, who was to celebrate the Mass and bless the flags. After some rehearsing under the critical but amused eye of Mirabeau, he performed the ceremony. Some of his associates already referred to him as Voltaire in a mitre. [9] Themselves apostates from their own aristocratic class, they had no trouble understanding his making war on his own order. After the ceremony, Talleyrand sought relief from the strain of the unfamiliar liturgy within the familiar walls of a gambling salon. He broke the bank. "Perhaps it was a good omen: providence blessing the Pope of the Federation with good fortune." So the comment of Schama. [10]

In the more serious world of politics, Talleyrand would gamble too, punting on democratic monarchy or monarchy without nobles. But his opponent, revolutionary democracy, was a formidable one. Would the carefree gambler be proof against the impassioned elan of men like the Cordeliers in their drive to a revolutionary democracy?

A few citizen-priests welcomed the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The Abbé Montesquiou (1756-1832) voiced a very different response. He had asked some pointed questions early on: was the Constitution "now to be one of those pagan cults that demands human sacrifice?" Was the "exterminating angel to pass over the Assembly?" [11] It was. Priests were bound, 27 November 1790, by a civil oath of loyalty – the first of several to uphold the Civil Constitution. The attendant sanction would grow in intensity to the point of death penalty for refusal. Meanwhile they were to be elected by the people and to be on the same level as public servants, magistrates and policemen. This was the ultimate subordination of the Church to profane authority. Four bishops and one half of the clergy accepted the oath. The result was schism – jurors and nonjurors.

Talleyrand resigned the Bishopric of Autun in January 1791, but in his last ecclesiastical act, he ordained two bishops to staff the civil Church. He was now in open revolt against his Church and was excommunicated 18 April 1791. Mirabeau had died eleven days before at the age of 42. He was a populist to the end. Crowds milled about his residence, and he received a continuous stream of visitors, conversing with Talleyrand for some time. He died as he had lived: the personification of heroic materialism. Mirabeau's funeral was intended to be a great demonstration of patriotic reverence. It would proceed through Paris, stop at the Church of Saint-Eustache for a eulogy, and culminate at the Panthéon. This recently erected, but as yet unfinished, edifice was originally intended to honour Sainte-Geneviève, the patroness of Paris; now it was to be not a temple to all the gods, as was its Roman ancestor, but a monument to '*Grandes Hommes*'. Paris was to have its own 'Westminster Abbey'. One of the reasons for its choice was its neo-classical lines which would distinguish it from the Gothic crypt of Kings at Saint-Denis. It would celebrate virtue not lineage, and accomplishment rather than tradition. The exemplary virtues were to be personal and familial as well as political or philosophical. Descartes was the first to be honoured. He had been persecuted by Kings and forced to live in exile. Mirabeau, as the first of the revolutionary heroes, raised various difficulties, but the great outpouring of lamentation that marked his death removed all objections. Voltaire was the third

candidate for the Panthéon.

The progress of the Revolution was in no way kind to Mirabeau. He was disgraced in 1793 for his friendship with the King, his body disinterred and consigned to a common grave. Talleyrand in his *Memoirs* wrote: “The Civil Constitution of the Clergy … was perhaps the greatest political mistake of the Assembly, quite apart from the dreadful crimes that flowed therefrom.” [12] Among the dreadful crimes, no doubt, were the death sentences later imposed on nonjuror priests.

The Pope, after irreparable delay, condemned the Constitution 12 March and again 13 April 1791, and declared null all elections of bishops and priests made under it. He imposed on jurors the obligation of retracting within forty days on pain of suspension. [13] This prompted a majority of the faithful to lean towards nonjuror priests. Many Catholics then detached themselves from the patriots and joined the aristocrats, who were resolved to restore the *Ancien Régime* with the help of foreign powers if necessary. In response to the opposition to the Civil Constitution and its oath, violent anticlerical manifestations had already broken out, at the end of 1790, in Paris and all France. Most bishops fled the country and joined royalists in Germany and Italy, trying to organise a league of Christian princes to save Church and King. In May 1791, the French government severed relations with the Holy See and annexed Avignon, a part of the States of the Church. The Pope was now convinced that the revolutionaries in Paris were spreading their propaganda in order to rouse people everywhere to insurrection against the throne and the altar. “Within France and throughout all Western Europe the revolutionary ideal and Roman Catholicism seemed to be in tragic opposition.” [14]

The King had accepted the Civil Constitution and its oath, 27 November 1790. But with the papal veto, he now had misgivings. His change of mind became evident on 24 April which was Easter Sunday. He decided to make his Easter duty at the hands of a nonjuror priest at St Cloud, a few kilometres north of Paris. He was ready for the journey when the Paris mob, Cordelier-driven, intervened and checked him. The King, forced to come to Paris on 6 October 1789, by the same Cordeliers, and now forced to stay in Paris 24 April 1791, was virtually a prisoner. Flight seemed the only way to freedom. It was chosen but miscarried, when the King and his family were recognised at Varennes and forced back to Paris (20-21 June). Louis was now really a prisoner in his own house. It was the monarchy’s lowest hour. With the strong man, Mirabeau, no longer there to defend it, anarchy was triumphant. This was clearly indicated in the progress of the revolution and the political clubs. They came now into their own.

Cordeliers, as an electoral district, had disappeared in May 1790, when an electoral redistribution made it part of a larger electoral unit, *Theatre Francais*. But the Club survived, and did so as the most important club on the left bank. It launched a drive to secure new members, dropping its admission fee to one livre. The nearby working class district of Faubourg St Antoine responded and gave it a proletarian base. One English observer saw the newcomers as consisting of rowdies whose “dress was so filthy and unkempt that one would have taken them for a gathering of beggars.” [15] But they were not nomadic and uprooted factory workers. They were unorganised water carriers, building workers, market porters, domestic workers, street hawkers and peasants. [16] Their vigorous reaction to the King’s attempted flight reflected typical Cordelier spirit. They called for the suppression of the royal automaton. At the anniversary of the Feast of Federation July 1791, at the Champs de Mars, their opposition was vehement. Lafayette suppressed it with bloodshed. Danton, Desmoulins and Marat were forced into temporary exile.

The Jacobin Club meanwhile rose to prominence. It was originally the Friends of the Constitution, which was prompted by meetings at Versailles, 1789. Like the Cordeliers, it got its name from the premises it occupied – a former Dominican priory now nationalised. The original Dominican house was dedicated to St Jacques and its friars became known as Jacobins. It flourished in the thirteenth century and housed the esteemed Thomas Aquinas, when he studied or lectured there 1245-1260. The royalists taunted the new occupants of the former priory as Jacobins. But what was intended to embarrass, became instead, something that was accepted and regarded as a compliment. Mirabeau was club president in 1790 and thundered from the tribune of the Paris headquarters of the club. Maximilian Robespierre would assume that role later.

Desmoulins later reported that the Jacobin Society possessed hundreds of provincial branches. 150 affiliated in August 1790 became 406 in May 1791. Through these, it exercised its influence from one end of the country to the other. He described the society as the Grand Inquisitor (the name originally borne by the controversial Torquemada), and the great redresser of wrongs. Every state, every village was to have its club. [17] The Jacobin Club had the external organisation of a sect, strict discipline, a rigid standard of orthodoxy, and intolerance of other creeds. While its response to the Cordeliers' call for the King's abdication was reserved, its persecuting spirit was seen in its promotion of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and in its hostility to King and nonjuror clergy.

The Cordeliers, consistent with their animus against the King, directed extremist antipathy against the Church as well. They led attacks on places of Catholic worship and mobbed priests and nuns. [18] Colourful expression was given to these outbursts of irreligion in a pamphlet by an author inn no wise disposed to the Catholic position, André Chenier (1762-1794). He was the son of a French Consul-General and a Greek mother. Greek literature was his speciality. In 1787, he went to England as secretary of the French ambassador. In 1790, he returned to Paris, and the ferment of the Revolution at first impressed, then, in its excesses, alarmed him. He wrote in *The Altars of Fear* (1791): "We no longer build temples to Fear like the Greeks. Yet never has the dark Goddess been honoured by a more universal cult. The whole of Paris is her temple, and all respectable people have become her priests and every day offer to her in sacrifice their thoughts and consciences." [19]

Pamphlets like this mortally offended Robespierre. The penalty in due course was prison and the guillotine, 1794. The activity of the clubs, and their regime of fear, threatened to open the way to pressure upon the Assembly from outside, in a word, to popular insurrection. [20]

That danger was perceived in the Assembly by more cautious members, and a law was proposed to restrict the freedom of the political clubs. The Assembly demurred, but did not endorse a resolution which proclaimed that the Revolution was over, and that it had to yield to the crucial principle of the uncontested sovereignty of the people, vested in their representatives. Robespierre, purist disciple of Rousseau despite his immaculately curled and powdered hair, who had become the leader of the revolutionary Left in the Assembly, sprang to the defence of the Revolution. In his now familiar slightly high pitched and metallic voice, he said that the Revolution was not accomplished; and that the proposed declaration of its termination was a denial of the right to assembly, speech, press and publication. These rights were necessary for the ideal of moral politics and the school of virtue preached by Rousseau. Without them there would be no reform of state and no republic of virtue. [21]

Robespierre moved successfully that all Assembly members disqualify themselves from re-election. This was a clever tactic. It excluded from the next Assembly those who had wanted the revolution declared accomplished – Talleyrand, Lafayette and Sieyès. Robespierre's contribution for the present would be very forcefully from the outside. So far as the Assembly was concerned, he could afford, at the early age of thirty three, to assume the austere isolation of the prophet. He was to move a long way from the principles of Paris' most famous of Oratorian colleges, the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, where he had studied on an endowment from his local bishop. Mirabeau (till his death in 1791), Talleyrand, Lafayette and Sieyès had prepared a Constitution which was completed in the latter half of 1791. The Declaration of the Rights of Man was its prelude; its detailed development became the body of the Constitution. Following its acceptance by the Assembly, elections took place in September. The new Assembly of 1 October 1791 was elected by only 10% of eligible voters. [22] In spite of this limited franchise, the new Constitution was one of the most democratic that ever existed. [23] Not only the sovereign Assembly, but the other organs of government were all elective. There was no bureaucracy, no national civil service, no centralised administrative authority. The King was a mere figurehead, his ministers almost powerless and the whole work of administration of the country fell on the elected directories of the departments and municipalities. But authority was so divided and restricted that the government no longer had any effective control over the administration, and liberty was elaborately safeguarded and smothered under the burden of ceaseless elections.

Sitting members in the old Assembly, having disqualified themselves from re-election, the new Assembly was a thing of new faces and forces. Bourgeois members from the Gironde, with Bordeaux as its centre, and from neighbouring cities, Nantes and La Rochelle, assumed leadership. Along with

others from elsewhere they were known as Girondins. Jacobins were the main opposition. Ironically, the Constitution, authored by Talleyrand, Lafayette and Sieyès, who were now unemployed, became the Jacobin gospel. Its mission was liberty and equality, and Lafayette's Declaration of the Rights of Man its creed. No zealous and enlightened patriot would be without his Declaration and the Constitution. As a consequence, it must be said that there was growing up outside the constitutional machinery a new and formidable Jacobin machine that possessed a ruthless will to power and was destined to inherit the authoritative and centralising tradition of the old absolutism. [24]

The Girondins and Jacobins were at one in their position on the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. November 29, therefore, brought a stiffer oath on the clergy. Refusal to take the oath could be considered the equivalent of resignation, and refusal to resign the equivalent of rebellion. [25] The King vetoed it. In the following January, the Assembly called on clerical members to swear, but to no avail. No more successful was the call to exclude them from the Assembly. A crowd of patriots, who gathered near the Assembly and threatened to hang these counter-revolutionaries, was equally unsuccessful. The same patriots regarded Catholic laymen and laywomen, who remained loyal to papacy and bishops, as disloyal to the Constitution. [26]

They proceeded to break up religious services of nonjuring Catholics in Paris and committed brutal outrages on priests and nuns. This was a continuation of the Cordeliers' violence at the Champs de Mars of July 1791. Efforts then to maintain freedom by Lafayette and Talleyrand were of no avail. The benevolence of Rousseau's General Will was being sacrificed on the altar of the Dark Goddess.

## Chapter 5

## The Revolution destroys the Monarchy

*"The Exterminating Angel."* – L'Abbé Montesquiou

On 12 March, 1792, Pius VI decreed the Civil Constitution heretical in several clauses, and bishops and priests appointed under it were excommunicated if they refused to retract within four months. [1]

This brief became well known in France in April. On 27 May, the Assembly voted a decree condemning to exile beyond the frontier any cleric whom twenty citizens denounced as a nonjuror and whom the district recognised as such. Every priest liable to deportation, if caught in France, would be sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. The law was calculated to draw a veto from the King and so sharpen hostility against him. [2] It succeeded. The King, fully aware of the gravity of this decision, decreed a veto. In a conversation with leading army general, Dumouriez, 18 June, who counselled discretion on the veto, he said: "I have finished with man. I must turn to God." [3] Two days later, 20 June, a demonstration was directed against the King at the Tuileries, where over 10,000 men for four hours heckled him and taunted him with cries of "Down with the veto" and "Death to the priests." Louis, a stout, easy going undecided man bore himself in the face of this intimidation with the dignity and composure of a King, but the monarchy was vanishing as a reality.

War hastened the process. On 25 January 1792, the French legislature had required Austria to desist from aid to emigrés, and alliance with any enemy of France. On 2 April, France declared war on Austria. Prussia joined Austria, and forces under the Duke of Brunswick were advancing. A war emergency was declared in Paris, and became the more

urgent when Brunswick threatened vengeance on any repetition of the June attack on the Tuileries. The Paris response was the launching of an 'Insurrectionary Commune' which swept away the sitting municipal council and established headquarters at the Hotel de Ville. [4] Its leaders, and masters of a temporary dictatorship, were Robespierre, Danton and Marat. Their work was the defence of the fatherland and the expulsion of the King.

On 10 August, an attack was mounted on the Tuileries, and 600 soldiers, including the King's personal Swiss guard, were literally butchered. Robespierre thought it was the "most beautiful revolution that had ever honoured humanity".[5] He also rejoiced that a "river of blood would now divide France from its enemies".[6] On 13 August, the King was suspended and confined to the Temple. This imprisonment

marked the beginning of a police state. A Military Tribunal [7] was set up to judge those criminals who had escaped the slaughter, and a Vigilance Committee, armed with police powers, such as make a police state, was also instituted. [8] 1,000 were arrested, the majority of whom were nonjuror priests, the others royalists. The provinces re-echoed the city with massacres of priests.

The verdict of history on these terrible events is well stated by Simon Schama in his *Citizens*:

"The carnage of 10 August was not an incidental moment in the history of the Revolution. It was in fact its logical consummation. From 1789 perhaps even before that, it had been the willingness of politicians to exploit either the threat or the fact of violence that had given them the power to challenge constituted authority. Bloodshed was not the unfortunate byproduct of revolution. It was the source of its energy. Only if it could be shown that blood did flow in its defence could the virtues of the Revolution be shown to be worth dying for." [9]

At the end of August, the Assembly ordered the dissolution of the Commune but to no avail. On 2 September, the Prussians were on French soil and from Verdun were threatening the Marne valley and the approaches to Paris. A levy of 300,000 men was ordered. The emergency called for a fearless leader. It was met in the person of Georges Danton, now 33 years old and to become the apostle of audacity. Tall, brawny, with beetling eyebrows and a bull neck, he was built to dominate. An enormous voice, booming from brazen lungs, was an excellent vehicle for a unique gift of words and language. His message, *'De l'audace, et encore de l'audace et toujours l'audace'*, stirred his countrymen from their torpor and fired them with enthusiasm for the national cause. Danton was Minister for Justice, yet a man of blood. As he said to the son of the Duke of Orleans, future King of France: "It was my will that the youth of Paris should arrive at the front covered with blood which would guarantee their fidelity. I wished to put a river of blood between them and the enemy." [10] A placard signed by the devoted friend, Fabre d'Eglantine, delivered the same message. It had the appearance of a semi-official proclamation and said: "let the blood of traitors be the first holocaust of Liberty, so that in advancing to meet the common enemy we leave nothing behind to disquiet us." [11]

Jean Paul Marat was Danton's co-agent in this campaign. He was a sinister character of morbid fears and jealous suspicions. He had a venomous and vituperative pen and an uncanny power of appealing to the terror and suspicions of the crowd. When forced to flee Paris, he sought refuge in the sewers and there contracted a skin disease from which he could get relief only by sitting in a bath. It was from there he did most of his writing. At this time, he was just as vehement as Danton in his cry for blood. He exclaimed: "Let us not leave in Paris a single enemy to be gladdened by our defeats and in our absence to slaughter our wives and children". [12] The joint message from Danton and Marat was chilling. Let Schama speak again: "What then followed has no equal in atrocities committed during the French Revolution by any party". [13] In Paris alone, over four days, 1,400 lives were taken in circumstances of revolting savagery. At the Abbaye, 19 of 24 priests were killed. At a former Carmelite monastery, 150 priests were killed. Elsewhere, 43 under the age of eighteen, 70 convicts awaiting transfer to the hulks and 40 prostitutes were the victims of what could only be called barbaric carnage. [14] This September massacre came to be known as the 'Little Terror'. Marat drafted a circular to the provinces justifying the massacre and urging them to do likewise. The September massacre had a macabre message. However virtuous the Rousseauan principles of the Kingless France were supposed to be, "their power to command allegiance depended from the beginning on the spectacle of death". [15]

There was some subsequent relief from these tragic events. 191 priests, who were massacred because they refused the oath of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, were beatified in 1926. [16] "The Church of exile" came in for commendation too. During the Revolution it numbered 30,000 priests, one third of those existing in 1789. They were resettled in nearly every country of Europe. In England in 1793 there were thirty bishops and eight thousand priests. They were welcomed by King, government and the Anglican Church. Pitt later said: "Few will ever forget the piety, irreproachable conduct, the long and dolorous patience of these men cast suddenly into the midst of a foreign people, different in its religion, language, its manners and its customs. They won the respect and good will of all by a life of unvarying godliness and decency. Their conduct helped lessen anti-Catholic prejudices and prepared the way for Catholic emancipation". [17] Similar tribute is to be found in Hilaire Belloc's *Characters of the Reformation*, p.278.

"The origin of the so-called Oxford Movement did not spring from Newman and his group, but began much earlier, when a sermon in defence of the Sacrament of Penance was preached in the University Church of St Mary the Virgin under the inspiration of the emigrant French priests of 1793.

Elections were in process during these gruesome times. 6% of an electorate of several million, it would seem, voted to have a revolutionary convention replace the Insurrectionary Commune and the Legislative Assembly. [18] The new body abolished the monarchy and declared France a republic on 21 September. Elected among a body of 745 deputies were Robespierre, Danton, Marat and Desmoulins. The constitutional monarchists, Talleyrand and Lafayette, were forced to flee France. The drive for a constitutional monarchy had failed. The first phase of the Revolution (1789-1792) had ended. The fact that the newly elected Convention represented only 6% of a population of 7 million voters in no way prevented it from proceeding with the trial of the King as a first priority. Indeed, its ensuing resolution could be called the Convention's founding decree. [19] A most impressive speech came from Louis Antoine Saint-Just (1767-1794), a protegé of Robespierre, saying the King had to die that the Republic live. [20] The Convention of 721 votes, registered a meagre majority of 75 for death. The Girondins, the new bourgeois, had sided with the Jacobin Left. [21]

Louis conducted himself with dignity during an elaborately contrived prosecution. His final words to his son asked questions that went back to Socrates. "How do good and seek the happiness of the citizens when they want to be free?" [22] From the scaffold 21 January 1793, he said: "I am innocent of the crimes of which I have been charged. I pardon those who have brought about my death and I pray that the blood you are about to shed may never be required of France." [23]

The death of the King did not save the Girondin government from a rash of problems. There was an economic and financial crisis as prices doubled and trebled. A new group called the *enragés* (wild men) led by Jean Varlet and Jacques Roux, curé of St Nicholas-des-Champs met at the former palace (another nationalisation casualty) of the Archbishop of Paris, next to Notre Dame. [24] On behalf of the poor of Paris, they addressed the crisis in food prices. They at first challenged, and then were taken over, by the Commune now under a very vocal and scurrilous journalist, Jacques René Hébert, a man whose professional scruples and ethics were nil. Meanwhile their agitation led to a violent uprising, 10 March, that did not succeed. It drew from Robespierre his displeasure at "debasing the sacred value of insurrection by directing it at paltry merchandise". [25] These developments prompted Pierre Vergniaud, a leading Girondin, to alert Convention to the violence and vandalism of 10 March. The unconstrained lawlessness of the Paris crowds was a danger to national representation. These riots were composed of idlers, men without work, unknown, often indeed strangers, to the sections (localities) or even the city, ignoramuses, great putters of motions. [26] He warned: "it must be feared that the Revolution, like Saturn, might devour in turn each one of its children,[27] and that it might engender, finally, only despotism with the calamities that accompany it." The prophecy became a terrible reality.

There was a peasant problem too, that led to civil war. The Vendée, a relatively poor portion of the west coast of France, south of the Loire, was royalist and Catholic. It took up arms, March-October 1793, against the draft for military service and the oath (18 March, 30 April, 31 October, 1893) imposed on nonjuror clergy. The new law said that the deposition of two witnesses that a priest had not taken the oath was enough to render him liable to death.

The discomfort of civil war was accompanied by reverses on the military fronts on the Rhine and in Belgium. These were intensified by the defection in Belgium of France's ablest commander, General Dumouriez, who had said Convention was made up of 300 scoundrels and 400 imbeciles. Such reverses, along with civil war and economic crisis, were excellent fuel for the agitators as they attacked the Girondins for aiding counter-revolutionaries. To bring order to the trial of suspects accused of counter-revolutionary activities in Paris, a Revolutionary Tribunal, sponsored by Danton, was set up on 11 March. [28] A little later, 6 April, the Committee for Public Safety would be for Convention something in the nature of a modern war cabinet of nine. [29] Danton was a member. Along with it a Committee of General Security, whose function would be police and espionage. [30] The trappings of a police-state were being confirmed. Marat took up the attack on the Girondins and outdid the *enragés* in the bitterness of his attacks. These men were the agents of counter-revolution and disloyal to the fatherland. The Girondins reacted by indicting Marat for violating the integrity of

Convention, but the Revolutionary Tribunal acquitted him. Marat became a hero of the Jacobins and opposition. [31] The Girondins, having indicted a member of the Convention, had now set aside the immunity of a deputy. It made them in turn vulnerable.

In late May, the Convention was attacked by the Paris mob. Robespierre insisted that a moral insurrection was necessary and incited the people to mount it against the corrupt deputies.

On 2 June, 80,000 men, heavily armed, responded to this call and surrounded the Convention. The Girondin government was helpless. It fell prostrate before the crudest form of bullying. [32] An armed minority of a portion of the people of Paris had humiliated the nation's representatives. A purge of the Girondins had begun and would proceed.

One person not impressed by the events in Paris on 2 June was a young woman in the city of Caen in Normandy. She was not a royalist, rather a republican. But an earlier event in her own personal experience disabused her. [33] When she was fourteen years old, her mother had died in childbirth. The parish priest of St Gilles, the Abbé Gombault, had given the stricken woman the last rites. The same Abbé had now fallen victim to the oath required of nonjuror priests in March 1793. He had been successively deprived of his living, and the latest oath or death decree forced him to the neighbouring woods for safety. There he was hunted down with the aid of tracker dogs, brought back to Caen and guillotined early April, the first to suffer that fate in Caen. This and the events of June 2 were brought into focus by the presence in Caen of refugee Girondins who were planning from there the formation of a Federalist army that would go south to Nantes and Bordeaux, thence to south Provence, Lyons and Marseilles, and thence to France-Conte and Besançon. Paris was its goal. On 7 July, a military parade took place on the *Grand Cour* of Caen. Watching it was the young woman of this story. She was twenty five years old and strikingly attractive; she managed to be introduced to military leader, Barbaroux, whose eloquence had already charmed her. Her name was Charlotte Corday. The eloquence of Girondin speakers was enhanced by letters from the department of Calvados, which were published in its capital, Caen, and which directed the attention of readers to the subjects of their attacks, Robespierre, Danton and Marat. One letter said: "Marat sees the Public Safety only in a river of blood: well then his own must flow, for his head must fall to save two hundred thousand lives". Charlotte, a direct descendant of classical dramatist, Corneille, seemed to cast herself in one of his tragic roles. She would surrender her life to remove Marat. He was living in the rue des Cordeliers and was at the height of his powers, even though his skin disease forced him to seek relief in his bath-water. She left Caen, 9 July, assassinated Marat 13 July, and serenely went to the guillotine, 17 July. [34]

The death of Marat hastened the impending fall of the Girondin government, already shaken by the June *coup d'état*. Robespierre, at the moment of the insurrection he had promoted, laid down in a private memorandum the groundwork that the revolutionary movement was to follow. "It is necessary to extend the present insurrection by degrees according to the same plan, to pay the sans-culottes (mainly the unemployed) and keep them in the towns: to arm them, to inflame their anger and to enlighten them. It is necessary to exalt republican enthusiasm by every possible means." [35]

This was a projected program of action that the death on 13 July of Marat only confirmed. Robespierre entered the Committee of Public Safety on 31 July, replacing Danton who had been dropped. He was thirty six and became the man of the new era. He was the real ruler of France and master of the new spirit of Europe. He was of the type of Lenin, a fanatical believer in an inspired text. What Karl Marx was to Lenin, Rousseau was to Robespierre. [36] He wrote: "which of us would care to descend from the heights of the eternal principles we proclaimed … holy equality and the sacred Rights of Man." [37]

Like Lenin, too, Robespierre was a master of revolutionary strategy. The same genius he had shown as a master of a national revolutionary machine, he now demonstrated as director of national policy. The Committee of Public Safety consequently became the most concentrated state machine France had ever experienced. It became a totalitarian dictatorship that touched every aspect of public and private life. [38] Robespierre was Rousseau's General Will incarnate. He proved, as de Maistre wrote, to be a "battering ram with 20 million people behind it". [39] It was a fierce will to power which destroyed every man and every institution in its way. But there was something more remote than Rousseau that

contributed to Robespierre's revolutionary impetus – his passion for Roman history and oratory. It earned him annual prizes at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand in Paris as well as the name of 'the Roman'. It was this passion that "opened the way to an atavistic return to pre-Christian religion: the worship of collective human power which had been the religion of the pagan Roman Empire and the Greek city states, which the Roman Empire had incorporated". [40] In the light of these life-long dispositions there is no little irony in the fact that an austere moralist, who preached a republic of virtue, and nurtured a conscientious objection against capital punishment, should lead the Revolution into the blood bath of the Reign of Terror.

Robespierre's plan to exalt republican enthusiasm, by every means possible, included economic Terror. It became an institution when Convention accepted Collot d'Herbois' death penalty for profiteering and hoarding of not only goods of first necessity such as bread, salt and wine, but many others as well. [41] The supply of grain was requisitioned to storage silos throughout the country to ensure sale at low prices in times of shortage. A network of information about crops and harvest yields involved, and made for, unprecedented intrusion into the rural economy. This was made only the more odious when an army of revolutionary unemployed was used to make good the shortage of government inspectors. All this suited Hebért and the Commune, now his power base. Less acceptable to his taste, however, was the replacement of the 48 Paris elected local revolutionary committees which he largely controlled. They were to yield to appointed bodies accountable to the executive committees of the Convention. [42]

Hébert played a leading role in his journal le Pere Duchesne as the trial of Marie Antoinette approached. It was not the heroic role envisaged by Edmund Burke in October 1789:

"It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the Queen of France, then the dauphiness, at Versailles; and surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision. I saw her just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she just began to move in, glittering like the morning star, full of life and splendour, and joy. Oh! what a revolution! and what a heart I must have to contemplate without emotion that elevation and that fall! Little did I dream, when she added titles of veneration to those of enthusiastic, distant, respectful love, that she should ever be obliged to carry the sharp antidote against disgrace concealed in that bosom; little did I dream that I should have lived to see such disasters fallen upon her in a nation of gallant men, in a nation of men of honour and of cavaliers. I thought ten thousand swords must have leaped from their scabbards to avenge even a look that threatened her with insult. But the age of chivalry is gone." [43]

By contrast with such gracious sentiments, Hébert set out to assassinate the character of Marie Antoinette and resorted to the politics of turpitude to do so. [44] The Queen, having already suffered the brutality and insult of months of confinement, bore the ignominy of a staged trial and went to the guillotine with royal composure. She had not reached her thirty-eighth birthday. Only weeks after, the Girondin leaders were subjected to the same travesty of a trial, convicted and sentenced. They went to the guillotine 31 October. [45] The second phase of the Revolution, 1792-1793 was over. Revolutionary democracy had superseded constitutional monarchy: it would now yield to revolutionary dictatorship

## Chapter 6

## The Revolution destroys its Founders

"*Saturn, successively devouring (his) children*" – Vergniaud, ***Citizens***, p.714

The Jacobin dictatorship did much to establish itself by the creation of a national conscript army and the mobilisation of all resources. [1] To supply metal for cannon, church bells from all over the country were taken from churches and transported to foundries. [2] This enormous military machine made itself felt mainly in the areas which the counter-revolutionary Federalist army had planned as strong points – Marseilles, Lyons, Bordeaux and the Vendée. These places, along with others on the Belgian and Austrian fronts, were secured by October – a military triumph for Robespierre.

The military recovery suggested to Danton and Desmoulins that there should be some relaxation of the Terror. They had accepted the decree, "Terror will be the order of the day," [3] when the British

under Admiral Hood had sailed into Toulon. Now they advocated an *'Indulgent'* policy designed to resist show trials like those of Marie Antoinette and the Girondins; and to work for a newly elected legislature and a negotiated peace with Coalition powers, based on the 1792 frontiers. [4] Hébert and the Commune opposed them, so too did the two punitive men, Collot d'Herbois and Billaud-Varennes; and military leaders too who thought it too early to loosen the Terror that had rescued the republic from disaster. On 10 October, Saint-Just contributed to the debate by drawing attention to the Law of Suspects of 17 September, which gave the Committee of Public Safety and its representatives sweeping powers of arrest and punishment over extraordinarily broad categories of people, defined as harbingers of counter-revolutionary designs. [5] That law, he said, was the charter of the Terror and it should be applied with the utmost rigour. "Between the people and their enemies there can be nothing in common but the sword; we must govern by iron those who cannot be governed by justice; we must oppress the tyrant. It is impossible for revolutionary laws to be executed unless the government itself is truly revolutionary." [6]

The Terror clearly was not to be terminated.

Another facet of the Terror was its policy of dechristianisation. The worship of the Republic was to replace the Christian cult. The term vandalism was coined by Gregoire, the ex-constitutional Bishop of Blois, when he denounced the most wanton assaults on statues, paintings and buildings. [7] One of the glaring examples of this phase of the Rousseauean cultural revolution was the Convention's decree that allowed the ransacking of the Cathedral of Saint-Denis, burial ground of the Kings of France, a famous example of medieval Gothic architecture. The Cathedral was saved but the tombs of the Valois and the Bourbons were desecrated.

The army provided another example of desecration while en route to drive the Federalist force from Lyons. It halted at Auxerre to smash church doors, and mutilate images and statues. At Clermont-Ferrand soldiers invaded the cathedral and with terrible, vigorous blows destroyed statues of numerous saints, broke stained glass windows, slashed altar pieces, heaped and burnt devotional manuals and hymnals, and appropriated gold and silver for the national treasury. This reached its apogée in November when the constitutional Archbishop of Paris, Gobel, was called on to renounce his priesthood, and did. When, despite this, he was sentenced to the guillotine, he sought reconciliation with his priesthood and Church. [8]

At about the same time, Notre Dame was *débaptisée* to become the Temple of Reason. Liberty, played by an opera singer, dressed in white, wearing a Phrygian bonnet and holding a pike in her hand, bowed to the flame of Reason, and then took a seat on a bank of flowers. This ceremony was sponsored by atheist, Hébert and his Commune. [9] The same Revolutionary desecration was carried to the provinces by *representants-en mission*. They were convention emissaries to the departments with such extensive powers that they were little less than local dictators. Most notorious of these was ex-Oratorian priest, Joseph Fouché (1759-1820), who had undergone a complete loss of faith and abandoned the sacerdotal state. He has been described as a man without passion or compassion, who like the horseman of the Apocalypse, swept aside all that stood in his way. At Nevers, he had destroyed all religious ornaments in the cemetery and announced that his mission was to 'substitute the worship of the Republic and natural-morality for the superstitious cults.' [10] In Lyons, he was responsible, along with Collot d'Herbois (1750-1796), for castigating that city for its Federalism. In that punitive operation, nineteen hundred and five were killed, priests, nobles, men of commerce and Federal officers. Collot, an actor, had been hissed from the stage in this city, a professional experience that touched a very sensitive artistic nerve. [11] It did nothing to quench his thirst for the revolutionary cause. [12]

By contrast, Paul Barras (1755-1829) in Marseilles was more attentive to judicial process and only 412 died under his rule. Jean Tallien (1767-1820) at Bordeaux was just as active a guillotine master but somewhat humanised by one of his victims, Teresa Cabarrus, who became his wife. Jean Carrier (1756-1794), at Nantes, was closer to Fouché for brutality and inhumanity. [13] His gruesome dispatch was by either shooting the victims as in a battue, or vertical deportation. The latter was by way of a flat bottomed boat with holes beneath the water line that were covered with boards which were removed when the boat was midstream. Priests were among the numbers killed in this type of

massacre. In the Vendée, when it fell, a scorched earth policy of exterminating proportions was carried out. One third, or 250,000 were killed. [14] Of these, 16,000 were attributed to Carrier. The Vendée cross, with bleeding heart, commemorates the 1793 Catholic peasant uprising against the French Revolution. It is worn today by those who revere the uprising as a monument of "Great Christian Heroism".

Commenting on the revolution of 10 August (1792), Robespierre had rejoiced that "a river of blood would now divide France from its enemies". The river was now swelling its banks; the current was flowing fast. [15] The apostle of the General Will was giving that notion a direction never contemplated by Rousseau.

Robespierre's colleague in his work of national direction was Saint-Just. Their skill as a team showed itself in presenting the Committee of Public Safety to the Convention. They made a science too of judicial offensives to meet moves from Danton on the Right and Hébert on the Left.

Danton's policy of '*Indulgent*' was opposed from its outset by the extremists. [16] Robespierre was at first inclined to give ear to this policy as he was less than impressed by Hébert's desecration of Notre Dame and the excesses of the *representants-en-mission* at Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux and Nantes. As well, Hébert was aspiring to ascendancy, and in company with Carrier, back from the atrocities at Nantes, called on the Commune for insurrection. [17] Its members, now appointed by executive committees of the Convention, ignored the call. Hébert was arrested 10 March 1794 and sent to the guillotine 23 March. Carrier shared his fate.

The attack upon Danton and his '*Indulgent*' policy was taken up rigorously by Collot d'Herbois, [18] who was Convention president, 1793, and Fouché, both just back from the blood bath at Lyons. Their opportunity to attack the *'Indulgent'* policy came when Danton was compromised by his friend, Fabre d'Eglantine, who was implicated in falsifying a document of liquidation and consequent bribery. Robespierre insisted that Danton sacrifice his self-evidently corrupt associate as the price of his own self preservation. [19] Danton was unwilling to desert his friend, and having stoutly defended himself with great voice and oratory before the Revolutionary Tribunal, his own creation, he was condemned to the guillotine. [20] He faced it, 6 April 1794, with the abandon of a man whose manhood no one could deny. The social atheists (for so they appeared to Robespierre), Hébert and Danton, had now been removed. Robespierre, in reaction to their squalid politics and the excesses of dechristianisation, proposed Deism as a faith for the Republic; and to launch it, sponsored, on grand lines, the Festival of the Supreme Being. [21] This, along with the immortality of the soul, he proposed in the tradition of Rousseau, against the Atheism of men like Barras, Fouché and Collot d'Herbois. In contrast with these lofty ideals, however, his devoted assistant, George Couthon, (1755-1794) who had said that the rights of man were not for counter-revolutionaries, but only for sans-culottes,

introduced the Prairial Law which defined the criteria for conspirators. [22] They were extremely elastic – "slandering patriotism", "spreading false news" etc. There would be no witnesses called, no defence counsel. Sentence would be either acquittal or death. This was the charter of totalitarian justice. It neutralised immunity and accentuated the speed and horror of the *Grande Terreur*. [23] In May, seventeen had gone each day to the guillotine, the number for June was twenty-six. It implied a complete loss of immunity. In April, Robespierre and Saint-Just had created a special police *Bureau* de Surveillance to report directly to the Committee of Public Safety. [24]

It infringed the jurisdiction of the Council of General Security whose most powerful members were dechristianised or enthusiastic terrorists. Fouché, Collot d'Herbois, Tallien and Barras were tough terrorists with blood on their hands. They despised Robespierre's pietism, and nurtured a keen sense of the danger that went with the loss of immunity. As a step for their own preservation, they moved successfully in Convention against Robespierre, Saint-Just and Couthon and had them declared as *hors la loi* (beyond the law). [25] On mere verification of identity, those so declared could be summarily executed within twenty four hours. On the day of their execution, 10 Thermidor, Saint-Just was the real Roman stoic, but Robespierre already bloodied, seemingly from a suicide attempt that did no more than put a bullet through his jaw, was hauled to the guillotine, uttering animal sounds till the blade fell. [26]

Tallien and Barras were among the main leaders in the move against Robespierre on 9 Thermidor. Teresa Cabarrus, a woman of striking beauty, had been mistress to Barras and was now Tallien's wife. She had already exercised influence over Tallien at Bordeaux. It would seem she was by no means inactive in Paris at the time of the move against Robespierre. She came to be known as Notre Dame De Thermidor. [27]

In Paris alone, 2600 victims of the Revolution had perished, but in the process, as Vergniaud had prophesied, Saturn had devoured his own children. The General Will had become a monster.

With the death of the Jacobin leaders, the Jacobin club was closed by, among others, Teresa Cabarrus, and the Commune was abolished. The third phase of the Revolution (1793-1794), the era of revolutionary dictatorship, was over. With the fall of the Jacobins, the republicans returned to the liberal principles of the Declaration of the Rights of Man. [28] The new constitution provided for a bicameral system of government and an executive Directory (1785-1799) of five elected leaders. It was to change the direction of the Revolution.

The three phases of the Revolution, 1789-1794, had been directed pre-eminently at political values. But inextricably interwoven with these, and of no less significance in the outcome, were corresponding phases of an economic revolution.

Before 1789, regulation of economic life had been by way of corporative organisation of the social order. The corporations organised master and man, capitalist and worker, in each industry or calling. The principles of this order were hierarchical and authoritarian, but they controlled prices, protected wages and penalised unjust usury. These principles suffered with the development of the principles of *laissez faire, laissez passer* (let do, let pass); and corporative control of industry was shaken by a succession of abolition and restoration of corporations. The breakup of the corporative order would be hastened with the growth of capital.

Industrial development in 18th century France, especially in maritime commercial centres, such as Bordeaux and Nantes, was considerable. Accumulation of savings and the growth of capital brought increased capital investment, the middle class enjoyed a considerable advance, and the balance of power, social and economic, passed from nobles to bourgeois. One factor that contributed to the process was the confiscation of Church property in 1789. It redistributed wealth as brokers, speculators and investors purchased to advantage, the national estate as it flooded the real estate market. They had become rich as the currency depreciated. But this latter currency phenomenon did more than allow the new rich to score. As Dawson writes:

"… the collapse of the currency is the central fact that dominates the whole social history of the period between the fall of Robespierre and the coming of Napoleon. In its own way it was an event no less revolutionary than the fall of the monarchy itself, since it completed the dissolution of the traditional corporative order and caused a wholesale redistribution of wealth and a shifting of social landmarks. Out of the whirlpool of inflation, speculation, and bankruptcy, there arose new classes and new social types which to a great extent determined the social character of nineteenth century France. Not only did it complete the destruction of the old privileged orders which had been already ruined by the reform of the Constituent Assembly, it also ruined the rentiers and the old higher bourgeoisie, which represented so much that was best in the culture and traditions of eighteenth century France. Their place was taken by the ruling class of self-made men who resembled the self-made men of the Industrial Revolution in their harsh individualism and their indifference to non-economic motives, while they were even more unscrupulous in their choice of means and their standards of commercial morality, since they owed their wealth not to industry and commerce but to revolution and war. As Vandal has written, 'Amidst the general disturbance of business affairs and transactions, one immense business continued to thrive – the Revolution itself', so that the vast and complicated system of interests which had grown up during seven years of Revolution had become the main factor in keeping the revolutionary movement in existence." [29]

By contrast with the growth of capital and the rise of the bourgeois, workers fared badly. Laws against corporations in 1790, left them unorganised and unprotected at a time of rising prices and cost of living, unemployment and food shortages. Jacques Roux, already mentioned above, the curé of *St*

*Nicholas-en-Champs,* a working class area in Paris, was not a socialist, but voiced the cause of the poor suffering in their frozen hunger. He spoke to Convention on 25 June 1893 in blunt and condemnatory terms. “Under the old regime it would never have been permitted for basic commodities to be sold at three times their value.” [30] His appeal was clearly from the liberal capitalism of the bourgeois republic to the traditional order of the old monarchy with its corporative organisation of economic life and its strict control of prices and wages. Roux’s enemies in Convention, therefore, charged him as inspired by counter-revolution and had him arrested by the Committee for General Security, and disowned by his local following. Some of the drastic regulatory proposals made by Roux were, however, taken over by the economic Terror and the Jacobins who had rejected him. The death penalty was enacted for food hoarders or tradesmen who withheld any necessary article from immediate sale. The law of the maximum price made profiteering a capital offence. The economic Terror was displaying a proletarian and anti-bourgeois spirit that in some respects was the forerunner of socialism. [31]

Jacques Roux was a prophetic figure. He was caught between Girondin bourgeois and Jacobin proletariat. His exclusion by both was a sign of their secularism and the fate that lay ahead for men of Roux’s impartiality and compassion, in the nineteenth century. Suggestions of the socialist trend were confirmed only months later. Saint-Just, who has been described as swordsman to Grand Inquisitor, Robespierre, demanded of Convention in February-March 1794 the realisation of the social implications of the Revolution. These were the liquidation of social elements opposed to the Revolution and the transference of their property to the poor. “A revolution has been made in the political area but it has not penetrated the social order”, he said. [32] A perceptive spectator of Saint-Just in Convention was Edme Bonaventure Courtois (1754-1816). He had been an Assembly member since 1791, was listed among those whom Robespierre intended to destroy, [33] and was a member of the Fouché plot [34] against Robespierre. Referring to Saint-Just, he wondered “where this man would have stopped in his socialism.” [35]

The fall of the Jacobins transferred leadership from men like Collot d’Herbois to Tallien, Barras and Courtois. They were of the Dantonist tradition and had no trouble in adopting Danton’s ‘*Indulgent*’ policy, and it was popular with the resurgent Assembly and Girondins. The Jacobin policy of social equality was abandoned for a return to bourgeois liberalism. Its devotees occupied the centre in the Assembly, the Jacobins the Left and the royalists the Right. The ensuing deregulatory policy effected the liquidation of the Jacobin economic regime. This was as much a matter of necessity as choice. Fixed prices, control of markets and requisitions were no longer possible to enforce without the sanction of the guillotine. Deregulation brought the inevitable consequences, high prices, food scarcity and popular insurrection, which the army was called in to suppress. A similar royalist uprising was subdued by Barras and the man of the future, Napoleon (1769-1821).

The Directory, which succeeded the Convention October 1795, was unpopular with both Jacobins and royalists. It had become a veiled dictatorship, [36] and was seen to be exploiting the Revolution in the interests of a class, those who had profited by the Revolution – the *nouveaux riches*. Since 1789, the resultant contrast between realities and ideals, between the Revolution as a religion and the Revolution as a business, inevitably produced the disillusionment and demoralisation that marked the period of the Directory. [37] In a word, the Directory had effected the fourth phase of the Revolution (1789-1799) – Bourgeois Dictatorship.

The reality of the more aggressive rich and the more defenceless poor threw into relief the new social inequality. This was totally unacceptable to the men dedicated to equality. It lit the fuse that exploded into a conspiracy of Equals – the logical outcome of Jacobinism – which launched the first socialist movement of modern times. Gracchus Babeuf (1762-1797) was a fellow native of Picardy with Robespierre and Saint-Just. He took a leading part in the revolutionary movement when, after the fall of the Jacobins, he became the spokesman of the group of ex-Hébertists and *enragés* that met at the club of the *Eveché*. He made it his mission to arouse the proletariat and create a ‘Plebeian Vendée’. [38] He argued in his *Tribun du Peuple* that the Revolution was a declaration of war – class war – between patricians and plebeians, the rich and the poor. The root of social evil was the institution of property on which rested the whole edifice of injustice and inequality. Economic equality could only be achieved by socialism. A conspiracy to launch it, 1796, was attempted but discovered and Babeuf went

to the guillotine a year later. Dismantling a massive machine, like the Terror, had produced an instability of government that created a power vacuum. The stage was set for the entry of a strong leader.

## Chapter 7

## Reaction: Empire and Romanticism

"*Four times since the authority of the Church of Rome was established in Western Christendom, has the human intellect risen up against her yoke … the fourth onslaught was the age of the Enlightenment … the doctrines of Voltaire were inherited and exaggerated by successors … down went the old Church of France with all its pomp and wealth … . Nor were the calamities of the Church confined to France. The revolutionary spirit, attacked by all Europe, beat all Europe back, became conqueror in its turn, and, not satisfied with the Belgian cities and the rich domains of the spiritual electors, went raging over the Rhine and through the passes of the Alps."* – Lord Macaulay in his essay on Ranke's ***History of the Popes***

Jacobinism took a more political turn in the year 1797, in Rome. Some Italian patriots and artists from the French Academy were shouting 'Long live the Roman Republic' before the French Embassy. Papal soldiers were despatched to maintain order. A young French general emerged from the Embassy with every good intention but brandishing a sword. He was shot dead by a papal soldier. French sensitivity was deeply offended and a punitive expedition was directed to Rome, 10 February 1798. Invoking the shades of Cato, Cicero and Brutus, it proclaimed a new Roman Republic. The Pope and his Curia were expelled from Rome. Pius VI was imprisoned at Valence in France and died there, 27 August 1799. Among those responsible for this position, along with Napoleon, were Talleyrand and Sieyès who had incurred Pius' displeasure and excommunication, for their leading role in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. They were now the subject of the aged Pope's final prayer, "Forgive them, Lord." But Napoleon already harboured thoughts that would control the Church, not only in France but in the person of the Pope himself. His designs were revealed when, as the Directory terminated 9 November 1799, he rose to supremacy as First Consul. His designs on the Pope were part of his plan to restore order and recovery to France after the chaos and destruction of Revolution. At the same time, he was 'the greatest instrument of the Revolution'. [1]

It is true that he undid the work of Revolution by dispensing with democratic institutions. But, like Danton, he preserved the essential features: civil equality, intellectual and religious liberty, the abolition of social privilege and the promotion of science and education. Again, by restoring religion, he undid the work of Revolution, and particularly that element of it for which Talleyrand and Fouché, his present ministers respectively of foreign relations and police, were responsible. But like Louis XIV he set out to create an absolute and centralised state. France thus became the first modern national state; with the first system of unified education and with the first rationalised code of law, the Code Napoleon. [2] But like the same magnifico – L'êtat c'est moi (I am the State) – he set out to control the Church.

Napoleon harassed both Pius VI († 1799) and Pius VII († 1823) and subjected both to the humiliation of arrest and imprisonment in France. He eased the tension with the Pope, momentarily at least, by a Concordat entered into with Pius VII. It was published in 1802 with no little ceremony at Mass in Notre Dame on Easter Sunday.

The First Consul's interest in the Concordat was unashamedly political. Superb military organiser as he was, he was not satisfied with half measures. The organisation of the Catholic Church in France came in for full treatment. The 133 ancient episcopal sees were jettisoned and replaced with 60 new ones. [3] Incumbent bishops were called upon to resign. Those who refused were deposed. Clearly the Church was to become an instrument of absolute government. The bishops nominated by Napoleon in traditional Gallican style were to be moral prefects, and the parish priests were to be local representatives of the established political order. Clergy salaries would be state-funded. There were concessions, however, to church life. The authority of the bishop was recognised, the Mass and sacraments were restored and the newly launched recruitment of priests was reinforced. It was to restore or replace 45,000 priests – one half of the total who had disappeared by death or exile since

1789. There had been no ordination since that year. [4]

While Napoleon set about repairing the material ravages of Revolution, a new movement was emerging that aimed to do something for the anguished soul of post-Revolution man. The Revolution was the child of the Enlightenment. But it destroyed itself and took toll, as well, of its progenitor. In the disillusion and tragedies of Revolution, some found the way to a new philosophy of society that was the antithesis of the Enlightenment. Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821), though never a French citizen, was French by language and culture and was a master of French literary style. He was a remarkable and independent thinker who straddled the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The greater part of the period 1789 to 1815, he spent at the Russian court as the impecunious ambassador of the King of Savoy in exile. There, material stress and exile only sharpened his interpretation of events and resultant judgements. The Revolution was for him not an event but an epoch in the history of humanity. The death struggle of one age was the birth pangs of a new. The transition was to be brought about by a monarchist throne and a Catholic altar. [5] The throne was to be an entity purified of the recent excesses; it was to establish the rule of law and to incorporate national traditions. The Catholic altar was not to be the discredited Gallican Church, but a body whose spiritual autonomy was guaranteed and whose mission was to be an instrument of divine providence. He viewed history as a superhuman process which transcended the accepted history makers. This was a view that would affect the next generation of thinkers [6]: on the one hand, Saint-Simon and the socialists along with Compte and the positivists, and on the other, the leaders of liberal Catholicism, Lamennais and his followers.

A German contemporary of de Maistre, Novalis (1772-1801), sounded a similar theme in *Europe or Christendom,* which exalted the religious ideals of the Middle Ages and saw signs of a spiritual renewal which would bring Europe back to unity. [7] This sounded an early note of what was to become known as Romanticism. This movement was a reaction to the rules and restraints of classicism, and equally to the exclusive emphasis on reason of the rationalists. It argued for the whole man, irrational as well as rational, in a word, passion, emotion and imagination. The mind was open, and open to the infinite so long as it was concrete not abstract. Baudelaire said Romanticism was a 'way of feeling'. But this definition was dwarfed by the first of the early French Romantics, Francois René de Chateaubriand (1768-1848). He had fled France in 1791 and returned from exile to see what Jaime Balmes (1810-1848) described as "atheism that was bathing France in a sea of tears and blood". [8] His response was an *opus magnum, The Genius of Christianity* (1802); and its message, he sang like a poet with a tongue of fire. Napoleon commented that it was "not the style of Racine but of a prophet; that nature had given him the sacred flame that breathed in all his works". [9] This work burst upon France in a blaze of glory. There were seven editions in two years and translations into German, Italian and Russian.

This history argued that faith inspired intellectual and spiritual life and, therefore, art and civilisation. It was history at its most lyrical, and pre-eminently a thing of the emotions. It was balm to many souls anguished by years of bloodshed, death and destruction. Napoleon, the victor, however, had others to applaud, and endow with the trophies of war. After Austerlitz, in December 1805, he declared that the House of Naples ceased to reign, and then proceeded to expel the Bourbons. In due course, Talleyrand was awarded the Dukedom of Benevento and Fouché that of Otranto. Both men, by now millionaires, were useful to Napoleon for the knowledge they had gathered during and since the Revolution. Neither man, however, was noted for fidelity and a fall from grace with Napoleon was the outcome. This left their case-hardened and long-tried hands free to plot against their former master. Metternich wrote in December 1808: "at the moment, two men hold the first place in France in public opinion and influence, Messrs. Talleyrand and Fouché. Formerly opposed to each other in views and in interest, they have been brought together by circumstances independent of themselves. I do not fear to suggest that at this moment their aim and the means of attaining it are the same; these latter have a chance of success because they conform to the wishes of a nation completely exhausted by a long series of efforts, dismayed by the immensity of the career which the actual master of destiny wishes it to undertake, also a people less disposed than any other to maintain, at the price of its blood and its fortune, projects which are simply the personal ones of their master." [10] Talleyrand was, consequently, the subject of a more bitter public denunciation by Napoleon than that which Mirabeau had directed at him in 1791. The two plotters, nonetheless, succeeded; and Talleyrand went on to persuade

Alexander I of Russia, who was of high standing in Europe at that time, to support the restoration of the Bourbons in the person of Louis XVIII, brother of Louis XVI. Both Talleyrand and Fouché became the new King's Ministers. Louis Madelin was biographer of both Fouché and Talleyrand. His judgement of them is noteworthy. "Talleyrand, the Prince de Benevento, was allied with the Duke d'Otrante in secret plots. Next, he drew away from, yet constantly approached, Fouché, until that astonishing moment, (July 1815), when Chateaubriand saw them leaving Louis XVIII's study, Fouché the former Oratorian and regicide, supporting the painful steps of Talleyrand, the apostate bishop, like 'vice leaning on crime'. Finally the two men, once again enemies, dragged each other down in their common ruin." [11]

Chateaubriand became the centre of the Roman circle in Paris and took up the cause of medieval art and the Gothic so belaboured by Voltaire as barbaric. Members of this circle included Victor Hugo (1802-1885), who was the leading Romantic mid-twenties, Alphonse Lamartine (1790-1869), one of the better Romantic poets whose *Les Meditations* Poetiques (1821) echoed war weariness, and Honoré Balzac (1799-1850) who, like de Maistre, promoted the cause of religion and monarchy. One, who was to become perhaps the most notable, for a time at least, was the French priest, Felicité Lamennais (1782-1854). His romanticism prompted him to seek a reconciliation between the ideals of liberty and the principles of his Church. He developed a line of thought pioneered by de Maistre among others. For them the principles of intellectual and political order transcended human reason and defied analysis. Their source was to be found beyond fallible reason; indeed, in God. The Creator bestowed on the first man basic religious, moral and political principles and the language in which to express them. This primitive, natural revelation was then handed down and became tradition. The criterion for testing the ensuing certitude was *raison generale* – universal reason or *sens commun,* the common conviction of mankind. Human reason was fallible. The human race was not. This revealed tradition, so verified by *sens commun,* was a participation in divine omniscience. It was infallible and had to be accepted on faith. The most universal truths, so infallible and worthy of faith, were the existence of God, his primitive revelation to man, and the immortality of the soul. Similarly, the true principle of the political order was not to be found in the will of man, but in divine authority, which is reflected in the sovereignty of monarch and Pope. History shows that the true principle of order lay in hereditary monarchy in the temporal sphere, and, in the spiritual sphere, in the Papacy. The primacy and infallibility of the Pope in the spiritual sphere indicated a move away from the Gallican subordination of bishop to King, to be replaced by the unfettered canonical and hierarchical relationship of bishop to Pope. This was a renewal and extension of the ultramontanism pioneered by the Counter-Reformation theologian, Bellarmine, in 1586.

Lamennais had not come to this traditionalist and ultramontanist legacy without a struggle. Born in 1782, his earlier years had been spent in the shadow of the Revolution and the Great Terror. In these years, he was a voracious reader of the best seller of the day, Rousseau. This unsettled his Catholic faith, which was only restored with the help of his brother, a devout priest. His first communion was thus delayed till he was twenty years old. His first book in 1808 appealed for a restoration of Christianity but made little impression. A second book did little more than incur Napoleon's displeasure which forced his flight to London in 1814. Returning to France, he was ordained priest two years later. The years between ordination in 1816 and death in 1854 were to be eventful years. Great success attended Lamennais, in his book, *Essai sur l'indifference* (Essay on Unconcern), in 1817. Against the background of a restored monarchy, he argued that reformed religion and an alliance with a renewed Bourbon monarchy constituted the way ahead. However, the constructive side of his apologetic was based on a theory of the irrational, the *sens commun*. Nonetheless, the brilliance, force and lyrical flights that conveyed the message produced favourable comments: he was likened by Lacordaire to Bossuet, by another to Pascal, and Chateaubriand made him an immortal. But there were critics who delated the work to the Congregation of the Index which ruled it orthodox despite its resort to the irrational.

*Essai sur l'indifference* was followed by articles in *Le Drapeau blanc* (The White Flag) in 1822, [12] in which Lamennais vividly expressed his mind on the worsening situation of the proletariat. "Modern politics regard the poor man as a mere machine from which the largest possible profit is to be obtained within a given time … you will soon see to what excesses contempt of man can lead. You will

have industrial helots who will be forced to imprison themselves in factories in order to earn a crust of bread … are those men free? Necessity makes them your slaves."

Members of Lamennais' group voiced similar sentiments. In the early 1830s, Charles de Coux (1787-1864) noted that the problem of value lies at the root of all political economy. Fifteen years before Karl Marx, he wrote: "All capital is simply accumulated labour." [13] And the Abbé Gerbet (1798-1864) also anticipated Marx. "Since the classes which overthrew feudalism … are themselves creating another sort of feudalism (the feudalism of wealth) in relation to the lower classes", others would inevitably rise against it. [14]

In a later work in 1825, Lamennais revealed his illusion with the restoration of the Bourbons. The Gallican stain was still there: the Church was still servant of the state. An authoritarian monarchy was subsidising the Church as Napoleon had done, 'like a stud farm', to use religion to raise good citizens. The alliance of throne and altar, therefore, had to terminate. But however admirable the intention of such an appeal, there was a difficulty. It was being made to the successors of bishops who had known the agony and horror of losing half their 90,000 priests in the 1790s and who had later suffered the iron hand of Napoleon. Imperfect as was their present position under the Restoration, it was infinitely better than what had prevailed from 1789 to 1815.Lamennais had already said that 'people' were the source of sovereignty, [15] but had not suggested that a democratic regime should supplant the monarchy. Reduced esteem for the monarchy, however, only intensified his enthusiasm for the Pope, who was God's anointed, his representative on earth, the trustee of the human race and expression of the universal will of man. In the interest of freedom against state intervention, he must give a lead in political affairs, unite the nations, and supplant the Holy Alliance which was a mockery of true order. In a word, Lamennais was proclaiming a return to theocracy. Enthusiasm was again his problem. The French bishops reminded him in 1826 that the temporal power is independent of the Church in purely civil matters. [16] And the Archbishop of Paris in a pastoral responded, and condemned a man so rash as to set up 'personal opinions as articles of faith'. [17] Lamennais, in reply, lapsed into undignified invective: official religion was a 'disgusting hotch-potch of stupidity and arrogance'. He was again delated to Rome. Denunciations arose from an army of enemies Gallicans, royalists, Jesuits, Sulpicians, and liberals who could not accept his ultramontanism. He was portrayed as 'torch in hand and at risk of causing a conflagration'. In turn, he requested the Pope to separate the cause of liberty from authoritarian government. A further attack on the existing civil regime was launched when ordinances in 1828 effected a state monopoly of education. Freedom of education was the issue. In a new work Lamennais petitioned the bishops to "restore to the Church her necessary independence'. This was a step towards the forces of liberty. When Lamennais was reminded of the dangers of liberalism, his reply was "Catholicize it." [18]

The move to liberalism was already occurring in Belgium where Lamennais' influence was strong. An alliance of Catholics and liberals took place there in 1828. It won a constitutional monarchy in August 1830. The new Belgian constitution guaranteed freedom of religion, separation of Church and state, along with freedom of the press and education. Yet the liberal character of the new regime of Louis Philippe in July 1830 did little to please Lamennais. Even though the state was now neutral in matters of religion, Gallicanism was as strong as ever. And the theatres were playing bawdy themes such as *Papesse Jeanne* (Pope Joan) and *Voltaire chez les Capuchins* (Voltaire among the Capuchins), to the applause of self styled Christians.

Lamennais had assailed the principle of 'God without liberty' under the Bourbon, Louis XVIII; now he would assail 'liberty without God,' under the Orleanist, Louis Philippe. [19] The Church should break with the state and look to its own regeneration. The time was propitious for a journal. *L'Avenir* (The Future), with 'God and Liberty' its motto, was produced in October 1830 as a Paris daily, and won immediate widespread expressions of applause. Romantic literature gave support. Contributions appeared over the names of Victor Hugo, Balzac and Lamartine. But it was mainly Lamennais' own journalistic genius, and the support of able lieutenants, such as prominent Catholics, Montalembert (1810-1870) and Lacordaire (1802-1861), which gave the journal its extraordinary drive and appeal. Indeed Lamennais, Montalembert and Lacordaire constituted a second wave of the Romantic movement in France. Charles Montalembert brought back from Ireland glowing reports on O'Connell's

work there for liberty, and Henri Dominique Lacordaire, a young barrister, recently returned to the faith, was a born controversialist with the soul of a mystic. Their enemy was Gallicanism which led to state despotism over the Church. 20 “We claim”, L’Avenir announced, “a freedom of conscience or of religion which is full, universal, without restriction or privilege and … in what concerns us Catholics, total separation of Church and state.” [21] Consequently, all Concordats between nations and the Holy See should be abolished. [22] Separation of Church and state signalled the claim that each had its own sphere and own freedom. The realm of the Church was concerned with revelation and the supernatural. There was no room here for religious indifference in Lamennais’ teaching. The realm of the state, on the other hand, had to do with the natural and the civil, and there was every reason here for tolerance and liberty. Because “civil tolerance is in no way equivalent to religious indifference,” [23] it “allows to error the unlimited power of diffusing itself.” [24] Yet *L’Avenir’s* liberalism did not mean the absolute ‘right of each man to believe and act as he pleases. [25] “The constitutional power possesses the right and duty to repress crimes and other offences which would materially attack these liberties or other civil and political rights of the citizens.” [26]

But there was a looseness in Lamennais’ position here. If religious indifferentism was unacceptable because it implied no supernatural and no revelation, civil tolerance or indifferentism was equally flawed because it eliminated that divine law which said pursue truth, avoid error. Lamennais was opting for both truth and error. Furthermore, civil tolerance or indifferentism opened the gate to license. The state, Lamennais would reply, had the power to repress and punish crime. But the state’s criterion was majority vote. The divine right of the majority – the natural – was then apt to override divine law – the supernatural. Not only was truth being mixed with error, but the supernatural was apt to be linked with a natural that excluded the supernatural. Both foe and friend saw this inconsistency. The Left ridiculed linking the psalms with the Marseillaise; and Robespierre with Jesus Christ. [27] Others saw Lamennais as Robespierre in a surplice. The Archbishop of Toulouse, on the other hand, questioned Lamennais’ philosophy and theological orthodoxy. [28] So too did Dupanloup (1802-1878), one of the younger clergy, later to become Bishop of Orleans.

Lacordaire suggested recourse to Rome as financial stringency beset *L’Avenir*. Its last number, November 1831 announced that Lamennais, Lacordaire and Montalembert would go to Rome as ‘pilgrims of God and Liberty’. Liberty was a desirable ideal, but it was a key word in the Revolution and recalled its excesses. The same excesses were tormenting Gregory XVI at this very moment. He had been forced to call in the Austrians to put down a Carbonarist insurrection in the Romagna (Bologna. Ferrara and Ravenna). This was for the pilgrims a most untimely intervention of events, that deprived them of any support from Austrian or French ambassadors to the Holy See. In Rome itself, the long series of denunciations and delations from Paris had not gone unnoticed. An enquiry set up by the Pope had reported certain errors in Lamennais’ teaching, but advised against a public condemnation. A group of bishops in France also had commissioned a panel of expert theologians to examine Lamennais’ theories and it had formally condemned them. [29] There was the basic theological error. The *sens commun* had substituted the unanimous testimony of mankind for both reason and divine revelation. There was also the philosophical error. Logic was a victim in a theory that said that the individual reason or part was fallible but the sum total of individual reasons or parts was infallible.

On the practical, political level, the pilgrims were asking for the impossible. The Pope was called upon to turn upside down the whole existing order of Church and state, and to negative Concordats upon which the whole outward structure of the Church depended. This could not be granted. Where the union of throne and altar promoted the Church’s supernatural goals, and where the union of Church and state in missionary countries produced temporal and spiritual results, monarchy would be upheld, revolutionary movements castigated, and union of Church and state sustained. Gregory XVI received the pilgrims in audience in March 1832, listened to them but gave no more than an assurance that a memorandum prepared by Lacordaire would be studied. They were discouraged from remaining in Rome for a reply.

The Pope’s answer came in the form of an encyclical entitled *Mirari vos,* dated 15 August 1832, which did not mention Lamennais by name. It dismissed both religious indifferentism, revived by the Enlightenment, and its sequel, civil indifferentism; ‘complete and unrestrained freedom’ of conscience

and political opinion was erroneous. Both forms of indifferentism denied the supernatural and were expressions of naturalism.

Lamennais accepted the Pope's ruling but temporarily only. In a book entitled *Paroles d'un croyant* (Words of a Believer), in which he revealed his turbulent Romantic emotions, he rebelled and was condemned by name in the encyclical, *Singulari nos* (1834). In the event, he abandoned the Church, and even his democratic ideals after election to parliament in 1848, and ensuing disillusionment. He died unrepentant, 1854. Lacordaire and Montalembert accepted the Pope's decree and continued to work for Liberty. That ideal had to be relieved of its extreme revolutionary undertones, and brought under the influence of Christian values. To this end Montalembert became a leading conservative figure in the French Parliament. Lacordaire's oratory drew immense crowds to Notre Dame in the mid-thirties. His pilgrimage took another and very fruitful road when he received the Dominican habit at the Convent of Santa Sabina in Rome in 1839. Despite the contribution Lacordaire and Montalembert continued to make in the cause of Liberty, it must be conceded that the attempt by members of the Church in France in the 30s to come to terms with the Revolution was, in the short term, not a success. What, however, could be said of Lamennais' contribution to the socio-economic question? As noted above, he wrote in *Le Drapeau blanc* in 1822: 'You will have industrial helots who will be forced to imprison themselves in factories in order to earn a crust of bread … are these men free?" These were words that would resound throughout the Catholic social movement and eventually find expression in *Rerum Novarum* in 1891.

## Chapter 8

## Frederic Ozanam

In the aftermath of Revolution and Empire, liberal Catholicism was one of the enthusiasms generated by the Romantic optimism of de Maistre and Chateaubriand. Others were positivism and socialism. Incipient socialism developed particularly in the period between the short lived Bourbon restoration (1815), and the second Empire (1852). Scientific socialism advanced by Claude Henri de Saint-Simon implied a new Christianity. It would be countered by the old, but liberal Christianity of Frederic Ozanam.

Louis XVIII (1755-1824), though a genial and alert man, replaced the tricolour with the white flag of the Bourbon dynasty. The ensuing White Terror by a decree of 1816, banished the regicides of 1793, including Fouché, Duke of Otranto. This turn of the wheel illustrated the two nations, the two philosophies and two traditions, over which the new King presided. Indeed the grinding conscription and bloodshed of war under Napoleon had done little to lessen the blinding violence that underlay his society. Louis, nonetheless, steered a middle course between ultra-royalists and revolutionaries. The assassination in 1820 of de Berri, a nephew of the King, provoked a strong royalist reaction. It was only intensified by the new monarch, Charles X (1756-1836), an aristocrat and clericalist when he aspired to a restoration of the *Ancien Régime*. Three days of fierce fighting and the burning of the episcopal residence in Paris, brought to an end the 840 years-old house of Bourbon.

The outcome of this 1830 Revolution was not another republic or empire, but a bourgeois or democratic monarchy, and Louis Philippe (1773-1850), anything but an aristocrat and a royal, extended a 'sentimental umbrella' that recalled the tricolour. Lafayette, the hero of two worlds and grand old man of the Revolution, was there with his erstwhile associate, Talleyrand, to anoint him as the type of monarch they had hoped for in 1789.

Talleyrand was London ambassador for Louis' government, 1830-1834. On resignation from that post, he spent a pleasant and quiet retirement in Paris during the winter and at Valencay during the summer. In his final months he was dutifully attended by nieces. His spiritual welfare was in the hands of the Abbé Dupanloup, a young cleric, who was to become one of the lights of the nineteenth-century Church in France. Under his guidance, Talleyrand recanted his errors, was purged of his excommunication and absolved; and when extreme unction was being administered, he requested the oil anoint the back of his hands as was the practice for clerics. [1] Lafayette had predeceased him by four years.

It would seem there was little more to the revolution of 1830 than political discontent. The liberal historian, H.A.L. Fisher, wrote: "The revolutionary movements which broke out in various parts of Europe in 1820, in 1830 and 1848 were not the product of factory discontent." [2] He quotes the eminent economic historian, Dr Clapham, who noted that only two towns in France, St Etienne and Roubaix, had grown rapidly between 1815 and 1848, and that three fifths of the pig iron produced in the country came from hundreds of little charcoal furnaces scattered among the woodlands. But Paris still had the poor that had sparked the *enragés* in 1792-93; and now wages continued to fall between 1817 and 1850. The Industrial Revolution too was moving, however slowly. One small indication was the steam engine. From a figure of 200 in 1820 it rose to 600 in 1830. Another was the employment of women and children, and a working day in the textile mills of Alsace of 14 to 15 hours. Reaction to these conditions came from several quarters. Gracchus Babeuf, who promoted the ideal of economic equality and suffered the guillotine, still had a strong following. His disciple, Filippo Buonarotti, in 1828, wrote the story of his master in *The History of the Conspiracy of the Equals*; and from Paris presided over the Carbonari, a terrorist organisation founded in Italy in 1808 under French inspiration to counter the French occupation. It placed a dagger in the hands of its recruit, who was then subjected to absolute obedience in an oath of readiness 'to act' and if necessary to 'sacrifice himself for the cause of the order'. [3] The order became one of the most influential societies of the nineteenth century. While its southern arm was most effective against the Bourbons in Naples, its northern Italian branch was responsible for repeated uprisings which were put down only with Austrian assistance.

Another reaction to the Industrial Revolution came from one who was to be named the founder of scientific socialism, Claude Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825). Having bought Church lands in the expropriation of 1789 and sold them profitably, he never quite renounced his attachment to private property. It was, however, the social implications of the new technology, Progress and a new golden age, that captured his imagination and found expression in a book, *New Christianity*. It reduced Christianity to one precept; and proposed that science, the vehicle of Progress, replace the Church, and that industrialists (a word he coined) replace feudal and army leaders. But importantly for future socialist theory, it made labour the foundation and source of wealth. This called for a positive reorganisation of society in which the worker would be first not last.

Another contribution came from Charles Fourier (1772-1837), a younger contemporary of Saint-Simon, who was more utopian. Progress was the fruit of good hedonism which ensured Perfect Harmony. The results would be a new world where the North Pole would be as mild as the shores of the Mediterranean, and the sea would lose its salt to become lemonade. The means would be the establishment of a phalanx on every square mile to include 1650 people in what could be a garden city – a village commune. Less high flying was Etienne Cabet (1778-1856) who, in 1840, made the municipality his basic unit and sought expression in various parts of the United States.

Saint-Simon's enthusiasm for the new technology and Progress had about it a novelty and excitement that appealed to many, but particularly to the students at the Sorbonne. This brought his followers into debate with a young student there, Frederic Ozanam, who was an intimate of both Lacordaire and Montalembert and shared their Romantic enthusiasm for medieval religion, art and culture. He consequently defended traditional Christianity and pointed to various works of mercy carried on by priests and nuns. He was prompted to bring laymen into these works and, at the age of 20, founded Conferences of Charity in 1833. They came to be known as the St Vincent de Paul Society, which now works in a hundred countries, and, in 1960, numbered 300,000 active members. [4] Ozanam and his followers were particularly active among the poor in Paris in the Faubourg St Marceau, [5] where Danton had lived and where the Cordeliers had been strong, and in the neighbouring Faubourg St Antoine where the Abbé Jacques Roux had waged his campaign for the 'frozen poor'. This work of charity was a telling example of person to person assistance to the poor and one answer to substituting science for religion and to reducing Christianity to one precept. Ozanam was saying that both religion and science were necessary and so were both precepts of Christianity.

Ozanam was a brilliant student if not a genius. He gained doctorates in law and literature at the Sorbonne at the age of 25. A year later, he was invited to compete there for the professorship of foreign languages, after a year as lecturer in commercial law at Lyons. [6] He competed successfully, and

became the youngest ever to become a professor at Paris' historic and prestigious University. [7]

The direction of Ozanam's lectures had already been signalled. In his thesis for the doctorate in literature, he had examined Dante's epic, the *Divine Comedy*. [8] Subsequently, "in his lectures at the Sorbonne on St Francis of Assisi, in his two books on Dante (1838 and 1839), and in his *Etudes Germaniques* (1847-1849), Ozanam, within the framework of comparative literature, always also taught religion and made 'the long and arduous education which the Church imparted to modern peoples' the central topic." [9] For Ozanam, however, Dante was more than literature. The *Divine Comedy* portrayed man as dignified by the power of love, disciplined by reason, and blessed with an immortal destiny. This was a theology Dante († 1321) had drawn from Thomas Aquinas († 1274). That theologian next became Ozanam's subject of study when, in his competition for the Sorbonne professorship, he presented a comparison of Charles de Montesquieu (1689-1775) and Thomas Aquinas. [10]

Montesquieu had gone along the Enlightenment road of Deism but finished his life reconciled with his Church. His E*sprit des Lois* (1748) made him one of Europe's foremost social and political philosophers. He abhorred despotism, admired republicanism but preferred limited monarchy. To this end, his major contribution was the division of political power to prevent its concentration in the monarch. The legislative, executive and judicial powers would rest in separate authorities.

Monarchy and the concentration of political power were no strangers to Thomas Aquinas. He was the son of Landulph of Aquino, Italy, and a relative of both the king of France, and of the Holy Roman Emperor. At the same time, he knew the mind of the subject as he surrendered place and property for the obedience and poverty of the religious life. He lived long before the great eighteenth century debate on the divine right of Kings and popular sovereignty. Yet his views, in a comparison with those of a leading Enlightenment thinker in that debate, were no less relevant.

The slave state he rejected as not only replete with abuses, but as an institution in which the subjects were not their own masters. The true and preferable polity was composed of free men, and the executive power was constitutionally limited, '*coarctata secundum leges aliquas civitatis*'. He rejected the view that the prince's pleasure (*lex regia*), independent of the people, had the force of law. [11] And this prince included not only the Holy Roman Emperor, but rulers of kingdoms and city states. [12] The fundamentals on which these propositions were based, have been ably illustrated. "According to St Thomas sovereign powers belong ultimately to the people, and the government exercises them merely in a representative capacity. This theory of popular sovereignty was the basis of maintaining that custom not only can obtain force of law but can even change or abrogate an existing law: 'For … the consent of the whole people expressed by a custom counts for more than the authority of the sovereign who has not the power to frame laws, except as representing the people' (S.T. 1a 2ae 97,3)." [13] Ozanam's choice of Montesquieu and Aquinas was well made. Both clearly emphasised the supremacy of the rule of law: *Lex regia coarctata secundum leges aliquas civitatis*.

Ozanam brought these studies together later when he published a work entitled *Dante and Catholic Philosophy in the Thirteenth century*. [14] This study was almost certainly influenced by the history of the Sorbonne itself. Founded as a hostel for indigent students by Robert de Sorbonne, who was confessor to Louis IX († 1276), it served its *alumni* when Thomas Aquinas was one of the lights of the University of Paris. At the time of Aquinas' death, the University vied for the privilege of his burial.

The influence of Thomas' Christian humanism was evident in Ozanam's lectures in the school of commercial law at Lyons in 1839-1840. He denied the accepted absolutism of *laissez faire* that made human labour a commodity subject to the law of supply and demand. 'Exploitation of man by man is slavery', and therefore contrary to the primacy and dignity of the human person. [15] He equally denied dictatorial government intervention; asserting, instead, state intervention in abnormal circumstances and for normal times the association of workers for self-defence. He further affirmed that every worker was entitled by nature to a minimum wage sufficient to provide the necessities of life, education for children and support in old age.

This teaching was timely as the Industrial Revolution increased its tempo. Steam engines in France, in 1830 at 600, were 2900 in 1840. The human cost was still deplorable. The Vicompte de Villeneuve-

Bargemont was an economist and a man of affairs, who could testify to this human problem. He had been a prefect under Napoleon in 1812 and a councillor of state sixteen years later, under the monarchy. He became a member of Parliament in 1830. His research as an economist revealed the disturbing figure, among others, that of 70,000 workers in Lille in 1835, 32,000 were paupers. [16] In 1841, in spite of his unpopularity as a legitimist with the Orleanist Government, he piloted bills through the Chamber of Deputies that marked the first departure by the French government from non-intervention in the labour question. [17] He had eloquent support from Montalembert. The resultant laws restricted the hours of work for children, between the ages of eight and twelve, to eight hours a day, and those between the ages of twelve and sixteen to twelve hours a day. This concession by the French Parliament to human welfare was, as a first step, commendable. But it was so minimal that it was a resounding indictment of liberal bourgeois society. It would do little to forestall the revolution that threatened.

The fiery atmosphere that prevailed in Paris in 1842 has been captured by Heinrich Heine, Paris correspondent of a German newspaper and one of the greats of German literature."Today", he wrote to a German newspaper, "when I visited some of the factories in the Faubourg Saint Marceau and discussed there what kind of reading matter was being spread among the working men, who are the most powerful element among the working classes, I thought of Sancho's proverb, 'Tell me what you have sown today and I will predict to you what you will reap tomorrow.' For here in the workshops I found several new editions of speeches by old Robespierre, Marat's pamphlets at two sous a copy, Cabet's *History of the Revolution,* Cormenin's poisonous little works and Buonarotti's *Baboeuf's* Doctrine and Conspiracy – all writings which smell of blood. The songs which I heard them singing seem to have been composed in hell and had a chorus of the wildest excitement. Really people in our gentle walk of life can have no idea of the demonic note which runs through these songs. One must hear them with one's own ears for example, in those enormous workshops where metals are worked and where the half naked, defiant figures keep time to their songs with the mighty blows which their great iron hammers strike upon the ringing anvil … .Sooner or later the harvest which will come from the sowing in France threatens to be a republican outbreak."

Fisher's comment: "It is clear from Heine's words that what was in the minds of the Paris workers was not a Fabian or scientific transformation of society, but a violent and bloodthirsty political revolt." [18]

The former Cordelier territory, the Faubourg St Marceau, 1842, thus gave notice of a repetition of the Jacobin revolution and bloodshed of 1793-1794.

## Chapter 9

### *"The Two Camps"*

The house of Orleans proved a poor replacement for the Bourbons. Its downfall only hastened the return of the Republicans and the rise of the socialists. Both groups evoked a definite, if divided, Catholic response. Despite liberal efforts for a new republic, a new Empire emerged.

Louis Philippe failed the aspirations of Lafayette and Talleyrand for a constitutional monarchy. The citizen-king proved to be neither king nor citizen. As king, he ruled through puppet prime ministers to the displeasure of many, including Bourbon descendants, who regarded the sons of Philippe Egalité as usurpers. As citizen, he fell short of the expectations of both middle class republicans and the lower classes. He did please the commercial classes, however, until economic down turn became critical. Disenchanted Republicans sought an extension of the franchise. Their efforts in parliament were rejected, and made little more progress when the campaign was taken to the whole country.

The prophet of republican ideals, Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869), a Romantic poet of the 1820s, and a member of the Chamber in 1833, had recently written warmly of his ideals in the *Histoire des Girondins*. He was a noted orator and the Adonis of every salon. He was elevated to leadership of the reformist campaign but soon found that he was confronted by a reformist riot in Paris which developed into a vigorous republican uprising. But there were other sparks from the Paris furnace. Economic crisis, unemployment and high cost of living were the signs of the depression of 1846-1847.

Consequent deplorable conditions among the industrial proletariat were confined to the industrial areas, but they were given strong voice by Louis Blanc (1811-1882), who was severely critical of the Orleanist monarchy, and led the communists. His *L'Organization du Travail* (1837) aimed to replace *laissez faire* (no restraints) liberalism with the *savoir faire* (know how) of socialism, and to redistribute income; he advocated national workshops for the unemployed, and the nationalisation of some industries e.g. the railroads. This was a disturbing program for landowners who formed the bulk of what was still mainly a rural community. Their holdings were threatened. Market prices fell to zero on the stock exchange. On 22 February 1848, an insurrection, swept along by middle class and proletariat, prompted the mob to proclaim a republic. Barricades were erected in places like Faubourg St Antoine, and on the second day of street fighting, Louis Philippe abdicated and fled to England. A Republic was proclaimed and a provisional government named in two

newspapers, one republican and one socialist, was established. [1] It included Lamartine in charge of foreign affairs and Louis Blanc with a commission on unemployment. Lamartine, Foreign Minister, had been requested to replace the Tricolor with the red flag, but refused. [2] It was no hollow rebuttal. "During the Revolution of 1848, he became head of the *Gouvernement Provisoire* and on 25 February achieved a signal oratorical triumph, when, standing alone and unarmed on the steps of the Hotel de Ville, he held in check for several hours, and finally subdued, an infuriated mob whose bayonets were levelled at his breast." [3]

These developments did not escape the new Pope, Pius IX. In his first encyclical (1846) *Qui Pluribus,* he condemned the indifferentism of Voltaire, the absolute Progress of Rousseau and the communism of Babeuf and Blanc. Yet Ozanam had spoken out even earlier. In the early 30s, he had noted the "division, which exists among men growing deeper and wider every day … Here is the camp of the rich, there the camp of the poor." A little later, he wrote: "a struggle is preparing between the classes, and it threatens to be terrible."

In early February, 1848, Ozanam, in the face of the discontent soon to explode, said: "Let's go over to the barbarians." [4] Barbarians was a term used at that time of the working class. The proposal received a harsh retort from Louis Veuillot (1813-1883), who was to become one of the great journalists of the nineteenth century and was at this time editor of *L'Univers*. He was to make that paper, the leading Catholic journal. To him the barbarians of whom Ozanam spoke, were the 'savages of St Antoine'. Speaking to an assistant on his paper, *L'Univers,* he said: "Ozanam wants us to put ourselves in the hands of those who hate God and Church – the scum of Paris, who'd cut our throats with delight … Does this trusting fellow want to take us back to the Terror?" [5] These remarks overlooked what Ozanam had been saying since the mid 30s, and was still saying: "Here is the camp of the rich; there the camp of the poor. Only one means of salvation remains to us. It is that Christians, in the name of love, interpose between the two camps … teaching them on both sides to look upon each other as brothers." [6] In direct answer to Veuillot, Ozanam was able to explain: "When I say, 'Let us go over to the barbarians', I mean that we should do as Pius IX had done, that we should occupy ourselves with the people whose wants are too many and whose rights are too few, who are crying out and fairly for a share in public affairs, for assurances of employment, and against distress; who follow bad leaders because they have no good leaders."

This explanation was necessary because middle and upper class Catholics after 1793-1794 and 1830, now dreaded the barbarians. Ozanam's fears of the barbarians, in the train of bad leaders, was accentuated by the danger of a communist dictatorship engineered by the followers of Cabet and Fourier. [7] He, therefore, aspired to a Christian republic long before the Christian Democrats. For a platform, he looked no further than his commercial law lectures at Lyons in 1839-1840. One proposition there was a synthesis of the Christian socio-economic position. The state would come to the help of the worker by protective legislation as a last resort. Short of that extreme, worker associations would assume the protective role. [8]

A newspaper, *The New Era,* was envisaged, and a prospectus under the names of Ozanam, Lacordaire and Charles de Coux (1787-1864) appeared in March. [9] Both Lacordaire and de Coux had contributed to *L'Avenir*. De Coux had been editor on matters of political and social economy. When that paper was suspended, he took up the same subject in lectures at the University of Louvain. He would assume the

same responsibility on *The New Era,* but with the benefit of experience and maturity. The paper was launched 15 April 1848 and had the blessing of the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr Affre. Lacordaire would be its editor.

In his editor, Ozanam had a strong ally. He had been friendly with him since early St Vincent de Paul days. Indeed he had been instrumental, at that time, in having the Archbishop of Paris invite Lacordaire to deliver the Lenten sermons in Notre Dame. [10] Ozanam then said that Lacordaire was the man to bring home to sceptics the significance of religious truth. What he had done then for religious sceptics, Ozanam thought he would now do for socio-economic sceptics. The pulpit at Notre Dame became Lacordaire's means of reaching the people of Paris and France. After some years in Viterbo and Rome where he became a Dominican, he returned to Paris 1841. He was invited by the Archbishop of Paris to resume the Lenten sermons so well received in the 1830s. Ozanam wrote:

"Our temples so long forsaken see their solitude re-peopled, the Abbé Lacordaire thunders forth the Word of God over an assembly of six thousand men, crowded into the mighty nave of Notre Dame". [11]

Some seventy conferences were delivered with notable power and religious passion. They were published in four volumes (1844-1851). The Catholic intelligentsia o f Paris and France came to acclaim a new popular idol, as his oratory defended the Church and its teachings, and ever promoted Liberty in Church and state. [12] Yet Ozanam's hopes for wide Catholic support for his Christian republic were not realised. Veuillot named *The New Era,* the New Error, because democracy was a mask for demagoguery. [13] And Montalembert wrote to his former fellow pilgrim for God and Liberty, Lacordaire, that his preference was Christian monarchy. [14] This division indicated by Veuillot and Montalembert boded poorly for Catholic political unity, and indeed would harass the Catholic cause into the 80s and beyond.

Ozanam had sought for his cause candidates for parliament. He led by example at Lyons, but was unable to canvass and was not elected. Lacordaire fared better; so did three bishops, ten other ecclesiastics and a strong body of laymen. [15] In these elections for the Second Republic, Lamartine had promoted universal suffrage to halt the red peril. The result was an Assembly that had tapped rural sentiment and became an overwhelmingly conservative body. This was a Second Republic not to the taste of the Paris workers. The Paris mob, now armed and reinforced by national workshop recruits, was not impressed by the new Assembly. It invaded that body, 15 May, as its forebears had done in 1793, raised the red flag and decreed the Assembly's dissolution. But the National Guard was mobilised, and it put down the insurrection with an enormous cost in human lives. The Archbishop of Paris, Mgr Affre, volunteered, at the request of Ozanam among others, and was accepted, as a mediator. He approached the barricades of the Faubourg St Antoine, but was shot, possibly by a random bullet, and died a little later. The death of the archbishop was a shattering blow to *The New Era* and forced the resignation of Lacordaire. His loss and the horror of civil war eventually brought about the closure of the paper. In four days of street fighting, 10,000 died and at least 4000 were wounded. [16] By contrast, in The Reign of Terror, less than that number, 2260, died in its last four most furious months. Paris was incensed, and countless summary executions followed. 11,000 were arrested and 4,000 were deported. [17] The red flag was now becoming quite forceful, competing not with the white of the Bourbons but with the tricolor of Revolution. It was less successful than the socialist name, however, which was now supplanting that of the revolutionary Jacobins.

Socialists who had come into notable prominence in the 1848 uprising, had a measure of success at the subsequent French elections. Pierre Leroux, a Saint-Simonian, pantheist and devotee of Progress, had popularised the word socialist in 1838. Philippe Buchez, who was president of the Assembly for a term, became the father of Christian socialism, and Pierre Proudhon chose a socialism that would fly the black flag of anarchism, and professed *ni dieu ni maitre* (neither God nor governor). He popularised the well known aphorism 'Property is robbery' which he borrowed from Lafayette's friend, Brissot de Warville. [18] Another colourful newcomer to the 1848 assembly was Lacordaire, one of the three Pilgrims of God and Liberty in 1832. He left no doubt about his profession of faith and his intention, when he appeared in the Assembly in the white habit and black cape of a Dominican friar. This was a brave step. It could not but recall the 1790s attempt by the revolutionary assembly to defrock the clergy and despoil the religious orders. To the historically perceptive, it was at least a

token effort to restore the Jacobins of the thirteenth century. No less courageous was the seat he took in the Assembly. It was on the extreme Left. [19] It was intended to strike a high political stance, but did not indicate a socialist sympathy. Indeed he suspected 'those corporative schemes' which claimed to unite 'fire and water'. [20] His choice of the Left meant his traditional attachment to the democratic cause – a lifelong enthusiasm. Life in parliament did not, however, realise his liberal aspirations. He resigned after a short experience and retired into religious life. In the 60s, he was received into the French Academy and on that occasion declared he hoped to die penitently religious, but impenitently liberal. [21]

A voice from the aristocracy joined Lacordaire and Ozanam in the person of Armand de Melun (1807-1877), who was elected to the French Assembly in 1849. In his *Annals de la Charité,* a pamphlet published in 1845, he proposed that the relief of the poor should be a matter of state responsibility as well as of private charity and that the state should supplement and utilise private efforts for social welfare. [22] He therefore promoted social legislation to effect social welfare, to develop associations between employer and employee and to eliminate the evils of industrial competition. In 1850 the Assembly voted, very much at his instance, laws on insalubrious dwellings, pension funds, mutual aid societies and the education and guardianship of juvenile offenders. Melun's efforts were hampered by the fear that state action was socialist action. When, in 1852, the Second Empire swept him from office, his continued enthusiastic and high quality action was of a private nature. He could justly be applauded, along with Villeneuve-Bargemont, as a pioneer of social legislation sponsored by the Catholic Social movement in nineteenth-century France.

The Catholic socio-economic movement suffered an irreparable loss in the death of Ozanam, which took place 8 September 1853, when he had just completed his fortieth year. He left a wife and young daughter. The cause of Ozanam's early death was not known till a post mortem revealed that tuberculosis had affected his kidneys. His last days were painful but marked by a human fortitude and faith, that testified to a life which had long been saintly. Ozanam's short life was a glorious one. His Sorbonne days were enough to assure the acclaim that goes with academic excellence. His works of personal charity in the depressed and revolution-ravaged Faubourgs St Antoine and St Marceau, works perpetuated by the world-encompassing St Vincent de Paul Society which he founded and inspired, were sufficient to write his name indelibly in the annals of the corporal works of mercy. In his attention to social, political and economic reform, his achievement was notable. "France had produced the forerunners of social Catholicism. Some, such as the Viscount Alban de Villeneuve-Bargemont and the Compte Armand de Melun, were aristocrats anxious to stem the tide of revolution. Others were disciples of Lamennais, among them Charles de Coux and the Abbé Gerbet, or Christian revolutionaries like Buchez. The two groups were linked by Frederic Ozanam." [23] This can only say that Ozanam was one of the greatest of those who sought the recovery of the Church in nineteenth century France.

At the same time, it must be conceded that the second Romantic wave for God and Liberty (The New Era) had proved little happier than its predecessor (L'Avenir). Recovery would take time. Ozanam had no successor. The centre of Catholic socio-economic activity would move East of the Rhine, as the "evolutionary spirit, attacked by all Europe, beat all Europe back, and … went raging over the Rhine" (Lord Macaulay).

## Chapter 10

## Joseph Gorres

*"A Sorcerer who drew into his magical circle heaven and earth, the past and the future."*

Colourful expression was given to worker discontent in Paris in the early 40s by Heinrich Heine (see Chapter 8, p.53). Though events proved his story anything but overstated, the language was worthy of a Romantic. Indeed Heine, who wrote from Paris for a German newspaper, was the last of the German Romantics. As a group, they were forceful and articulate and marked the fact that Romanticism was a European phenomenon. They had a competent *journaliste* in Madame de Stael, who, as well as being daughter of Necker, the French Director of Treasury and Finance, and wife of Baron von de Stael-

Holstein, was herself an accomplished figure in European letters.

She observed that French Romantics will prefer Fichte to Descartes, and Shakespeare to Racine. [1] The latter preference was well instanced in Germany, when August Schlegel (1767-1845), the most noted literary figure among German Romantics, translated the greater part of Shakespeare into German. The great English poet satisfied the Romantic appetite for great deeds and the painful feelings of unfulfilled destiny. But more than that, he could be quoted against the narrowness of the rationalism of the Enlightenment: "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamed of in your philosophy." And, against the aridity of Deism, could be cited: "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we may."

Fichte's philosophy proposed a divinity that appealed to some French and German Romantics. According to his dialectic of affirmative, negative and synthesis, the self conscious process of the will (affirmative) responding to duty in the world (negative) provided consciousness with a self-generative process that extended alike to self and world (synthesis). This suited some Romantics because it provided a living process that underlay personal experience and gave vitality to history. It was subject, however, to the charge of Pantheism.

Catholic Romantics, by contrast, directed their attention to the medieval doctor, Thomas Aquinas, and his teaching of a personal, transcendent God. Many found their way into the Catholic Church by way of this Romanticism and its attachment to medieval culture. Among these were August Schlegal's brother, Freidrich († 1829) and his wife, Dorothy († 1839), (daughter of Moses Mendelsohn) and Joseph Eichendorff († 1851). Others who, under the same influence, returned to the Church were, in France, Leroux and Buchez; [2] and in Germany, Joseph Gorres and Franz Baader, both of whom were to become dominant figures in German Catholic life. Gorres would dominate in the political world: Baader in the socio-economic. Joseph Gorres (1776-1848) had his schooling in his native Coblenz where the prevailing atmosphere was the Enlightenment. [3] He emerged a disciple of Rousseau with an enthusiasm for the French Revolution, that vanished as a result of a visit to Paris. Back in Coblenz, he studied science and came under the influence of a Pantheistic version of Fichte. Gorres was now showing some interest in the Romantics, and in the years, 1806-1808, spent enough time in Germany's oldest university at Heidelberg to give his mind to things medieval. The ruins of a thirteenth-century castle above the city, among other things, only sharpened his awareness of nation, folk and medieval society. Lectures in literary and historical subjects, completed the process.

Gorres' already deep Romanticism was caught and well expressed by Eichendorff, himself a noted German lyricist and Romantic. In his memoirs, "Heidelberg", he wrote: "There dwelt in seclusion a sorcerer who drew into his magic circle heaven and earth, the past and the future that – was Gorres." [4]

The *Rhenish Mercury* became Gorres' next outlet for the expression of maturing ideas. It was based in his native Coblenz and occupied him there 1808-1815. It became Germany's first national political journal and German Romanticism's greatest periodical. Its national call was for German liberty, and it naturally opposed Napoleon. It strove to give concrete shape to a constitutional state and a realistic program for a national people's culture. Gorres was not impressed by the direction of the German government, and wrote strong words that had to bring reprisals. The *Rhenish Mercury* said that when the German revolution came, it would be just as much a menace to the peace of Europe as had been the French Revolution. It would "inevitably end with the expulsion of all ruling dynasties, the destruction of all ecclesiastical forms, the extermination of the aristocracy and the introduction of a republican constitution … it will step beyond its frontier and destroy Europe's whole rotten political system as far as the frontiers of Asia, because every revolutionised nation becomes a conquering one." [5] The *Mercury* was suppressed and Gorres retreated to Heidelberg, where he spent the years 1816-1819. Heidelberg was host at this time to a rising philosopher, George Hegel (1770-1831). In 1811 he published the first volume of his greatest work, *Logic*. In 1816 his growing fame as a writer secured for him a professorship at the University of Heidelberg.

For Hegel the material world was incomplete, and unable to exist by itself. It was the necessary counterpart of intelligence or spirit, and the object in which the spirit revealed itself. This revelation, in this most abstruse philosophy, was by way of evolution or dialectic: a clash of opposite ideas

generated a third implicit idea. The consequent march of progress from lower to higher forms resulted in an Absolute Idea or Spirit and that Absolute attains its manifestation in the state. "The state is the reality of the moral Idea, of the self-unfolding Spirit, and presents the divine will as present, as the real pattern and organising factor in the world … the individual subject becomes a mere 'moment' of the universal spirit." [6] Hegel's purpose was a basis for the rising Prussian state, but obviously there was provided here the theoretical groundwork for every absolutist or totalitarian government.

Gorres' attitude to anything like Hegel's state absolutism had already been shown in his *Rhenish Mercury* in its campaign against Napoleon and in its preference for a constitutional state. The same antipathy he now directed to the new Prussian state. He expressed it vigorously as he came to the defence of the Church, harassed by an intrusive state.

There had been conflict between the civil authorities and the Holy See on the appointment of bishops. Neither would yield to the other the right of appointment. In 1815 there were five bishops in all Germany and four of them were over eighty. [7] The Prussian government, after the Congress of Vienna, was just as inflexible because it aspired to German unification under the Hohenzollerns. The absence of geographical continuity and of common tradition between the Rhineland and north eastern Germany, or between Cologne and Berlin, were obstacles that called, in the government's view, for vigorous and energetic action. Religion would have to make its contribution to the all-powerful state – an ideal cherished since Frederick the Great. Gorres' defence of the Church's freedom, in these circumstances, led to an order for his arrest; his retreat this time, 1818, was to Strasbourg. [8]

From Strasbourg, Gorres joined what was to be called the Mainz circle, a group in Mainz responsible for a publication called *Katholik,* founded in 1821, which aimed to defend the Catholic Church against the incursions of the Prussian state and to lead the drive to restore Mainz and the Rhineland Church. In this venture, Gorres recovered the atmosphere that effected for him a full-hearted return to Catholicism (1824). Mainz, in its long history, had known the best and worst in Catholicism. Its best days were an inspiration to recovery: its worst days a warning against human frailty. Mainz was the metropolitan See of St Boniface († 754), who was the apostle of Germany. It thus became the primatial See of Germany. But when the Emperor's authority began to fade in the Middle Ages and no strongly centralised authority remained, the bishops, and particularly the great archdioceses of Cologne, Mainz, Trier and Salzburg, acquired unlimited secular authority over their territories. [9] Bishops thus became princes. In time the prince prevailed over the bishop. There was nepotism and simony. In the eighteenth century, Febronianism aspired to have these dioceses separate from Rome. A second break with Rome was envisaged. The French Revolution intervened however, and as the French armies subjugated the left bank of the Rhine, the prince-bishops fled. Mainz fell to the French in 1792 and a third of the city was destroyed. The left bank was secularised and Church properties for the most part sequestrated. The West bank was secularised under Napoleon (1803) and all Church property sequestrated. (The Prussian government alone collected US $250m). [10] Mainz, along with other bishoprics, was financially ruined. This was not all. Mainz saw her primacy transferred to another; she was stripped of her suffragans, and herself made suffragan to a Franco-Belgian diocese, Mechlin. She had no bishop for many years (1818-1830) and was administered during these years by a vicar-general. The Congress of Vienna ratified these developments of sequestration and secularisation; and the Prussian government now moved to take up the reconstruction of the dioceses of the Upper Rhine, Freiburg, Fulda, Limberg, Mainz and Rottenberg. The Holy See requested that Mainz be made the metropolitan See, but was refused, and Mainz became a suffragan of Freiburg. The intransigence of the Prussian government in its intention to appoint bishops, and so dominate the Church, harassed that body all through the 1820s into the 1830s. It was in the midst of the controversies by *Katholik* to defend the freedom of the Church, that Gorres, [11] one of its chief polemicists, was called to Munich to take the chair of history in 1827.

Gorres became the dominating spirit in what came to be known as the Munich circle. He publicised Church and cultural policies and led in the renewal of Catholic thought and life. And his long controversial experience had well prepared him for a role as the most eloquent and embattled Church politician in the fight against the Prussian state.

What came to be known as the 'event of Cologne' arose from an ordinance of the Prussian King that

obliged children of a mixed marriage (Lutheran and Catholic) to be brought up Lutheran. Pius VIII in a Brief, *Litteris* of 1830, directed priests, before celebrating a mixed marriage, to obtain from the parties an oath to bring up the children Catholics. Five years later, Archbishop Droste-Vishering of Cologne insisted his priests enforce *Litteris*. Eighteen months of fruitless negotiation followed, and on 20 January 1837 the Archbishop's house was broken into by the police, and the aged prelate was sent under a strong armed guard to the fortress of Minden in Westphalia. Europe was shocked. Gregory XVI delivered a rigorous protest against the insult done to the Church and the Holy See. It was sent to all ambassadors accredited to the Holy See. Other protests came from Gorres, Montalembert and Lamennais who had just severed his links with the Church.

Late in 1837, Gorres published a book defending the freedom of the Church, entitled, *Athanasius*. A professor of history, he was able to play on the persecution of Athanasius, the historic Archbishop of Alexandria and a Father of the Church. He, in the years 335-337, just 1500 years earlier, had defended the Church against Arianisers in Constantinople, who were using the state to promote their doctrine against the divinity of Christ. He was banished by the Emperor. Most accommodating for Gorres' play on history was Athanasius' place of exile, nearby Trier on the Moselle. It was a prime German place name that could not but heighten interest in the 'event of Cologne'. What Trier had been for Athanasius, Minden in Westphalia was now for the Archbishop of Cologne. And for Athanasius, Trier was only the beginning of exile. Seventeen years would follow, mainly in Rome, decreed by successive Emperors 339. 356 and 362. Athanasius was an excellent example of the heroic, embroiled bishop defending his Church against the state. Gorres followed with another book one year later entitled *Trier* which confirmed his theme. The joint effect of these two works was that it brought all Catholic Germany to the defence of the Church, and largely contributed to the quick liquidation of the 'event of Cologne'. It also softened, for a while at least, the aggression of the Prussian state and, as a by-product it presented German Catholicism with the methods and literary forms to carry on Church-State controversies.

The Munich circle was the richer for the presence of Franz Baader (1765-1841). He has been called the 'philosophical genius and social conscience of Romantic Catholicism'. [12] This is a large claim in view of the celebrated French Catholics known as Romantics, but nonetheless noteworthy. Baader spent the years 1792-1796 in England. He managed a foundry there, and witnessed the Industrial Revolution at first hand. In the years 1796-1820, he was an engineer in Freiburg and there came to know the German country worker. These experiences were subjected to the alchemy of thought and reflection when he was appointed to the chair of philosophy at Munich in 1826. This enabled him to master Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury and Aquinas. Upon these authorities, he constructed a system of philosophy that countered the sensualism and materialism of the English and French philosophers, the rationalism of the Enlightenment, the autonomism of Kant, and finally the pantheism and impersonalism of Fichte and Hegel. In the theological shelter of Christian personalism and Catholic realism, the 'existential unrest' of the Romantic found its repose. It found it in the rational certitude that "reason, *Ratio,* is *Deo data,* an organ created for man at his birth for the perception of God … only through true rationalism can you proceed to supra-rationalism, only through true naturalism to supra-naturalism." [13] This implied an easy step to the Divine natural law that Baader made the foundation of his thought. Given this essential background, he sought the totality of life and existence. The result was a religious existentialism, that was prelude to Christian personalism. At the centre of this Romantic existentialism was a firm trust in living man, and in man's personality, who through his own insight of will and reason finds the confirmation of his personal faith in God. In association with Gorres, Baader published *Eos,* a periodical, for the Munich circle. Though he never published a book, his writings filled volumes. His lectures were more attractive and were supported by the charm of a gifted conversationalist. Baader's influence extended beyond Germany and won a unique tribute from the 'father of existentialism', Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855), who chose only Baader for the support of his ideas. He, "as a matter of course, should be known to all those who wish to ponder" the personalistic problems of Evil and Liberty. [14] Such influence extended into the twentieth century in the persons of Soloviev (1853-1900) and Berdyaev (1814-1928).

Baader's purely philosophical system proposed an original and practical system of Christian political thought and social organisation. It covered every aspect of the Christian reform of social and economic

life. “In these studies Baader established his position as the first inspired social philosopher of German Catholicism, and as spiritual father of the ‘Christian Social’ movement in Germany. [15]

The existence and nature of the class war, as Baader saw it, evoked from him colourful language:

“As it would be wrong to drop the respect for true kings because there are also kings of spades or clubs, no one should give up true freethinking because there is bad liberalism. Unfortunately the error is still fairly widespread that you can get rid of Jacobinism only by means of ultra-Royalism, or of the latter through the former, and that consequently the choice lies only as between anarchical and autocratic despotism. But do not the victims of this error know that the insolent and arrogant lust of despots and the cowardly and servile lust of slaves always and under all circumstances appear together like two galley slaves chained to one another, and that they can also disappear only together which is why the despot has always to fear the rebel and the rebel the despot?” [16]

His critical searching mind on socio-economic problems was given similar expression in 1835 when he presented to the Bavarian government a memorandum on the plight of the *Proletairs*. It was the first continental document to bring the plight of the proletariat to the notice of a government. It said:

“Indeed, whoever takes only one look at the abyss of physical and moral misery and neglect in which the majority of the proletariat is condemned to live in England and France, has to admit that serfdom itself – even its most oppressive form of physical bondage always matched by spiritual bondage since the one cannot exist without the other – was less cruel and inhuman, and therefore less unChristian (for to be Christian is to be humane) than the proletariat’s present status of unprotected and helpless outlawry. In England and France, reputedly our most cultured and educated nations, more than anywhere else has the development of the industrial system with its money wages intensified the disproportion between the rich and the poor, many public assurances to the contrary notwithstanding. These denials are usually made in the interest of the argyrocrats (the moneyed interests), and only secondly in the interest of the aristocrats (the landed interests). …”

“Now it can be said that the people have mostly exchanged their former land servitude which made of them land serfs (as *glebae adscripti*) for the even harsher and more oppressive ‘plutonic’ money servitude which makes of them money serfs. …”

“How often have I, for instance, assisted at meetings and gatherings of factory owners in England which regularly ended by establishing maximum wages and minimum sales prices and therefore were no better than conspiracies against the proletarians whose wages always remained far below the natural price for the one commodity they have to sell, i.e., their labour. The worst way to try to remedy this manifest iniquity is through the chambers and parliaments, for here more than anywhere else the factory owners are at the same time contending parties and judges while they exclude the representation of the interests of the poor wage earning masses from these chambers … .”

“… it is necessary to have a better insight than has prevailed since the beginning of the French Revolution, into the relationship between political and social liberty on the one hand, and the corporative system on the other … (the individual) needs … to possess some corporate liberties.” [17]

Baader was impressed by Lamennais’ exposition of the social data of the socio-economic problem. Views were exchanged probably on the occasion of Lamennais’ visit to Munich in 1832. They shared an enthusiasm for a social deaconry by priests, who, as a disinterested third party, would endeavour to bridge the gap between employer and employee. The friendship terminated in 1835 when Lamennais’ romanticism took him to the ideologies of secularised social Christianity. The social deaconry was nonetheless significant in Germany for prompting the first steps of a social movement of program and action for reform in which priests played a significant role.

It could be said there was a marked similarity between what Baader was doing in Germany and what Ozanam had done in France. A difference lay in the fact that Ozanam had no successor. Baader did, in the person of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, who had been drawn to Munich by Gorres’ controversial prowess in the memorable ‘Cologne affair’. Ketteler had resigned from the Prussian civil service as a result of that incident. After a stay in Munich he left for Munster in 1841 to study for the priesthood, a step strongly supported by Gorres.

Ketteler was ordained priest in 1844 and would soon assume Baader's selfless role of defending the proletariat. But Ketteler was a born controversialist and would step into the shoes of Gorres, his much admired forerunner, as a combatant on behalf of the Church.

## Chapter 11

## Karl Marx

*"I hate all the Gods"* – Aeschylus.

The development of ideas from 1750 to 1850 had now reached a critical and challenging peak for Catholics. The Enlightenment had rejected the Christian God for the pale abstraction of the Deists in the name of Reason. The Revolution had embraced the Goddess, Reason, in the name of Liberty. And now Marx was proclaiming the anti-God of a world classless society, in the name of Equality.

Born at Trier in 1818 of Jewish parents who converted to Protestantism, the young Marx proceeded for university studies to Bonn in 1835. A year later he transferred to Berlin and came under the influence of the regent of German philosophy, George Hegel. Marx studied him assiduously and, though rejecting his idealism, retained other significant elements: Hegel's world Spirit or state would satisfy Marx as he fashioned a program of social engineering that did not stop at national boundaries, and his dialectic was the path to progress by means of a permanent conflict between opposing forces. [1]

Among his fellow university students were Bruno Bauer and Ludwig Feuerbach, both of whom were to influence him subsequently. They were all members of a group who were moving away from Hegel's idealism, and came to be known as young or neo-Hegelians.

Marx's preference was undiluted materialism. His choice of a doctoral thesis was Epicurus (314-270 BC), who regarded matter as eternal and infinite, and containing to some extent an 'energising principle'. A consequent atheism for Marx was no less unreserved. In his forward to his thesis, completed in 1840, he made his own motto the words of Aeschylus' Prometheus: "In a word I hate all the Gods". Marx realised that his doctrine was at odds with Berlin orthodoxy and presented his thesis at more liberal Jena where it was accepted. In the same year, in the face of increasing revolutionary activity, the new king, Frederick IV endeavoured to impose strict Hegelianism on all schools and universities. He was not successful. Instead, there were created two solid camps, Hegelians and neo-Hegelians. The latter group was strengthened when Ludwig Feuerbach published his *Essence of Christianity*. It was accepted by the neo-Hegelians as an answer to Hegel and an invincible case for materialism. Engels, Marx's life long associate and co-author, wrote: "Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity* placed materialism on the throne again" [2] and "Feuerbach in many respects forms an intermediate link between Hegel's philosophy and our conception." [3] Marx later abandoned Feuerbach because his attachment to materialism was inadequate. Bruno Bauer formerly a fellow neo-Hegelian associate of Marx at Berlin, was now a professor at Bonn. He invited Marx to join him there in a teaching position. Marx did so, and the two, keen to propagate their views, published anonymously a pamphlet attacking Hegel, entitled *The Trump of the Last Judgement on Hegel*. The Prussian authorities regarded this as an attack upon the state, and soon discovered the identity of the authors. Bauer was removed from his university professorship and Marx from his teaching post.

In 1845, a radical group established the *Rhenish Gazette* at Cologne. Marx was an early contributor and then editor. His ruthless attacks on the Prussian government and its laws incurred the attention of government censorship. He resigned and the paper was closed within a year. Plans for its revival in Paris prompted Marx and his wife to seek what was now the centre of world socialism. There he met Leroux, Michael Bakunin and other Russians, and Pierre Proudhon. The latter he met often and learnt from him [4] that the real clash of opposites was to be found in the constant and bitter opposition of the lower and higher classes in society. Proudhon had undertaken "to interpret economics in terms of Hegel … but where he stumblingly led, Marx followed. Proudhon is the inventor of the central lever in the Marxist system." [5]

Increasing revolutionary fervour in Paris in the mid 40s and corresponding police action counselled retreat for Marx to Brussels in 1845. There he broke with Proudhon, who had written *La Philosophie*

*de la Misère* and replied with *La Misère de la Philosophie*. He had however, the company of a kindred soul, Friedrich Engels (1820-1896) who had spent some years in England, where he met Robert Owen, studied Ricardo and Chartism, and observed closely the Industrial Revolution. Independently of Marx, he discovered that "economic factors constituted a decisive historical factor". [6] In his preface to Marx's *Misère,* Engels wrote: "The present work (*Misère*) was published in the winter of 1846-1847, at the time when Marx had cleared up for himself the basic features of his new historical and economic outlook." [7] That historico-economic outlook was given ample expression in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* which was written in 1847 and published in German in London in February 1848. The *Communist Manifesto,* for a manifesto, is a long document, some seven thousand words. A reference to its leading principles suggests the main line of its argument. It proclaimed that "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles", i.e., struggles for economic power by the classes of society. The *Manifesto* presented a graphic picture of the struggle being waged at that time:

"Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other bourgeoisie and proletariat. … [8] The bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons the modern working class – the proletarians. … What the bourgeoisie therefore produce, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable. … The first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, … to win the battle of democracy. The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie … this cannot be effected except by despotic inroads on the rights of property. The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property: … ."

"When in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class; if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class. … In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

"The struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle, but then an international one. Hence the battle cry 'Proletarians of all nations unite.'"

The *Manifesto* was a vigorous and powerful document driven by an extraordinary sense of certainty and confidence. It was a remarkable piece of revolutionary propaganda. But Marx himself was not content with the written word. He returned to Cologne to resume at the *Rhenish Gazette,* but faced a charge of treason and fled to London.

The Catholic response to Karl Marx and the *Communist Manifesto* in Germany came from Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler. He was a man who, as would be expected from his earlier stay in Munich, had known and appreciated the influence of that centre of Catholic Romanticism. Since ordination in 1844, he had served in several parishes including Berlin, and had just been elected to the German Federal Parliament at Frankfurt. His correspondence from that body reveals a principle, the principle of subsidiarity, (*Subsidaritàtsprinzip*) that he had inherited from the society and values of the Middle Ages:

"My view is deduced from this simple principle, namely that every individual element which is able to exercise its rights should be left free to do so. To me the state is not a machine but rather a living organism with living members (*Glieder*) in which every member has its own right, its own function and is free to determine its own life. Such members are the individual, the family, the community etc. Every lower member is free to move in its sphere and enjoys the right of the freest self-determination

and self-government. Only where a lower member of this organism is no longer in a position to achieve its own ends or to defend itself against a threatening development, may a higher member of the organism intervene and take over so much of the freedom and self-determination as is necessary for this higher member to achieve its ends. So long as the family or the community is in a position to fulfil its own material ends then they must retain their right to self-determination.” [9]

On September 18, the day after this letter was written, he spoke in the Paulskirche on education, and invoked this principle to reveal his philosophy on state and the citizen. “The state may demand a certain amount of intellectual culture from every citizen, and may insist that parents procure this culture for their children. Beyond that the state has no right to go; it has no right to determine at the outset what course the father is to follow in the education of his children. That would be tyranny, that would be the most shameful tyranny.” [10]

On the very day that these words were uttered, even stronger words were needed to face a more pressing evil. A bloody encounter between government troops and revolutionaries shocked the city of Frankfurt. Worse was to follow. At nightfall, two conservative deputies, General von Auserwald and Furst Lichenowski, were riding out of the city to the residence of the Regent of the Empire. Rioters followed and literally slaughtered them. The crime was heightened by the fact that it occurred not only in the political capital of the Federation, but in a city that had been the site of the coronation of German Kings and Emperors.

Ketteler was selected to preach the funeral oration in the cemetery. Over open graves, he said: “it is not our noble honest German people from whom this horrible deed has gone forth. The murderers are the men who sneer at Christ, Christianity and the Church … who raise rebellion, revolution to the dignity of a principle.” The Augsburg *Allegemeine Zeitung,* in its report of the obsequies, wrote of the oration: “It was a remarkably impressive and thrilling discourse” [11] There seems little doubt that it was directed at men like Karl Marx.

In the following month, the first Catholic Congress took place at nearby Mainz which was not only an episcopal city but the fortress of the German Federation. Its Governor was appointed alternatively by Germany and Austria for five year periods. Ketteler spoke at the Congress and insisted that the most difficult question, which no legislation, no form of government, has been able to solve, was the social question. It was something, therefore, which called for devoted action by the Church and its members. [12] While Ketteler came to modify his distrust of state action, his consideration that the Church had a particular duty remained with him.

Advent sermons in the Cathedral at Mainz were intended to stir the faithful in their preparation for the Nativity, much as John the Baptist had fired his followers to expect a Messiah. For the chosen preach, it was an opportunity to select a topic with a messianic flavour. Ketteler was invited to fill the role, and was launched into further national prominence, as he chose the social question, or the freedom of the worker, as the ‘most important question of the day’, and one that imposed on the Church a certain messianic mission. [13]

Property was an important central element. Property unlimited, as in capitalism, could enslave workers; totally limited as in communism it could equally enslave. Marx’s abolition of private property was possibly as yet a threat only. But something approaching unlimited capitalism was more than a possibility in the context of the *Code Napoleon*, a code now of European significance. It said in article 44: “The right of property is the right to enjoy and to dispose of things in the most absolute fashion, provided that one does not put it to use forbidden by laws and regulations.”

Against such, Ketteler expounded Aquinas at length; and the conclusion was drawn; “when we speak of a natural right of ownership, there can be no question of true and complete proprietorship but only of a usufructuary right … in the use of these goods man must recognise the order established by God, and at no time has he the right to alienate them from the purpose assigned them by God.” [14] This order established by God was nature as it issued from the Author of nature. This teaching was directed at both capitalism and communism:

“The false doctrine of the rigid right of ownership is a continual sin against nature because it sees no injustice in using for the gratification of the most insatiable avarice … what God intended to be food

and clothing for all men; … the notorious dictum, 'property is robbery', is something more than a mere lie; besides a great lie, it contains a terrible truth. Scorn and derision will not dispose of it. We must destroy the truth that is in it, in order that it may become all lie again. As long as it contains even a particle of truth, it has power to overturn the whole order of the world. As deep calleth unto deep, so one sin against nature calls forth another. Out of the distorted right of ownership, the false doctrine of communism was begotten. Communism is also a sin against nature for under the pretence of philanthropy, it would bring upon mankind the profoundest misery, destroy industry, order, and peace on earth, turn the hands of all against all and thus sweep away the very condition of human existence." [15]

There was here an obvious response to 'Proletarians of all nations unite.' Ketteler in Frankfurt and now in Mainz had stirred Catholic Germany much as Gorres had done ten years earlier in the Cologne affair. His words on revolutionaries in Frankfurt and on communism in Mainz had found their mark too in Karl Marx, who as late as 1869 wrote: "whenever these dogs (for instance Bishop Ketteler in Mainz) flirt with the labour question. As it turns out in 1848, we have toiled for them, only they enjoyed the fruits of the Revolution in the time of reaction." [16]

A tribute from a different source came at the third Catholic Congress at Mainz in 1892. Noted Swiss sociologist, Gaspard Decurtins, commented that when in 1848 the *Communist Manifesto* was launched on the world, "Ketteler was one of the few men who recognised the full significance of the social movement then still in its infancy," and that belongs to him the "undying honor of having met the *Communist Manifesto* with a program of Christian sociology that stands unsurpassed to this day." [17] But a more immediate and prestigious appreciation was at hand. The bishopric of Mainz fell vacant on 20 December 1848. The diocesan chapter elected liberal Professor Schmidt of Giesson on 7 December 1849 to succeed. But Rome refused to confirm the election, and appointed instead Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler on 15 March 1850.

The new bishop had now a twofold task: to continue his proclamation of the Church's mission on the social question, and to raise Mainz from the ashes – a daunting prospect. Like the Jews rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, he was obliged to 'do the work with one hand, and with the other hold the sword.'

A newcomer to the European scene was the new papal legate to Belgium, Mgr Joachim Pecci. The appointment was not without opportunity for one who was later to ascend the papal throne as Leo XIII. The papal embassy would be his charge in Brussels from January 1843 to May 1846. This central vantage point afforded the thirty-three year old diplomat an excellent observation post from which to study the European scene. It provided Karl Marx with the same opportunity in the years 1845-1847.

Belgium had recently (1830) become a parliamentary monarchy in a liberal experiment that owed much to Lamennais. It probably came as no surprise to Pecci, the second papal legate to Belgium, to find himself in the midst of a liberal initiative which united King Leopold I and liberals, both Catholic and non-Catholic, long enough to embarrass him. The coalition sought the right against the bishops in the matter of the examination commission in the Catholic university. The bishops resisted and the papal legate backed them. The coalition was unreservedly liberal and the King asked the Pope for his ambassador's recall. The Pope agreed and made Pecci, Archbishop of Perugia, an important see in the central Papal States.

During his stay in Brussels, Pecci gained some significant insights. The parliamentary form of government was something Pecci was commissioned to study on the occasion of a visit to England. He was accorded the courtesy there of being a guest of Queen Victoria to dinner at St James' palace; and he met Lord Palmerstone who, half way through his fifty-eight years (with thirty-eight of them at cabinet rank) in the Commons, was well on the way to becoming the father of that institution. The hospitality extended itself to an invitation to attend a sitting of Parliament. [18]

A less attractive side of life was revealed to Pecci when the danger of ecclesiastical schism took him to Trier in 1845. He curbed that problem, and then travelled along the Rhine to Mainz and Cologne. He thus experienced the three historic dioceses that had been the scene of so much adverse history, and of a recent conflict between Church and state, and were now witnessing the resurgence of the Church in the Rhine valley. Pecci was the guest for some weeks of Mgr Fornari, papal legate to France whom

he had succeeded in Brussels. [19] Fornari's three years experience in Paris, plus Pecci's three years observation from Brussels, ensured some background knowledge and a corresponding insight into the Paris scene.

The Paris headquarters of the Carbonari, that had been directed by Italian-born Filipo Buonarotti till his death in 1837, could only recall for Pecci his experience in Benevento as apostolic delegate in 1835. That papal territory, bordering the kingdom of Naples, had been plagued by brigands and smugglers. It was an excellent recruiting ground for the Carbonari, and they had staged a major insurrection in 1831 in the neighbouring Kingdom of Naples. The better side of the Paris coin was revealed to Pecci when he was given an audience with Louis Philippe, Lafayette's model of a constitutional monarch. [20]

The European stint, short though it was, had given Pecci some insight into not only revolution as advocated by men like Marx and Buonarotti but also to parliamentary monarchy exemplified in Belgium, England and France. His acquaintance with the latter types would more than interest the new liberal Pope, Pius IX, as he prepared representative reform in the Papal States. And his knowledge of revolution would prepare him for the explosion of 1848 and its aftermath in Italy.

## Chapter 12

## The Occupation of Rome

*"The Revolution of the bourgeoisie (had) achieved its last victory with the occupation of Rome.* – Jedin, ***History of the Church***. vol. IX, p.190.

European Catholics, disturbed by their own revolutions, were only the more dismayed by the similar reality that befell the Church in Rome. It was something that recalled the vulnerability of the Church during the Napoleonic era. In the opening decade of the 19th century, Napoleon had made himself President of Italy and had annexed Piedmont and Parma. A little later, he declared himself King of Italy, occupied Rome and annexed the States of the Church. In 1810, Rome became the second capital of the Empire. The Papal States, by the Treaty of Vienna, were restored to the Pope, but they were nonetheless vulnerable. The administrative efficiency of the French, during their occupation, had revealed the glaring maladministration of the Papal States and the need for reform. Secret societies, too, such as Freemasons and Carbonari, contained under Napoleon, seized the obvious openings.

Freemasonry mushroomed in late 18th century France, but with the Jacobin progress of the 1790s, Freemasons, along with others, were ejected from city governments. With the fall of the Jacobins, they reappeared in close association with the Revolution. Two leading figures in the Italian Revolution, Mazzini and Garibaldi, were both Freemasons and members of the Carbonari. When Garibaldi was making his successful assault on Palermo in the 60s, he established there a grand orient. [1] Later, he vowed he would make Rome the world capital of Freemasonry, something he was unable to fulfil. [2] When, however, Mazzini's funeral took place in 1875, Masonic banners were seen on the streets of Rome for the first time. [3]

Guiseppi Mazzini was born in Republican Genoa in 1805, studied law and practised for a while as an advocate. His agitation as a liberal and a Saint-Simonian, incurred prison, and, on release, he founded 'Young Italy' in Marseilles in 1831. This became for him what the Jacobins had been for Robespierre. It proved to be a power base that enabled him to become the most untiring political agitator in Europe. But he was also something of a philosopher-mystic, drawing on Rousseau and Saint-Simon. His reference to Lamennais, whom he failed to win as an associate, was revealing. "Lamennais is a priest, and a priest who has been devoted during half his life to Catholicism, to the Papacy. It must have cost him much to destroy his ideal. If his strength had not been exhausted by that effort, Lamennais would have been led by the force of logic to deny the divinity of Christ and thus bring back Christ to humanity, and not Humanity into Him; that is the approach to humanity in which I believe." [4]

For Mazzini, "Catholicism is dead". He therefore, wore the black of mourning for his country, in contrast with the white of the Pope. When asked what he would put in place of Catholicism he replied

that that role was to be performed by the first people which would constitute itself in practice the revealer of the moral law. [5] Humanity thus was to become the interpreter of the moral law. This was vintage Rousseau. The next step was provided by Saint-Simon. God's law, Humanity's law, was Progress.

Mazzini's antipathy for the Papacy was shared by Guiseppi Garibaldi (1807-1882). His special contribution was guerilla warfare. Born at Nice, the son of a sailor, he qualified as a ship's captain. Early involvement in 'Young Italy' and an attempt to seize Genoa led to a death sentence. Escape took him to South America where he joined a provincial attempt against the government of Brazil, and impressed favourably as guerilla and privateer. He next turned to Montevideo to give similar support to Uruguay against Argentina. The Italian Legion he mobilised there remained with him on his return for action in Italy.

A real opening came for Mazzini and Garibaldi when Pius IX became Pope in 1846. The new pontiff, a liberal, immediately granted an amnesty that released 1000 from gaol and hundreds more from exile. [6] He unwittingly provided the manpower for revolution. He also granted first a consultative body, then a Roman constitution, which followed the standard pattern of limited monarchy, at that time generally available to European liberals. "The Romans were presented in two years with as large a measure of constitutional progress as the English had won arduously in two centuries." [7] At the same time, however, a Civic Guard was formed by Pius against revolutionary action. But the amnesty had already been the occasion of newly formed political clubs, which became Mazzinian and Carbonari strongholds. These made a mockery of a constitution, which had a division of powers, and representative councils that were competent (subject to papal veto) to effect civil administration and political law. They became, like the Jacobins, an alternative centre of power.

Revolutionaries were given another opening against Pius when Piedmont went to war with Austria, 24 April 1848. They called on him to join with them 'against the barbarians' (the Austrians). But Pius would have nothing of an offensive war; and so, not only surrendered any leadership of the Risorgimento, but also in fact became its enemy. This position was further weakened when the clubs, that had now taken over the Civic Guard, demanded a new provisional government. The Pope appointed a former diplomat, Pellegrino Rossi, as his Premier. Rossi was a strong man and proposed a Federation of Italian States under the leadership of the Pope. This was not the mind of the revolutionaries, and Rossi was stabbed to death as he mounted the steps to the Council Chamber of the Palace of the Cancellaria. Garibaldi later in his autobiography justified the assassination.

The clubs now presented their demands to Pius, which included abdication from his temporal authority. He refused. The club's members, numbering 6000, did exactly before the Quirinal what the Paris mob had done before the Paris Assembly in 1793; they came with arms and were prepared to use them. A bishop, Palma, was shot dead as he stood at a window in the Pope's household. The Civic Guard now replaced the Swiss Guard and the Pope was a prisoner much as Louis XVI was in 1791-1793. Pius fled risking as much as Louis had done in his flight to Varennes. He sought and was granted asylum at Gaeta in the neighbouring Kingdom of Naples. To replace him and his cabinet which had resigned, the revolutionaries set up a Committee of Public Safety. The ruling Junta decreed 29 December 1848, a constituent assembly to be elected by direct and universal suffrage. It would be of two hundred members and would meet 5 February. On 9 February, the Assembly voted the end of the temporal power of the Pope and established a 'pure democracy to be called the Republic of Rome'. [8] The new French Republican Assembly of 1848 lauded the new Roman Republic. Mazzini's reply was a blend of nationalism and mysticism. "Your citizens have understood all that is great, noble and providential in the flag of regeneration floating above the city that encircles the Capitol and the Vatican – a new consecration of eternal right; a third world arising upon the ruins of two worlds extinct." [9] Mazzini, after seventeen years of exile, was vested with citizenship and was welcomed as leader of the new government in the Cancellaria. Garibaldi was given control of the armed forces.

There was widespread overseas sympathy for the Pope. "The *Times* and the public at large were agreed in deploring the outrage suffered by that 'splendid fellow', the liberal Pope who had actually introduced into his state a constitution derived from that of England." [10] (This compliment recalls the visit by Mgr Pecci, now Archbishop of Perugia, to London in February 1846 and his study of its

parliamentary institutions.) French Catholics were also vocal in their outcry, and Louis Napoleon, who needed their support, despatched troops to Rome to restore the Pope, in the hope of his re-establishing free institutions. But Pius was adamant. The encyclical, *Quibus Quantisque* was a repudiation of the Revolution and a refusal to restore free institutions. Garibaldi resisted the French advance April-June 30 and then fled to the hills of Umbria. Mazzini made his escape to London, where his intentions for the future were undisguised. He had little sympathy for the English on the occasion of the re-establishment in England of the Catholic hierarchy. "Every so-called religious agitation against the Papacy will be vain which does not take in hand the Italian question … It is the Italian nation alone that can annihilate the Papacy." [11]

Pius IX returned from exile in 1850, intent on reform, but cautious reform. His restoration, as already noted, was due to Louis Napoleon. But thanks to the force of French Catholic opinion voiced in the Assembly by the former pilgrim of God and Liberty to Rome, Montalembert, in one of his greatest orations, the Pope was not bound by the guarantees that Napoleon had sought as a concession to French liberal opinion. In the same assembly debate, Voltairean Thiers added his support in similar vein. "The Pope does not concede a liberty such as exists in England, whose destinies are committed to two chambers together with the executive authority: but it would be quite wrong to reprove him for having prudently profited by recent experiments, and for having wanted to close the way to new agitations amongst a people that has shown itself so very unprepared for them. Municipal and provincial liberty provides a first step in the education of a people." [12]

Montalembert later wrote words that revealed the good reason for leaving Pius unfettered. "In 1848 Pius IX conceded everything, prepared the way for doing so, but what could satisfy Mazzini or disarm Garibaldi?" Montalembert, now a noted leader of French Catholic opinion, would continue his influence in both the French Assembly, and the French Academy to which he was elected in 1851, and in his own journal, *Le Correspondant,* to defend Pius IX; and even at the expense of opposing Napoleon, when his treatment of the Pope seemed less than loyal. Pius appreciated Montalembert's support since he would continue to need Napoleon's protection. In 1853 the Pope was the object of an assassination attempt, and two years later his Secretary of State, Antonelli, suffered a similar assault. Mazzini, too, continued to be the tireless revolutionary. He presided over uprisings on the borders of the States of the Church: Mantua in 1852, Milan 1853, Genoa 1854 and Leghorn 1857. But the sort of patronage Napoleon could bring to the Church would depend on his character, which was at best unpredictable, and on the control he could exercise over his country.

Louis Napoleon was born in 1808, a nephew of the Emperor Napoleon. In 1831 he was a Carbonaro in an uprising in the Romagna against Gregory XVI. He was urged by the local archbishop, the future Pius IX, Mastai-Ferretti, to lay down his arms. He did, and was furnished by the same archbishop with papers that ensured his escape. This adventure was followed by dreams of empire; and two unsuccessful attempts in 1836 and 1840 were made to unseat Louis Philippe. The ensuing sentence to life imprisonment would have daunted another man, but Louis, true to the Napoleonic irrepressible spirit, escaped to London. He was described as being, at that time, both 'mystic and Lothario, looking like an opium-eater and speaking French like a foreigner'. [13] Yet he was to score from a revival of the Romantic appeal of the great Napoleon, and at the plebiscite of December 1848 he was returned head of the poll to become President of the French Republic.

In 1852, he became Emperor in a *coup d'état* that lost him much Catholic support. He, however, gained a new ally in a leading figure of what was now becoming known as the *Risorgimento* (Revival) which was an Italian version of the French Revolution. This was Count Camillo Cavour (1810-1861), who, in 1852 had risen to prominence in the Piedmont Parliament and would dominate it for a decade. Piedmont's Sicardi laws in 1852 unilaterally broke a Concordat with the Holy See and opened up a new era in Church-State relations in Piedmont. This was taken a definite step further when Cavour in 1855 introduced his law of Convents which, on his own admission, followed Talleyrand's expropriation of Church property in 1789. "All the Religious Orders are re declared abolished, with the exception of the Sisters of Charity and those of St Joseph and those Orders and Communities dedicated to public instruction, preaching or the care of the sick."

Some 334 Congregations comprising 5500 persons, were suppressed [14] and property worth 2 million

gold *livres* was transferred to the treasury. [15] Cavour justified this action in the interest of modern Progress and the welfare of the Church. Actually it was part of his grand plan for the extension of Piedmont from the Alps to the Adriatic. This would be at the expense of Austria which dominated the plain of Lombardy, and the States of the Church, which ruled the Romagna that took in Bologna, Ferrara, Imola, Ravenna and Rimini. Joint military action by France and Piedmont defeated Austria in April 1859, forced it to withdraw and created the vacuum that raised a cry for the annexation to Piedmont of the Romagna. The groundwork had already been prepared. In July 1858, at Plombières in the Vosges, Napoleon III had secretly agreed with Cavour that France, in exchange for Nice and Savoy, would station troops in Rome to secure it, but not the Romagna, for the Pope. For all practical purposes, the Romagna was now lost to the Papal States. Catholics in France were outraged by the Emperor's opening the gate to the Romagna and abandoning the Pope. From the beginning of Napoleon's campaign against Austria, Montalembert in *Le Correspondent,* warned of the danger to the States of the Church. He now produced a famous polemic, *Pius IX et la France* en 1849 et 1859. He argued that in 1849 ill of France had sent a French army to Rome; now in 1859, when the Will of France could no longer express itself, France's ruler had arbitrarily pursued a policy that was opposed to French principle and religion. [16] The arbitrary nature of the Emperor's style was further illustrated when Pius on 19 January 1860, published an encyclical, *Nullis certe,* denouncing the attack upon the domain of the Church. Veuillot, until this time a supporter of Napoleon, published it in his *L'Univers*. By abrupt government order, the paper was obliged to cease publication. [17]

Austria was now powerless and the Romagna defenceless. The Pope could only hope for support from the Catholic powers Belgium, Spain, Portugal and Bavaria. But Lord Palmerstone of England strongly supported the new doctrine of non-intervention in Italy, and was in a position to enforce it. "By isolating the Italian peninsula, the doctrine of non-intervention in fact left the way open to whatever state was militarily strongest in that peninsula to swallow up the others." [18] Piedmont had now an open road to Rome and the whole Italian peninsula.

In May, Garibaldi with his 'thousand', wearing the red shirt of the Montevideo slaughtermen, landed in Sicily en route to Naples to drive out the white clad warriors of the Bourbon king. This was done with Cavour's connivance, but Piedmont forces had to be in Naples before him. In September, Piedmont's forces invaded the States of the Church, south of the Romagna known as the Marshes and defeated papal defence forces at Castlefidardo. More papal territory was taken when Umbria was overrun. The road to Naples was now open. It was taken, and Garibaldi's men were beaten over the line. In the victory parade his men brought up the rear. [19]

In November 1860, a memorandum embodying the idea of the renunciation by Pius of the Temporal Power in return for the complete independence of the Church from state intervention was put to the Pope by Cavour. Negotiations were abruptly ended when it was found that the same Turin anticlerical laws of 1855 were being carried out, at that very time, in Umbria, the Marshes and Naples. [20] In an encyclical, *Iamdudum Cernimus,* 18 March 1861, Pius denounced this duplicity and aggression. In a speech 27 March 1861, Cavour claimed he was creating a "free Church in a free State". Montalembert, from whom Cavour had borrowed such ideas, classified Cavour's version of the ideal as nothing better than a 'despoiled Church in a spoliative state'. [21] His summation of Cavour's endeavours was equally damning. "You have conspired for twelve years, and you boast of it, to make all government impossible in the Roman States. When the Pope has ecclesiastical ministers, lay ministers are demanded of him. When he appoints a layman, his throat is cut on the steps of the Parliament; when he has no army he is reproached for not being able to defend himself; when he forms one, he is denounced as a peril to his neighbours" [22].

In June 1861, France recognised the new Kingdom of Italy, something almost necessitated by the previous recognition by England. The States of the Church were now reduced to the Patrimony of Saint Peter – Rome with a garden – a coastal strip that ran from Civitavecchia, north of Rome to Gaeta, south. Its integrity, however, depended on the already unreliable patronage of France. This security began to vanish when the September Convention of 1864 had France agree with the Kingdom of Italy to withdraw its army from Rome on condition that Italy honoured the Patrimony. In 1870, when France had withdrawn its troops for action on its own borders, the Italian army marched into

Rome. The Pope was allowed to retain the Vatican, St Peters and St John Lateran; but territory held by the Papacy for 1083 years was now finally transferred to the Kingdom of Italy.

With Rome occupied and his mini-army disarmed, Pius was a defeated man. The 1000 year old papal kingdom was lost, and the crown of the most venerable political institution in Europe lay in the dust. Pius had clearly faced invincible odds. Why it may be asked, had he, in such circumstances, remained so stubborn? Why had he not sought, as an alternative to complete loss, some accommodation? Both Napoleon III and Cavour had suggested he renounce his temporal power. The most important reason for his wishing to retain the sovereignty of a state was the thought that it guaranteed his spiritual independence. Napoleon I had threatened and buffeted, as wheat in a sieve, Pius VI and Pius VII. But no Pope as spiritual leader, with subjects in many states, could bow to any particular state. The temporal power of the Pope was, therefore, to be retained to ensure spiritual independence. This became more pressing as the nineteenth century progressed and national states arose claiming sovereignty based on territory possessed. The Church, before rising nationalism, needed its own sovereign territory to retain its place in the community of nations, and so have access to non-Catholic countries such as England, the United States and Holland. But nation states retained their sovereignty because of army and alliances. There was no territory without an army. This was Pius' problem. He could not enter the world of armaments. His temporal power was, therefore, vulnerable in a world of competing nation states. There was a similarity between his world and that of Thomas a'Becket. One of the characters in T.S. Eliot's play, *Murder in the Cathedral*, uttered words that were quite relevant in Pius' day.

"I see nothing quite conclusive in the art of temporal government,But violence, duplicity and frequent maladministration,King rules or barons rule:The strong man strongly and the weak man by caprice. They have but one law, to seize power and keep it. And the steadfast can manipulate the greed and lust of others,The feeble is devoured by his own."

Pius was devoured by his own. To that extent he was 'feeble'. But history had handed him a mammoth task. Veuillot well wrote: "the Italian Question has been created by the Revolution", the principles of 1789. In the face of that torrent of blood and rapine that ravaged Europe, 1789-1870, Pius stood firm with constancy and fortitude.

Pius found little favour in his day for his stand against the Progress and liberalism of Cavour. But with that loudly acclaimed dash for modernity, Piedmont became for Italy, what Prussia became for Germany. That Italy produced Mussolini and that Germany produced Hitler. Time has done much to restore Pius.

## Chapter 13

## Lassalle and Ketteler

From 1500 to 1850, the great social question of the day in Europe was the peasant question. [1] The democratic movement of 1848 changed this but not immediately. Karl Marx and his communist followers chose exile, primarily for safety but also because there was not yet much in the economic life of Germany on which their doctrine could fasten. [2] Some have even speculated that had Marx and Engels not known the social theories of Paris and the industrial revolution of England, *Capital* might not have been written. [3] Then, in half a generation, modern industrialism gripped the German people. 12,000 tons of Ruhr coal in 1860 became 29,400 in 1871 and 12,000 coal miners in 1861-1865 became 247,000 in 1887. [4] A rich and powerful bourgeoisie arose and socialism became possible, not as a doctrine of intellectual or revolutionary minorities but as a mass phenomenon. "And since in no European country was the labouring man better educated and at the same time divided by a wider social gap from the 'upper' classes, the possible became the actual with astonishing speed." [5]

Heinrich Schultze-Delitzsch (1808-1883) was able to take advantage of the better educated when in 1851, he established the first German Loan Association. [6] Its feature was co-operation and self help rather than state support. It made its own motto, Quesnay's *Laissez aller, laissez passer, le monde va de lui meme* (no restraint, let go, let pass, the world goes by itself). It flourished, and in 1859 became the

Federation of German Workingmen's Associations. Its founder had said: "Don't let the (socialist) beast loose", and a grateful bourgeoisie crowned him 'King of the Social Realm', and 'vanquisher of the red spectre'.

The response to this movement came from Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864). [7] A man of overmastering eloquence that could inflame mob passion, Lassalle directed with withering effect the demon-like force of his logic at Schultze-Delitzsch. He soon came to be called the 'Labour King'. His background was radical. He had joined the communists in 1848, agitated and gone to prison repeatedly. Enjoying the freedom of Paris, Switzerland and Ostend, he produced a philosophical work, *Heraclitus the Obscure of Ephesus,* in 1857. For one whose interest was Marx's dialectical class war, Heraclitus was as attractive as Epicurus had been to Marx. Heraclitus saw an order, that was common, throughout all things, an order that was enduring and unified. It was achieved by maintaining the correct tensions between ever changing opposites. There was, therefore, an abiding condition of strife or war. A common unity of warring opposites was the all pervading direction and order of things.

A more practical topic was taken by Lassalle in his most ambitious work (1861), the *System of Acquired Rights*. It was directed at the bourgeoisie, and a system designed to protect and secure their rights. Aquinas had distinguished natural rights which are based on nature, and the Author of nature, from acquired rights which issue from some action of the right holder, such as occupancy, labour or appointment by lawful authority. An abstract natural right to property could thus become a concrete, acquired right. But Lassalle denied every moral foundation of rights. The only source of right was the consciousness of the generality of the people, or absolute popular sovereignty. Consistently with these works, Lassalle, in an Open Reply to the Requests of the General Congress of Workingmen, February 1863, for a politico-social program, scorned the ideal of harmony between labour and capital and truculently preferred Heraclitus' 'warring opposites, the all pervading direction and order of things'. He urged the proletariat to oppose the bourgeoisie. [8] He became president of the same body in May 1863.

One of the reasons for Lassalle's anti-bourgeois bias was the Iron Law of wages, something very much associated with his name, but something he inherited from Turgot and Ricardo. Average wages are always confined to that level of sustenance which is necessary to ensure for the worker the possibility of existence and propagation. If they rise above this level, worker supply outstrips demand and wages fall. If wages fall below this level, worker supply diminishes, wages rise and so too does labour supply.

In the spring of 1864 when Lassalle and Schultze-Delitzsch were in the throes of controversy, Ketteler published *Christianity and the Labour Question*. [9] It has been named epoch-making. Its initial emphasis was stark realism. The worker competed with the machine that works 'day and night … with not merely human strength but the force of many horse-power'. [10] Wages were determined by supply and demand. "The labour question is essentially a question of subsistence. Now there is no doubt that the material existence of almost the whole labouring class, that is the great mass of the citizens of all modern states, the existence of their families, the daily bread necessary to the workingman, to his wife and children, is subject (in our times) to the fluctuation of the market and the price of merchandise." [11]

Wages were therefore uncertain and inadequate to human needs. His language was as forceful as Lassalle's. "This is the slave market of our liberal Europe." [12] Ketteler dismissed co-operative or corporate organisation of capital and labour as proposed respectively by liberal Schultze-Delitzsch and socialist Lasalle. The liberal proposals, based on self help, was perhaps adequate for the skilled artisan but beyond the capacity of the average worker. The socialist proposal was unacceptable because state funded. Ketteler opted, somewhat romantically, for self-help and the support of the Christian Churches. This preference for independence, however, laboured under the uncertainty of charity, and had to be abandoned. Trade unionism, on the other hand, was not merely lawful but worthy of support: and English trade unions were proposed as a model. Finally, the worker had a right to the protection of the state and legislation. [13] Within three months of publication, three editions of *Christianity and the Labour Question* were called for. [14] A French translation was published in 1869 in Liège, which was to become a great international centre of Catholic socio-economic thought in the 1880s, and an Italian version was published in 1870. [15] A fourth edition was published in Mainz in

1890 and carried an introduction by the great German Centre leader, Ludwig Windthorst (1812-1891). He wrote: "We all venerate Bishop von Ketteler as the champion and doctor of Catholic social aspirations … It will ever redound to our glory that it was a prince of the Church, who at a time when Economic Liberalism controlled public opinion, had the courage to raise the banner of Christian social reform." [16]

Ketteler addressed the worker problem again in positive and vigorous terms in 1869. He was even stronger in his call for state intervention. In the course of episcopal visitation of his diocese, he took the opportunity of making Offenbach, in industrial Hesse, the locale for a sermon entitled *Labour Movement and its Relation to Religion*. [17] Its significance was reflected in the audience of some 10,000 workers. In the process of a lengthy discourse, he enumerated claims for the working class that came to be regarded as the *Christian Labour Catechism*. [18] They were: (1) increased wages relative to the true value of labour; (2) shorter hours of labour; (3) a day of rest; (4) prohibition of child labour in factories; (5) prohibition of women labour in factories. The eminent, internationally renowned, Swiss Catholic socio-economic activist, Gaspard Decurtins (1855-1918), said, twenty year later, that the Offenbach address was "one of the most important and noteworthy utterances ever made on the social question and its solution from the Catholic point of view." [19] Proposals, that were even more far-reaching than those stated at Offenbach, were put to the German bishops at Fulda a few months later. Each diocese, it was decided, would enquire into working conditions in its own area and report to the next Conference. [20] Fulda was the site of an ancient Benedictine monastery and burial place of St Boniface. Through Ketteler's aegis, it became the meeting place of the German episcopate.

The socialist side of the debate suffered when Lassalle died in a duel in 1864. His followers joined the communists, and Marx's *Capital* published in 1867, became their sacred text. The Gotha Program of 1875 confirmed the union; and ensuing socialist electoral progress advanced from real to spectacular. It recorded the following Reichstag election figures.

| Elections | Votes |
|---|---|
| 1871 | 118,655 |
| 1874 | 340,078 |
| 1877 | 481,008 |
| 1878 | 420,662 (in spite of the Reichstag's being dissolved) |
| 1881 | 335,307 (in spite of the repressive socialist law) |
| 1884 | 507,798 |
| 1887 | 673,283 |
| 1890/1 | 323,300 [21] |

The above figures for the 1870s indicate Ketteler's timely contribution to the Catholic reply to Lassallean-socialist doctrines. It had been a life work commencing in 1848 in response to the *Communist Manifesto,* and apace with the socialist electoral upsurge of the 1870s. Doctrinal development was equalled by leadership in Catholic social thought and reform. It all came to an end when Ketteler fell a victim to cholera (possibly contracted in Rome) and he died at Mainz in 1877. He had sown well, however; others were there to reap. The first Catholic periodical exclusively devoted to the study of the great social problem, *Christlich-Soziale Blàtter*, was published in 1868. It was the work of a young but extremely well informed curate of Aix-la-Chapelle, Joseph Schings. It anticipated, by a few months, those Catholic societies that formed the Christian Social Party, and became their official organ. This marked the real birth of the Catholic Social Reform Movement, as an organisation and institution, in Germany. [22]

The same movement found expression in 1870 in Christian Social Unions. They were interconfessional in character, and led in many instances by the clergy. [23] They had 30,000 members in the Ruhr, and featured in some strike leadership. During the *Kulturkampf* they concentrated on the political struggle and lost their interconfessional and social character. They became, however, a great movement in the 80s, and played a salutary role in the ruinous strikes of that period in the Ruhr-Westphalia coal fields.

The Reich Parliament also heard the voice of the Catholic Social Reform Movement. Canon Moufang had been a protegé of Ketteler, who had appointed him successively rector of the seminary at Mainz, canon of the cathedral and representative in the upper house of the Hessian Lantag. He entered the Reich Parliament in 1871, and delivered an electoral address that was a classic formulation of the German Catholic Social Reform program. [24] He formed an association for the welfare of workers and when he retired from parliament in 1886, he was succeeded by another cleric, Canon Franz Hitz (1851-1921). Based at Munchen-Gladbach, he, with others, formed an association that later became the Volksverein. This was a unique instrument of social organisation and education within the entire German Catholic Social Reform movement – Christian social unions, Catholic Workingmen's Associations, Artisans' Guilds and similar bodies. [25]

It was through the efforts of men like Moufang and Hitz, under the competent parliamentary guidance of Ludwig Windthorst, Centre leader, that a major contribution was made to an era of social insurance in the Reich – social insurance in 1883, accident insurance in 1884, old age and infirmity insurance in 1889. These measures fell short of the Centre Party's reform proposals (1883-1889), due to the vehement opposition of Bismark. This changed, however when Bismark was dismissed from office, March 1890. The subsequent speech from the throne, 6 May, was largely devoted to labour-protective legislation. The Emperor, no doubt spurred by recent socialist electoral gains, and assassination attempts on his life, wanted urgent action. The Centre Party responded warmly. In his *Germany and the Germans* vol 2, p.353, W.H. Dawson wrote that the "higher interests of the labouring classes never had sincerer defenders than the Catholic representatives who, more than any other party, stood up for factory legislation, for Sunday rest, for prohibition of work to children under a certain age and of night work to women and for work people's insurance." [26] "And so on 1 June 1891," to quote Metlake who wrote with the enthusiasm of a biographer, "after fifteen years of almost uninterrupted parliamentary struggle, in which the greatest statesmen and political economists were engaged, the incubus of liberal industrialism was lifted from the workpeople of Germany, and Ketteler's social reform program received the sanction of law." [27]

## Chapter 14

## The Divine Natural Law

*"What is ordained of heaven is called the essential nature of man; the following of this essential nature is called the natural law; the cultivation and refinement of the natural law is called culture."* – Confucius

Contingencies of war occasioned the movement to other countries of German Catholic social ideas. French arms fell to Germany at Metz in 1870. Two French officers, both aristocrats, Count Albert de Mun and the Marquis La Tour du Pin, were taken prisoner and held at Aix-la-Chapelle. This city was already a centre of the German Catholic Social Movement and influenced both men to return to France with ideas inspired by Bishop von Ketteler. De Mun and La Tour du Pin established Catholic Workingmen's Clubs in France which, politically, became an electoral bureau for monarchy and counter-revolutionary action. [1] De Mun was more a Veuillot than an Ozanam but more flexible than Veuillot. He entered the French Parliament and was the butt of bitter hostility when the Republicans came to power in 1876. Twice his election was invalidated, but he was elected in 1881 and, but for a defeat in 1893, continued in Parliament till 1914.

Parliament came to know his interest in social reform and his oratorical powers in 1884, when trade unionism was being debated. He opposed worker-employer unionisation as conducive to class war, and proposed something very acceptable at that time, the corporate organisation of industry. This was a position he would soon abandon.

The opposition that Bismark had directed at the German Centre in the 80s, de Mun experienced, at the hands of the Republicans, in 1886 when he introduced bills for insurance to cover accident, sickness and old age; and in 1889, when he proposed similar bills for the protection of women and children in employment, and for arbitration and conciliation. [2] The opposition to these bills came from the Republicans who were ill disposed to social legislation. From 1874 to 1884 there was no social reform at all on their parliamentary agenda.

But strong opposition came from within Catholic ranks as well. Their opposition to intervention, which accused de Mun of being a socialist, was voiced by the school of Angers, and its bishop, Mgr Charles Freppel. [3] Monarchist in tendency, it was strongly averse to state legislation, and the state domination implicit in the corporative organisation of industry and state. The corporative organisation of industry had received a strong fillip from Austria, which, like France, had received the influence of German Catholic social ideas amid the accidents of war and politics.

Bismark dethroned the King of Hanover in 1866 with effects that were various and far reaching. The King's Minister of Justice of 1851-1853 and 1863-1865 was Ludwig Windthorst, who deplored the event but moved to the Reich Parliament in 1870, there to outlive Bismark. Another of the King's circle, Dr Maxen, tutor to the royal heir, fled to Austria. There he formed a discussion group of aristocrats around Prince von Lichenstein, also called the 'Red Prince', and names like Count Blöme and Count Franz Kuefstein. [4] Unusual circumstances had brought these men of birth and title together. The German Empire, it has been said, was built more on coal and iron than on blood and iron. [5] The same could not be said of Austria. It was still very much an economy based on land. But capital, banking and industry there were largely in the hands of Jews, and because Jewish millionaires were rapidly becoming landed magnates, [6] the Christian aristocracy of birth was moved to reassert its authority. It became more or less the disinterested defender of the industrial proletariat against the industrial capitalist and financier. Aristocrats became radicals and almost socialists. This was very true of Baron Karl von Vogelsang, who joined the board of *Das Vaterland* which had been formed by the disciples of Maxen, and had become the organ of Catholic social ideas. He became a real leader of the Austrian Catholic Social Movement in the 80s.

Vogelsang, Prussian by birth, had become a Catholic under the influence of Romanticism – something that contributed to his extreme anti-capitalism. To him capitalism was a fundamental moral problem and a defection from the Christian order of the Middle Ages. [7] He was obviously much more inflexible in his outlook here than was Ketteler. Consistently enough, he was influenced by Dr Rudolph Meyer, a fellow refugee from Bismark, but a Protestant. Meyer was the doctrinaire economist of the group, and had been a disciple of the German socialist, Rodbertus [8] (1805-1875). Notwithstanding this influence, Vogelsang preferred a 'social kingdom'. Transformation would take place from within rather than by upheaval. The 'exploitation' of capitalism "whose only purpose of economic activity is net profit" was to be otherwise eliminated. Occupational 'corporations', in which capital and labour, employer and employee, are united, were to form a 'social institution of society and state'. Horizontal stratification according to class would cede to a vertical replacement, and would be characterised by a 'republican cooperative relationship.' 'Purely private, absolute, capricious property which is robbing God, society and the state' would be eliminated. At the top of such economic and social order was to reside the 'social kingdom' as an integrating element. [9]

Vogelsang's obvious corporatism as a contributor to social order had widespread support and moved westward to France and Switzerland. Its life there was short, withering in the early 90s; but it clung on tenaciously in Austria, continuing to have influence there into the twentieth century, [10] in the Christian corporate state of Dr Dollfus (1892-1934). Vogelsang next mounted his attack upon capitalism under another head. He attacked what he considered the driving force of capitalism, the interest it exacted on money. For him it was unlawful usury. To support his case he sought ecclesiastical sanction and invoked both canon law and St Thomas Aquinas, but on both counts his interpretation was astray. August Lehmkuhl, S.J., (1834-1918), who as a moral theologian would rise to international eminence, took issue with him and, in an extensive controversy, argued that interest was not necessarily unlawful usury. He distinguished money in itself from money as an instrument of commerce. Money in itself, a medium of exchange, was sterile, but money as an instrument of commerce, that is, money saved as capital, enjoyed a 'quasi-fertility' or was 'virtually productive'. Value, therefore, attached to its use and on that score was entitled to interest. This was lawful usury. Lehmkuhl went on to argue that the state can fix the price of money and sometimes has a duty to do so. This occurs when "capitalists may try to effect an unjust division of profit between money and labour". He further contended that if the rate of interest is not 'notably' beneath the just rate of profit on investment, this is a sign that the rate of interest is unjustly high. [11]

Lehmkuhl's very public controversy with the editor of *Das Vaterland* was a sign of the rise of Neo-Scholasticism – something already heralded by Ketteler. Its leaders in Germany signalled also the revival of the Jesuits. Notable among these were Costa-Rosetti, S.J. (1842-1900), to whom both Lehmkuhl and Theodore Meyer, S.J., were indebted, and Swiss-born Victor Cathrein, S.J., (1845-1931), who would become adviser to Leo XIII. [12] In Italy, their counterparts were Luigi Taparelli, S.J., (1793-1862) who had taught Joachim Pecci, the future Leo XIII, [13] and Matteo Liberatore, S.J., (1810-1892), master of Roman Neo-Scholasticism. [14] Dominicans were represented in Tommaso Zigliara [15] (1833-1893), who had been ordained by the Archbishop of Perugia, Joachim Pecci, and who was a disciple of Taparelli, and Heinrich Deniflé (1844-1905). [16] Under the impetus of these international theologians, studies were directed primarily to St Thomas Aquinas (1228-1274) and Francisco Suarez (1548-1617).

This revival in scholastic philosophy was the answer to the revolution in philosophy that marked the modern age. That philosophy lay deep beneath the ferment of political revolution and persecution. The gifted literary popularisers, Voltaire and Rousseau, had promoted Reason and Nature, and destroyed not only absolute monarchy but absolute values as well. They were only voices, however, for weightier minds. Descartes, their predecessor, was the father of Rationalism; Kant, their successor in time at least, was the father of modern Idealism. These were the philosophers who opened wide the gate to subjectivism and relative values. Descartes († 1650), pursuing a regime of methodic doubt, acknowledged only one certainty, his own thinking and consequent existence. "I think, therefore, I exist." There was no certainty about things outside the mind. The bridge was thus broken to the outside world. The subject himself was the repository of certainty. This came from his own clear and distinct ideas such as those of the mathematician. One being outside the mind whom they did reveal was the all perfect being, God and his existence. God, good by nature, could only guarantee the veracity of other clear and distinct ideas, including innate ideas. Obvious assumptions appear in this reasoning, God's guarantees, e.g., and these, later thinkers rejected. The subject, the thinker, however, was all important. John Locke († 1704) rejected Descarte's innate ideas, and stressed ideas from experience, sensation and reflection. But reason was supreme as with Descartes, and truth as relative as each thinker.

Immanuel Kant († 1804) was satisfied with neither French rationalism nor English empiricism. He proposed that there was no distinct and certain knowledge of anything outside the mind. Things are known not in themselves but only in their appearances. The mind imposes on those appearances its own forms or categories – the fruit of its own processes of thought and reflection. It cannot know what matter, the soul or God is. It can only know its own categories, its ways of understanding the real. It is the same in the order of practice; everyone knows the command of conscience. This is the category of command or the categorical imperative. Ultimate truth, therefore, whether in the realm of thought or practice, comes from within the world of ideas. Kant's followers rejected conscience and duty. There was then no standard in external reality to measure moral limits. There was no certain or absolute truth in either the world of ideas or practice. All was relative and private opinion. It is not difficult to see how agnosticism, atheism, evolutionary pantheism, secularism and even communism drew on Kantian idealism.

Against these Liberatore took up the cause of objective and absolute values. His *Institutiones philosophicae* (1840-1842) ran to eleven editions. It developed the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas for its realism and objectivity. The mind has an innate disposition to examine the terms of a proposition and accepts them when they are manifestly self evident, e.g. 2+2=4, and Do good, avoid evil.

The mind receives sensations through the senses from outside, and by a process of abstraction ignores particulars perceived. This allows it to conceive an idea of the essence of the thing outside the mind that gives it knowledge and certainty. A knowledge of things points to their creator, God, who is spirit, infinite and eternal. Man is a creature of spirit and matter: immortal in spirit and like God; mortal in body and like other created things. All created things have an end or good. God is the supreme good and last end of all things. Man is the end of all material goods. But he is not bound by them. He distinguishes them and is free to choose from alternatives or opposing means. Yet he is bound by the self evident moral principle: Do good, avoid evil, because it derives from the fact that every

intellectual agent acts for an end that it regards as good, as a due end, and, therefore, in accord with nature and reason. He is capable nonetheless of having reason propose and the will choose what is only the appearance of good. To so choose, contrary to reason and nature, is the abuse of freedom. To avoid this, man needs law to guide him to right reason which presents the real good as against the apparent, and so enables him to choose the real as against the apparent good, i.e., the morally good. Whence this law?

The leading Neo-Scholastic to pursue this question was Luigi Taparelli, S.J. in his A *Theoretical Essay on Natural Right from an Historical Standpoint,* (2 vols. Palermo 1840-1843) whose seventh edition was published in Rome in 1883. He was followed by his disciple, Liberatore, in 1863 in *Institutioni di etica* et *di diritto naturale* (Rome). Both men had made a further substantial contribution in their articles in *La Civiltà Cattolica,* a Jesuit biweekly. This publication, originally established in Naples, moved to Rome in 1850. It argued that natural law was the basis of civilisation and that Christian-inspired natural law was the matrix of Christian civilisation. Liberatore wrote 900 articles in this publication alone. Their primary authority was St Augustine (345-420) who defined the eternal law with a definition that became the foundation of Neo-Scholasticism on law. "The eternal law is the mind and will of God commanding the observance of the order of nature and forbidding its disturbance." (St Augustine *On Free Choice* 1 Ch. 6.).

"This fundamental concept – *lex aeterna*," Christopher Dawson observes, "is derived from purely Hellenic sources. It is the characteristically Greek idea of cosmic order which pervades the whole Hellenic tradition from Heraclitus and Pythagoras to the later Stoics and neo-Platonists, and which had reached Augustine by way of Cicero and Plotinus." [17]

Cicero (106-43 BC) had indeed expressed this idea:

"Law did not then begin to be when it was put into writing but when it arose, that is to say, at the same moment with the mind of God." (*de Lege,* ii, 4).

Similar thoughts occur in his *De Republica*. This work is no longer extant, but its definition of the natural law has been preserved in a quotation by Lactantius, who was known as the Christian Cicero:

There is in fact a true law – namely right reason – which is in accordance with nature, applies to all men, and is unchangeable and eternal. By its commands this law summons men to the performance of their duties; by its prohibitions it restrains them from doing wrong.

It will not lay down one rule at Rome and another at Athens, nor will it be one rule today and another tomorrow. But there will be one law, eternal and unchangeable, binding at all times and upon all peoples; and there will be, as it were, one common master and ruler of men, namely God, who is author of this law, its interpreter and its sponsor. [19]

Confucius (552-479 BC) had anticipated him in the *Unvarying Mean*:

"What is ordained of heaven is called the essential nature of man; the following of this essential nature is called the natural law; the cultivation and refinement of the natural law is called culture." [18]

"Augustine's order of nature was the order born (natus) of the Creator's mind and will, as, in the words of Suarez, "It moves all things to their due end", and "lays down the order to be observed either generally by all parts of the universe with respect to the common good, or specifically by intellectual creatures with respect to their free action." (Suarez *Laws* II 3, 5-6).

It has been noted that Suarez was a diligent reader of Duns Scotus (1265-1308), who insisted on the manifold shape of the world, and pursued a method that was empirical, positive and historical. [20] The same line of thought was developed by Luis de Molina, S.J. (1535-1600) a contemporary of Suarez. He systematically distinguished absolute natural law as embedded in the 'nature of man' and formulated in the Decalogue, and relative or 'contingent' natural law, which comprises all natural legal matters (*persistente lege naturali in se*), as dependent on historical circumstances. Relying on this distinction, Victor Cathrein, S.J., (1845-1931) elaborated, according to the needs of his time, an autonomous natural law ethics:

"Ethics may be defined as the science of the moral rectitude of human acts in accordance with the

principles of human reason. The proper method of Ethics is at once speculative and empirical, it draws upon experience and metaphysics." [21]

In the light of the first principle of the natural law, "do good, avoid evil", reason examines in the field of human relations, the order in human nature, i.e., its due ends. Life is a good, a due end. 'Do good' becomes preserve your own life, respect the lives of others. 'Avoid evil' becomes do no injury to your own life or the life of another. All these goods or due ends of human nature, the dictates of the Creator of nature, become correspondingly dictates of human reason. This is law, natural and eternal, and the rational creature sharing both. The words of Aquinas are apposite, (St Thomas 1a 2ae, 91.2) As nature reflects the Author of nature, natural law reflects eternal law. Natural law is therefore man's sharing in the eternal law. It is his guide to right reason, and the choice of the really good, the morally good, i.e., to objective natural values, based on eternal ones.

Aquinas' sharing in the eternal law, however, is limited and defective. "Human reason cannot have a full sharing f the dictates of Divine Reason but one which is in accord with its own mode." (St Thomas 91, 3 ad 1). Man's natural sharing of the eternal law consists in the knowledge of certain general principles, e.g. the Decalogue, not of particular decisions relating to individual cases.

Since generality admits of infinite degrees, the precepts of the natural law cannot be numbered exactly. All such precepts are deduced from the primary precept that good is to be done and evil avoided. As these conclusions become more and more remote, they shade off into the sphere of human law; there can, therefore, be no clear border line between natural and human law. Human or positive law consists in variable determinations of immutable law, as these are applied to varying circumstances of social life. To quote a simple example. In the case of life-taking, the circumstances of self defence as a last resort against a would-be murderer change the species of the act of life-taking from being against, to being in accord with, the Decalogue. Eternal law, natural law and positive law, however, though distinct from one another, form a continuous series that may be compared to a tree. [22] The eternal law is its hidden root, the natural law is its main trunk, and the different systems of positive law are its branches.

Man's sharing in the eternal law by way of the natural law, however limited, provides not only objective, moral values based on eternal ones, but also the foundation of an objectively based social philosophy.

Man has God as his supreme good and last end. Among his fellow men, he has specific needs in order to accomplish his end and may claim, in the name of the natural law, rights to those needs e.g. life, freedom, marriage, property, and society. They impose on him corresponding duties. Right and duty in society is of particular significance. Man, because spiritual in his soul and like God, is supreme among created things. Society is one of those created things. Man, because immortal, transcends society and it must revere his rights. But he is also mortal, and society will outlive him. He needs it and has corresponding obligations to it. Between man and society there is an important transcendence-subordination relationship. In view of his transcendence, society is to supplement not supplant him. This is the principle of subsidiarity, whose definition by Ketteler has already been mentioned (see Chapter 11 note 9.) It says that society is subsidiary to the individual and groups within it and that every member, individual, family or group within that society, has a right to determine its own life. So long as the individual, family or group can fulfil its own ends, it must have a right to self determination. Concomitant with the principle of subsidiarity is that of solidarity. It demands of the individuals and groups, that subordination that ensures the rights of others and of the society on which they depend.

The word subsidiary, used in business parlance to define the company which is an offshoot (part) from a parent company (whole), is different in meaning from the philosophical term, subsidiarity. The latter term connotes a relationship between a group (whole) and a person (part) in which the group (whole) is subsidiary to the person (part).

Neo-Scholasticism thus provided a philosophy of objective and eternal values for both person and society. Members of the Catholic Social Movement were consequently at one on fundamentals, but already it was abundantly clear that emphasis on ways and means would vary, very much on grounds

of historical circumstances, from country to country and from school to school within the one country.

## Part II: Leo XIII withstands the Revolution

## Chapter 15

## Revolution: Political

Perugia, the see to which Joachim Pecci was appointed in 1846, was situated on the right bank of the Tiber in central Umbria. To all appearances it was remote from the great centres such as Rome and Milan. But it was on the route from the exarchate of Ravenna and the Romagna to Rome: and it linked the Lombard north with the Neapolitan south. It was a natural stopping place for travellers, and almost all French and Belgian bishops visiting Italy called on its archbishop. [1] Through conversations with fellow bishops, foreign diplomats and others, the host archbishop was well informed on the Church abroad and the world of foreign affairs. His avidity for authentic current information was indicated by the volume of his reading matter. Soderini, his biographer and intimate, wrote: “There was no book, no review or newspaper of any importance he did not read. His study was like a reading room and so it later seemed at the Vatican”. [2]

The archbishop’s voluminous reading took in the intellectual enthusiasm of the day – modern progress – which queried the Church as a vehicle of civilisation, and evoked from Pecci several pastorals. In them, Progress was accepted as long as it included religious and moral progress.

Election to the papal throne brought Pecci to Rome 20 February 1878. His pontificate as Leo XIII could scarcely expect to be an easy one after the tribulations suffered by his predecessor. Their roots went back a long way. “By 1790 outside the States of the Church and the United States of America, there was not a single country in the world where the Catholic religion was free to live fully its own life, and not a single Catholic country where there seemed any prospect but of further enslavement and gradual emasculation.” [3] The pontificate of Pius IX (1846-1878) saw prospect become reality as enslavement overtook him, and emasculation only accelerated.

It was only a daunting picture then that Europe could present to Leo. But he proved to be the man for the times. To steely determination, he linked what seemed to many ‘pure intelligence, all mind’. He could work at his desk ten and twelve hours a day, week in week out for years on end. [4] The greatest of all his gifts was an eagle eye view of men and events, absolute freedom from gullibility, and unfailing recognition of what could and could not be done and lastly, the power to carry out his decisions with extraordinary tact, skill and subtlety. These gifts made him the archetypal diplomat and statesman. His adversaries called him a ‘white cassocked Talleyrand’, [5] but he was the very opposite.

He valued the skills of diplomacy and promoted them. But his esteem for the power of orthodox teaching was for him paramount. In twenty-seven encyclicals over twenty-five years, he gave new life to dogma, sacred scripture, morals and philosophy including that of political and economic life. As well, he inspired piety and devotion.

One of his earliest encyclicals was *Aeterni Patris* (August, 1879), which was to establish the works of Thomas Aquinas as the thesaurus of theology and philosophy for his Church. This was a project he had already initiated at Perugia, when he established the *Accademia San Tommaso*. This initiative took a more advanced and prestigious form when he established the Roman Academy of St Thomas Aquinas and launched a critical edition of the works of that theologian. Both enterprises he placed in the competent hands of Tommaso Zigliara O.P. A fellow member of the Academy was Matteo Liberatore, S.J., who contributed a lifetime’s work to the revival of Thomist philosophy. Both of them have been noted above for their part in the development of Neo-Scholasticism. This encyclical did more than enhance the philosophy and theology of the rising Neo-Scholastics. It provided the foundation of the entire program that Leo would pursue in his pontificate. [6]

It claimed, by way of the philosophy of Aquinas, to offer a universal solution to all problems of the modern world, especially social problems. Its teaching on the true nature of freedom and the divine origin of authority possessed an ‘invincible power’ to overcome those principles of the ‘new

jurisprudence', i.e., revolution, which harm order and public welfare. The encyclical's outcome was a philosophical movement whose most important representatives were able to revive Aquinas as one of the greatest thinkers of Hellenic-Occidental philosophy. The renaissance was an historical, creative process, not just a classical copy.

However much Leo was inspired by the writings of Thomas Aquinas, he needed all the patience and skills required of a diplomat in an impossible situation. Italy's Law of Guarantees, 1871, [7] sought abdication by the Pope of all sovereignty – a request that had to be refused. Pius' rebuttal brought a stream of reprisals. The government hindered the nomination of bishops, until more than sixty sees were vacant. Religious orders were dissolved and monasteries confiscated. Religious teaching was banished from schools, and clergy were forced into the army as soldiers. [8] Bismarck's *Kulturkampf*, a 'struggle for civilisation', was already well on its way. It was directed at Catholics because many of them preferred Austria to Prussia; and the strong Rhineland Catholics harboured a traditional south-German antipathy for Prussia. The ensuing "May Laws", 1873-1876 were fiercely anti-Catholic. Some archbishops were gaoled. Some bishops were deposed and four hundred parishes were deprived of their parish priests. [9] The German ambassador in Paris advised his master that France would support Germany in a common policy against Rome. [10]

Bismarck was checked in his attack upon the Church by electoral realities. Ludwig Windthorst, leader of the Centre, though backed by Catholics who represented only 25% of the electorate, was a political leader of unusual skill. His followers in the Reichstag grew from 63 to 91 in 1874 and to 103 in 1878; and he was able to become the hinge of every government. In addition, the socialists were increasing their slice of the vote despite Bismarck's anti-socialist laws.

In these circumstances, Leo in 1878 extended the olive branch to Bismarck. The Iron Chancellor, for all his reluctance, was a realist and announced in 1881 a resumption of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. This concession was gradually extended and in 1883, 1500 priests were allowed to return to their parishes. [11] Leo's initiative could claim results. He had been prepared to accept the *de facto* situation and declared himself ready to collaborate with regimes deriving from the Revolution.

While success attended Leo's efforts in Germany, the same could not be said to have rewarded him in France. There he was faced with a different France from that which he had experienced when he visited Paris in 1845, and was courteously received by Louis Philippe. The conservative forces of the Third Republic had ceded place to radical Republicans in 1876. This started a persecution of the Church which had been loudly hailed when Leon Gambetta in 1877 uttered his battle cry: "Clericalism, there is the enemy." [12] Republican Laws between 1879 and 1886 were bitter and comprehensive. They deprived of their seats on the *Conseil superieur de l'Instruction* the members nominated by various religious bodies, and withdrew recognition of Catholic universities. The Jesuits were expelled and their property seized. Other religious orders were given three months to seek state recognition. If it was refused, the order was to dissolve. 8,000 men and 100,000 women were affected: 10,000 were driven from their houses. All religious instruction was excluded from primary and grammar schools. Faculties of theology in universities, and chaplaincies in the great *Ecoles Normales* were suppressed. Army and hospital chaplaincies were abolished, seminarists subjected to military service, and nuns forbidden to nurse in hospitals. [13]

This heartless secularisation of French life, within a short period of years, produced a resounding bitterness of attitude among Catholics. Many of their leaders, e.g. La Tour du Pin, refused to recognise the regime and never ceased to fight it. Some French Catholics desired the overthrow of the Republic for political reasons; others, for religious reasons reckoned it inevitably and necessarily anti-Catholic. Catholic republicans, few in number, did not come in for criticism from the Catholic anti-republicans, but the moderate Catholics did. This group did not accept the political philosophy of the victorious Republicans, but aimed at a *modus vivendi* with the Republic. They sought to have a full civic life within the anti-Christian Republic by using their right to influence its legislation in a Christian sense. This position was most unacceptable to the Catholic anti-republicans, who attacked the moderates as bad Catholics.

Leo consulted the leaders of the various Catholic factions, and after a long study of every side of the

French scene, published his mind and directive in an encyclical *Immortale Dei,* 1 November 1885. There seems little doubt that Matteo Liberatore, 'Master of Roman Neo-Scholasticism', was called into consultation. He had written *La Chiesa e lo Stato* (Naples 1871). But of even more significance he had personal experience of both absolutism and revolution. He had been driven out of Naples to Malta in the 1848 revolution. [14]On his return in 1850, he participated in the foundation of *Civiltà Cattolica* whose writings did not please the absolutist Neopolitan Bourbons. It had written that the Church was not tied to any particular form of government, but found all acceptable, including democracy, so long as it respected Christian principles. This was regarded by the monarchy as subversive and *Civiltà Cattolica* was forced to move to Rome. [15]

The encyclical began in true Thomist fashion by emphasising the positive Christian view on the nature and origin of the state. [16] Man's natural instinct moves him to live in civil society. Society, therefore, has its origin in God who is the author of nature. Public power, without which society cannot function, equally has its origin in God; and whoever holds that authority holds it from God. God has willed no particular form of government. It may be this or that form, provided only that it be of a nature to ensure the common good, i.e.. the rights of all. If citizens for their part are convinced that political authority is from God and that to obey that authority is a matter of justice and duty, their homage should be willing and dutiful. "To cast aside obedience by popular violence, to incite to revolt is, therefore, treason not against man only but against God."

One very important consequence of the divine origin of the state's authority is that the State must make public acknowledgement of the links that bind it to God. For "society, no less than individuals, owes gratitude to God who gave it being and maintains it." Hence governments should never hinder, but in every way make easier, the religious life of their subjects, for the practice of religion is the 'link connecting man with God'. Religion is the true religion, i.e., the religion established by Jesus Christ which he committed to his Church, to protect and propagate it. The Church is thus a public society that cannot be 'looked upon as inferior to the state, or in any way dependent upon it'.

How adjust the claims of these two authorities over the same set of human beings?

The Church is, as it were, a state for spiritual matters. To it Christ gave "unrestrained authority in regard to things sacred with the power of making laws, as also with the twofold right of judging and of punishing which flows from that power". God has then arranged that two authorities shall have charge of the human race, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one for divine things, the other for human things. "Each authority", i.e., Church or state "in its genus is supreme. Each has fixed limits within which it is contained; there is an orbit traced out within which the actions of each is brought into play by its own native right". But since the same subjects live under the two authorities, and the same matter might appear to belong to the jurisdiction of both, God had to provide a means of avoiding conflict between them. The nature and scope of the divinely established correlation of Church and state – which ensures that such real conflict of rights shall never happen – is determined by (1) the nature and (2) the relative excellence of the two powers.

"Whatever in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs (1) either of its own nature or (2) by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls or to the worship of God, is subject to the Church … Whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to civil authority". Such is the Catholic ideal. Its laws are aimed at the common good, i.e., the rights of all. "They are not framed according to the delusive caprices and opinions of the mass of the people, but by truth and justice. … obedience is not the servitude of man to man, but submission to the will of God, exercising his supreme authority through the medium of men."

But laws that were 'framed according to the delusive caprices and opinions of the mass of the people' were in fact introduced. Their origin was the rage for novelty in ideas and ideals, which reached its climax in the sixteenth century. This finally showed itself in the succession of revolutions from 1789 onwards. (As Jedin has remarked: "Leo has always imagined democracy was the result of revolution".) [17] This new conception of the nature and function of law is based on the principle that "lays down that as all men are alike by race and nature, so, in like manner, all are equal in the control of their life; that each one is so far his own master as in no sense to be under the rule of any other individual; that each

is free to think on any subject just as he may choose, and to do whatever he may like to do; that no man has a right to rule other men." Government, in a society based on such maxims, is nothing more or less than the will of the people, which, by way of social contract, is its own master. A state, in this conception of things, does not consider itself bound by any kind of duty to God. It treats all religion as a matter of private judgement and does not believe that it is bound to show favour to any particular creed. In this kind of state the Church is regarded as no different in kind from any other association, and where the twofold jurisdiction of Church and state overlap, the state prevails. Marriage is state regulated, and ecclesiastical property is sequestrated under the pretext that the Church cannot possess property. The Church, in such a system, possesses no legal right *as the Church*. Her very corporate life only continues by virtue of the state's favour, as a concession of state law. Leo's judgement of the outcome of this secularist trend in the modern state was severe. The liberal state which eliminates religion – a probable reference to the French state – will lead to general moral decay and social instability. Indifference in religion will lead to atheism. The sovereignty of the people as a doctrine favours violent revolution and every kind of defiance of government authority. In the face of all this, the Church can never consent to be subordinate to the state, or to be a function of the state. In modern circumstances, however, there is a case for saying that it may prove useful and even inevitable that Catholics resign themselves in practice to something less than the ideal. This was possibly a plea to Catholic conservatives in France to face the real situation and adapt. By the same token, some states may find it necessary to tolerate religious error 'for the sake of securing some great good, or of hindering some great evil'. Indeed the Church is not opposed to democracy itself, i.e., the direct participation of the people in government. Nor is it opposed to intellectual liberty in the true sense, i.e., the use of reason to promote the cause of God and the common good. Leo, therefore, urges Catholics not to be content with disapproval of the secular state but to engage in civil life and political affairs and so testify to Christian principles. Expediency may counsel the opposite in some cases. This was no doubt a reference to the Italian situation where the Church had not recognised the state which had spoliated the Papal States, 1860-1870.

Leo's efforts to pacify French conservative Catholics were not successful. Discontent came to a head five years later, when Charles Martial Clavier (1825-1892), Cardinal Archbishop of Carthage, founder of the White Fathers and apostle of north and equatorial Africa, pursued an unofficial mission to rally French Catholics to support a republican regime in France; to overcome the anticlerical majority in the French parliament and to make a change of laws that barred the way to a *rapprochment* (reconciliation) between the Holy See and France. He launched a *ralliement* (rally) by proclaiming to a large assembly of officials in Algiers, on 12 November 1890, the obligation of French Catholics to adhere to the republican form of government. The famous *toast d'Alger* angered French monarchists, who criticised Lavigerie severely and unreservedly. Mgr Freppel, Bishop of Angers, (1827-1891), strenuously upheld clerico-monarchist tradition and denied that the Republic was acceptable to Catholics. He, along with others, took his protest to Rome. [18]

A year later, 2 February 1892, another encyclical, *Au milieu des Solicitudes,* declared that "acceptance of the new regime is not only permitted, but demanded, and even imposed, by the necessity of the social tie which has created it. Such an attitude is the surest and most salutary line of conduct for all Frenchmen in their civil relations with the Republic, which is the present government of their nation". Most bishops and the devout submitted to direction, but many priests and laymen remained hostile. Leo admitted failure ten years later. "By their disobedience to my program in 1892, the French clergy rendered me powerless to save them." [19]

Leo could not have foreseen the outcome of his endeavours. One pertinent judgement said:

"The action of the Holy See caused a neo-Gallicanism in France that was to reach its climax in the *Action francaise."* [20]

The mention of neo-Gallicanism could only recall the truth that political loyalties run deeply at any time; and the more so when, as in France, they had a millennium of tradition behind them. The intransigent royalism of the 1890s bridged the turn of the century. In one of its most spectacular expressions, *Action francaise,* it became a purely nationalistic matter; so much so, that Pius XI was moved to reject it unreservedly 5 January 1927. It went down eventually but not before taking with it

Cardinal Billot, whose sympathy for it was well known. He was persuaded to renounce his cardinatial dignity, something he had been awarded by Pius X very much because of his notable support of papal directives in the Modernist controversy.

*Action francaise* indicated not only the insuperable difficulties the political revolution had presented to Leo XIII; its demise was one proof that Leo's option on the future was well placed.

## Chapter 16

## Revolution: Socio-Economic

The new Pope had already, as Archbishop of Perugia, indicated his mind on socio-economic problems. In a pastoral published in Lent 1877, the language was vigorous, and recalled that of Archbishop Ketteler:

"The modern schools of economics have considered labour as the supreme end of man whom they take into account as a machine of more or less value according as he aids more or less in production. Hence no consideration for the normal man, and the colossal abuse that is made of the poor and lowly … excessive hours … poor children shut up in factories … consumption awaits them … does not this sight … oblige Governments and Parliaments to make laws that can serve as a check to this inhuman traffic." [1]

This was certainly a call for social legislation to meet the abuses of the industrial revolution. The death of Ketteler in the following July could only have confirmed the archbishop in his attachment to ideas largely pioneered by that prelate. Within twelve months of his appointment as Pope, Leo turned his attention to other enormities associated with the socio-economic world. These have been treated in some detail in Chapter 1: the revolutionary activity in Benevento which evoked the encyclical, whose English title was *Socialism, Communism, Nihilism* (December 1878); the encyclical, *Diuturnum Illud* (June 1881) which enlarged on its predecessor and was probably occasioned by the assassination of Tsar Alexander II of Russia.

Leo brought added emphasis to this teaching when he appointed a commission of theologians and others to study the theological and philosophical principles that would throw light on economic problems. It came to be known as the *Circulo dei studi sociali ed economiche* [2] and included some very eminent clerics and laymen. Cardinal Ludovico Jacobini had become Secretary of State in 1880. He had been nuncio to Vienna in 1874 and had met Bismarck in 1879 in an effort to terminate the Kulturkampf. Cardinal Zigliara brought all the prestige of his editorship of the works of St Thomas Aquinas. Cardinal Camillo Mazzella (1833-1900), an eminent theologian, had lectured in dogma and morals at Lyons, and, in the United States, at Georgetown University and Woodstock College. He was raised by Leo XIII to the chair of theology in the Gregorian University and held that position till he was made cardinal in 1886. [3] Mgr Mermillod was to be a cardinal in 1890. Heinrich Deniflé O.P. (1844-1905) had been brought from Graz in Austria to Rome in 1880 to collaborate with Cardinal Zigliara on the new edition of the works of Thomas Aquinas. Matteo Liberatore S.J. had been associated with *Civiltà Cattolica* since 1850 in its dedication to the portrayal of the Church as a vehicle of civilisation. There were prominent laymen also: Count Soderini already mentioned, Henri Lorin, [4] a near foundation member and a graduate of the 'Catholic Workingmen's Club' in France, and soon to play a role in the creation of the French *Semaines Sociales*; and Gaspard Decurtins (1885-1918). The latter was a young man who was already a member of the Swiss National Council, and who would promote legislation for worker insurance and welfare that would outstrip that of France. He was to play a leading role in Swiss politics on behalf of the worker. [5]

Particularly prominent in the group was Gaspard Mermillod, who in 1864 had been appointed auxiliary bishop to Mgr Marilly, Bishop of Geneva and Lausanne. In 1872 he, as auxiliary, appointed a parish priest, and the government nullified the action on the grounds that only Bishop Marilly could make the appointment. Mermillod was ordered to withdraw from all episcopal duties and to terminate all relations with the priests. He was in effect banished, and retreated to Ferney, Voltaire's former home, over the French border. A Law for the Reorganisation of the Catholic Church followed. Parish

priests were to be elected by the faithful; the right to create and suppress parishes would rest with lay authorities; papal and episcopal documents required government *placet* before publication. It was an attempt to establish a National Church: another Civil Constitution of the Clergy: or a *Swiss Kulturkampf*. [6]

Mermillos harassment by the political authorities did not dampen his long cherished interest in the socio-economic question. A sermon 23 February 1868 at St Clothilde's, Paris, had revealed that he was then well aware of it. The Swiss Alps with their valleys and snow drifts provided excellent imagery for his argument. "The movement of the working-classes appears to us as a torrent rushing down from the mountains; it may destroy everything in its passage, and scatter ruin through our valleys; but it must be the honour of the Catholic Church to go forth to meet these forces, and by forming barriers and canals, reduce these imperious billows and form them in the nineteenth century into a mighty and fertilising river". [7]

In 1883, Mermillod's ten year term of exile came to an end, and he returned to become Bishop of the newly constituted diocese of Fribourg-Lausanne-Geneva. He resided at Fribourg, the most Catholic part of Switzerland, and was to make it a centre of Catholic thought and studies on the socio-economic problem. He soon found strong support .La Tour du Pin, co-founder with de Mun of the Catholic Workingmen's Clubs in France, had been impressed by the Harmel experiment at Val de Bois near Rheims. Since 1840 it had developed cotton spinning mills based on a union of employer-worker associations, in a word, a corporative or guild organisation. This interest was intensified when, as military attaché in Vienna (1879-1881), he imbibed some of Vogelsang's guild enthusiasm. On his return to Paris, he was alarmed by the division between the schools of Liège and Angers, and proposed in 1884, on behalf of the French Catholic Social Group, to the two Austrian leaders, Kuefstein and Blöme, that steps be taken to promote an international federation of socially minded Catholics. [8] The idea won support and a group from various countries met at Fribourg in Mermillod's library. The Catholic Union of Fribourg for economic and social studies was the outcome (1885). [9] It met annually at Mermillod's new habitat which was excellently placed geographically and linguistically to become a clearing house for the socio-economic thought and aspirations of the Belgian, French, German and Austrian worlds at least. It is obvious that the Fribourg Union and the Rome circle had certain members in common, something that had to aid their common purpose yet leave an opening for varying views. They had, as well, contributions from outside. Lehmkuhl, in a letter to the Fribourg union, wrote:

"Where free contract between master and man leads to the oppression of the workman, or even to the danger of being oppressed, by the employer, public authority may and ought, according to circumstances, to fix a minimum wage, and see to its application." [10] By contrast Liberatore, of the Rome circle, in his *Principi de economia politica,* pp.230-231 Rome 1889, had proposed a family wage:

"To the workman labour signifies that which is necessary for his sustenance and that of his family. Consequently if he consecrates his labour to a master, the latter is bound to remunerate him with an equivalent to this labour in order that equality in exchange or justice is thus observed *Justitia aequalitatem importat*. We may therefore, affirm that the natural price of labour is that which allows the workman to suffice for his own maintenance and that of his wife and two or three children." [11]

Mermillod made a significant report to Leo on the work of the Union 15 March 1888:

"The struggle for life having now been established as a law of human relations, and labour being considered as a commodity, the existence of the working people has become subject to the free action of material force, and they have been reduced to a condition that recalls pagan slavery."

This was the voice of Ketteler and next came the voice of Lehmkuhl:

"Rationalistic economics, by making a distinction between things and their value, give as a basis of the present system of production and exchange, the previous deduction of an interest, fixed in virtue of the value as just remuneration of those who, by their activity, have co-operated in the enterprise." [12]

Both of these criticisms implied the necessity of state intervention. They were near contemporaneous with another form of intervention recently (1885) accepted in the United States. James Gibbons,

Archbishop of Baltimore, gave approval to a pioneer trade union, the Knights of Labour, an action that must have had the Pope's blessing, as he made Gibbons a cardinal the following year.

At the same time, in the United States, an unacceptable form of state intervention was being promoted. Henry George was campaigning vigorously and successfully for his Single Tax doctrine, that tax on land replace all other taxes. It said that, as land rents were caused by the community, they belong to the community. This was one step from saying that land should be nationalised. George gave significant prestige to his cause by running for mayor of New York on a Single Tax platform. Mgr Edward McGlynn, parish priest of a leading parish, unreservedly supported George, in spite of a prohibition by his archbishop, Patrick Corrigan.

He was suspended, removed from his parish and summoned to Rome. He refused to go and was excommunicated, July 1887. The case in Rome was handed to a commission of three cardinals, Virga, Zigliara and Mazzella. The last named, as already noted, had spent some years in the United States lecturing in theology, and could thus bring some local knowledge to the George/McGlynn problem. Entrusted with the task of summing up the outcome of the investigation, he reported that it was necessary to examine George's 'teaching', and without condemning the author, to issue a pontifical document in which the 'censurable teachings contained [in George's] writings are scrutinised' as well as others like them. [13] The suggestion to defer judgement on George and treat his views in a more comprehensive document seemed to be something destined for self fulfilment as Mazzella and Zigliara did participate in such a pontifical document, the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. But *Rerum Novarum,* 1891, censured Georgism with nothing more than its general condemnation of socialism. McGlynn was relieved of his censure in 1892.

The practical problems of the United States came to the Fribourg Union and the Rome circle, as matters for their research and report to the Pope. Valuable as was this research, there was needed the wider ranging scrutiny of an open forum. This came in a series of conferences in the North, based on Liège (Belgium). This city was no doubt chosen as a type of a progressive industrial economy and a socio-economic laboratory. "Belgium was the one country in Europe which kept pace industrially with England in the first half of the nineteenth century". [14] These conferences exposed the hopes, aspirations and divisions that lay within the Catholic Social Reform Movement. Overriding topics of interest were the corporative organisation of industry, and state intervention to protect the worker.

In the 80s, corporations, envisaging the collaboration of classes, became fashionable but took many forms. There were those of the *Ancien Régime*; that of Harmel which proposed a form that was both family and confraternity. It was labelled paternalist. The Catholic liberals, Perin of Belgium and Le Play of France, [15] opted for a corporation that was hierarchical, voluntary and free from external restraint. In 1883, at the Catholic Convention in Dusseldorf, by contrast, legally mandatory guilds were vehemently debated; with the leaders of trade favouring, and the social politicians of the Centre under Windthorst, opposing. [16] For Austria, Vogelsang, proposed corporations that were agents of the state, and his disciple, Kuefstein, went a step further to make them a Christian form of socialism. Kuefstein, a member of both the Rome circle and the Fribourg Union, was vigorous in his promotion of his form of corporation. In 1888 at a congress held in Vienna, he and Count Blöme, among others, determined that the principal scope of the efforts for reform of social and economic order should be directed to the organisation of society into corporative bodies. Similar views were expressed at successive congresses in Vienna, held in 1889 and 1890. [17]

Leo gave some support to these ideas in an address to French workers led by Harmel 20 October 1889. "What we ask of you," he said, "is to cement anew the social edifice by returning to the spirit and doctrines of Christianity, reviewing at least in substance, in their manifold and beneficent attributes and under such forms as the new conditions of our times admit of, those corporations of arts and trades founded upon a Christian ideal … which formerly provided for the material and religious needs of the working classes." [18]

Notwithstanding this promotion and support, interest in corporatism tended, after a struggle, to recede before the controversy on state intervention to protect the worker. At conferences at Liège (1886-1890), the lines on state intervention were drawn between the schools of Angers under Bishop Freppel and that of Liège under Albert de Mun. [19]

At the 1886 Liège Congress, notables representing the school of Angers were Charles Perin, [20] who was more than impressed with the Belgian liberal economy and would support state intervention only as a last resort, and Frederick Le Play reputed for his scientific observations of French society and economy, who was of a similar mind. [21]

Differing from them and favouring the Liège school were Cardinal Manning of Westminster, a firm admirer of Ozanam and de Mun; Archbishop Gaspard Mermillod and fellow Swiss Catholic social activist, Gaspard Decurtins, who strongly favoured intervention. Mermillod addressed the conference and, among other things, said that the Scylla of 'statolatry', excessive confidence in the state, must be shunned but it would be no less disastrous to fall into the Charybdis of refusing legislative protection to those who needed it. [22] The Congress opted for state intervention and repeated the choice in 1887.Mermillod's fellow Swiss activist, Gaspard Decurtins (1855-1918), became a deputy in the Swiss National Council in 1881. In 1888, when Mermillod was making his Fribourg Union report to Pope Leo, he took up a matter promoted by German Catholics in 1882 – an International Conference of States for an international agreement on factory legislation. In 1889, the Swiss government accepted this proposal and invited European governments to send representatives to a conference at Berne. The Emperor of Germany, William II countered, proposing instead a conference at Berlin, and prevailed. That conference was held in 1890. Decurtins' action was nonetheless significant. It was applauded by a letter from Cardinal Jacobini on behalf of the Pope, 1 May 1889. The same letter named particular items suitable for social legislation; the duty and right of the state to protect childhood, in order that its strength be not prematurely wasted, nor its innocence exposed to peril; to prevent the health of women and mothers of families from being injured and destroyed by factory work; to protect adults so that the duration of their daily work be not prolonged beyond certain limits; to guarantee in every possible way Sunday rest. [23] Support for social legislation was certainly gathering, and issuing from high places.

Cardinal Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892) has been described as both radical and ultramontanist. At the Vatican Council in 1870, he was whip for the ultramontane cause of papal infallibility. In this he was like Veuillot, but he was a devotee also of Ozanam and de Mun. Like them, he pursued a radical line. He endorsed journalist W.T. Stead's campaign against the horrors of the white slave trade in young girls, much to the dissatisfaction of some of his respectable followers. He moved the Mansion House resolution against the pogroms against Russian Jews, and extolled General Booth and his Salvation Army. He combined with Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore to save the Knights of Labour from ecclesiastical censure; and in spectacular fashion in August of 1889 played a prominent mediating role in the London Dockers' strike, something that had merited the thanks of the Pope.

He now addressed the September 1890 Liège Congress, and as advanced years took their toll, did so by letter. He strongly favoured social legislation. [24] Lehmkuhl (already mentioned several times above) did not enjoy the high public profile of Manning, but in the world of moral theologians his standing was correspondingly eminent. At this Congress, his earlier letter to the Fribourg Union, quoted above, on the regulation of working hours and a minimum wage was read and accepted as a memorandum. Further he contributed an important paper. *De la legitimité et del illegitimité des grèves* (the legitimacy and illegitimacy of strikes), in which he supported the right to strike as the only guarantee left to the workman under the existing organisation of labour. [25]

Social legislation supported by de Mun in common with Austrians, Germans and Swiss was triumphant. The Congress recognised the "necessity of extending without delay the guild organisation of society," favoured an international agreement for the legal limitation of the working day for men, reaffirmed the principle of obligatory accident and sickness insurance, strengthened its plank on old age pensions, advocated the legal prohibition of child labour (14 years for northern and twelve for southern countries), the establishment of a maximum working day of 8-12 hours for women and children, prohibition of night work and Sunday work for women and children, and six weeks' rest for women after childbirth. Even the minimum wage question was debated, but the anti-interventionists, led by Mgr Freppel, revolted against quite so drastic a decision, and the proposal was tabled. [26]

The discomfited anti-interventionists, encouraged by Mgr Freppel, Bishop of Angers (1827-1891), sponsored a rival Congress, 7 October, at Angers; that set up a rival organisation the Catholic Society

for Political and Social Economy', which was to counter state socialism. Allied with them were the Catholic jurists, who controlled the *Revue catholique des institutions et du droit* and were particularly prominent in the new association, so much so, in fact, that their review became its organ. In their opinion, wages must be determined by supply and demand, compulsory social insurance was repugnant to natural law, and state intervention in labour questions must be restricted to the narrowest limits.

In the face of all this, Count de Mun was conciliatory almost to the point of surrender. Mgr Freppel was willing to admit state intervention for the protection of rights and repression of abuses: all Catholics could agree on this formula, said de Mun. It was only in its practical application that disputes arose. All were agreed, on legislative restriction of child labour and of the employment of young persons and women. On the limitation of hours for adults, there was no agreement as yet. The minimum wage question and social insurance could be left to the guilds or to arbitration boards representing the interested parties. Almost all Catholics agree that the organisation of guilds was desirable. [27]

State intervention by social legislation was obviously very limited as a result of these negotiations. Intervention by way of guild or arbitration board was acceptable. But even guilds were no more than desirable. Arbitration boards were an alternative. Freppel, who had been professor of patristics at the Sorbonne (1855), was a redoubtable character and was ill-disposed to come to terms with the Revolution. For him state intervention infringed upon individual freedom and was socialism. He wanted to "restore Christian society by the affirmation of Catholic doctrine against the Revolution which had destroyed the social order." [28]

The Liège-Angers division of September/October signalled trouble for the Catholic Social Reform Movement. Strong attachment to political ideals and loyalties had left monarchists and republicans on opposite sides of the fence. Similar emotions were now separating state-interventionists from free marketeers. The problem was aggravated by the tendency for each side to belabour its opponents with disparaging labels. State-interventionists were called socialists, and free marketeers capitalists or paternalists. The clash of these forces had echoes in Rome.

In April 1890, a draft for an encyclical on the socio-economic question was commissioned by the Pope. It proved unacceptable and in September, Cardinal Zigliara was called upon for a second draft. This was completed, and handed to Alessandro Volpini (1816-1903) for translation into Latin. This process was suspended *per ordine superiore,* i.e., no doubt, by Leo himself, for twenty one days. [29] It would seem reasonable to conclude that the break was made to consider the friction between Liège and Angers, and its effects on the work in progress. Another factor, the *Ralliement,* was imminent, 12 November, and was to intensify strife between monarchists and republicans. The men in Rome preparing the socio-economic encyclical could ignore neither of these matters. They engendered such heat that a pause was expedient. Volpini's work was resumed 17 November and completed 31 January. But the work was far from finished. There were objections. Freppel journeyed to Rome to beg Leo not to speak on the social problem. [30] Care was, therefore, urgent. Soderini, close friend of Volpini and biographer of the Pope, wrote that the compilation of *Rerum Novarum* was entrusted by the Pope to Cardinal Zigliara. "Leo XIII, having considered Zigliara's work, ordered Boccali and Volpini to remould it completely … this done, he read the encyclical and finding it conformable to his ideas, sent it back to the cardinals … (he) confined himself to a few amendments." [31]

The number of drafts so made, and the number of contributors so involved, was given more precision by Joseph Schmidlin [32] who wrote much later than Soderini. Jedin relying on his work has the following note: "The first draft of the encyclical was probably written by M. Liberatore. The second one was amended by secretaries G. Boccali and A. Volpini. who also used suggestions from Fribourg. Cardinals Zigliara and Mazzella, and again Liberatore worked on the third version. [33] It would seem Leo was doing everything possible to avoid the divisions that had attended his earlier encyclical, *Immortale Dei*.

Leo obviously needed considerable royal prudence (*prudentia regnativa*) to negotiate a safe and widely accepted path between the varying schools and variations within a school. His attempt took its name

from the first two words of his encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*. He would address the problem of the socio-economic revolution, but he would nonetheless expose the Gods of Revolution who sought to control it.

## Chapter 17

### *Rerum Novarum*

Revolution (*Rerum Novarum*), which has long disturbed the political world, Leo wrote, has now, not surprisingly, passed into the economic world. Certain factors have brought its conflict to breaking point (*ut certamen erumperet*). Those factors were the great expansion of industry and, accompanying it, remarkable scientific discoveries; the changed relations between employers and employees; the enormous fortunes of the few and the extreme poverty of the masses. There was also the worker's increasing self-reliance, and his closer mutual combination. All this, against a background of moral degeneracy, was a matter of momentous gravity, taxing all minds and all levels of society. Accordingly, just as on earlier occasions, in encyclicals, *Diuturnum Illud* (1881), *Immortale Dei* (1885), *Libertas* (1888), it was opportune to refute false teaching on matters political, it was expedient to address, of set purpose and in detail, the problem of the working classes in the socio-economic revolution.

To define the rights and duties of rich and poor, the Pope said, was not in itself easy. And it involved the danger that accompanies any controversy – the opportunity it presents to crafty agitators to foment differences, pervert the cause of truth and stir people to revolt. The misery and wretchedness pressing unjustly on the majority of workers was due to several causes. The ancient working-men's guilds were abolished and nothing replaced them. The ancient religion was downgraded by both state and laws. The worker was surrendered to the unchecked competition of *laissez faire, laissez aller*. Rapacious usury [1] added to the process. And the concentration of employment and trade in the hands of a few imposed on the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself. This was absolutism in the free market. In its remote ancestor, it revealed the face of Voltaire; in the more recent past, there was the classical economist. It was a God of Revolution with an inhuman face.

The socialist remedy for liberal absolutism was to "work on the poor man's envy of the rich", (in itself an incitement to revolution), … "striving to do away with private property". "Individual possessions", they contended, "should become the common property of all, to be administered by the state or the municipal bodies". This was the mind, it may be noted, of the *Communist Manifesto* which said, "the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: abolition of private property … . In the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the right of property … by measures which are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production." [2] Amongst those measures the first was the 'abolition of property in land and application of all rents of lands to public purposes.' This was absolutism in an unfree market. To the extent that it could be attributed to the 'general will', its remote ancestor was Rousseau. Its obvious more recent progenitor was Karl Marx. It was a God of Revolution with a face no more human than that of its capitalist opponent.

Similar absolutist sentiments had been expressed by the forerunners of Liberation Theology, the anarchists in the province of Benevento. In 1877, "they had seized the municipality" in the village of Letino, "set fire to all the papers and the civil registers, proclaimed the Social Revolution and the fall of the King and ordered the partition of the land." [3] As already suggested, this was not lost on Leo XIII who had once governed Benevento as papal delegate; or on Matteo Liberatore one of the draughtsmen of *Rerum Novarum,* whose birth place was neighbouring Salerno.

It was the claim of the socialist and anarchist that the transfer of property to the state would mean a fair share for all. But such expropriation, Leo adjudged, was to rob the lawful possessor, and, in transferring his property to the state, to distort that body's function and to cause social confusion. In fact, it was contrary to the wage earner's deep-seated motivation which was to earn his wage, dispose

of it and even to invest some of it, say, in land.

Furthermore it was contrary to his rational nature. This was for the encyclical to move from the existential to the essential. It was moving to the Neo-Scholastic teaching that his rational nature binds man to self-realisation; indeed the pursuit and possession of the Author of nature, his Creator. To do this he has certain needs of nature, needs implanted in him by the Author of nature, which entitle him to natural or human, divinely sanctioned, rights to those things that fulfil those needs. The basic rights of this kind are life, freedom, marriage, association and property. They are a hierarchy whose levels are determined by their respective necessity. The right to life is absolute. Freedom is not, but it is paramount. Next comes marriage, association and property. When there is a conflict between rights, e.g. between property and life or between the property of one individual and the welfare of many individuals, i.e., the community, then the right to property must yield to the right to life or the right of the community but only as a last resort, i.e., when alternatives have been tried and found wanting.

To emphasise property as a natural right, the encyclical distinguishes rational from irrational creatures. The animal kingdom lives by means of things within its range and reach. Man by contrast, sees the need to look beyond the present and the temporary, and has a natural right to have and to hold in stable and permanent possession not only things that perish in the use but those that continue for further use. By the light of the same reason, he knows the eternal law and the Providence of God, needs to, and seeks to, live in accordance with that law and Providence. He thus can choose for both present and long-term, future welfare, needs to do so, and so has a right to not only the fruits of the soil, but the soil itself: in a word, producer goods.

And "there is no need to bring in the state. Man precedes the state, and possesses prior to the formation of any state, the natural right of providing for life and life's needs". This was Ketteler's principle of subsidiarity (see Ch.11, n.9) of state to person, upholding the right to personal freedom. It was to recur throughout the encyclical, no doubt to anticipate objections from the school of Angers. But an objection to personal property was raised on the score that God had given the earth to the whole human race but to no individual for private possession. This, however, overlooked the fact that the division of the earth and private possession have been left to man's own industry and the laws of individual races. Even though some parts of the earth are apportioned to private owners, it still provides for all; for some by way of ownership, for others by way of labour. Given that the land-owner's industry of mind and body cultivates the land, and so leaves on it the impress of his own person, he establishes a personal right to it.

This reasoning in favour of the person, the encyclical continues, had to meet certain obsolete opinions that "it is unjust for anyone to possess outright either the land or what he has built on the estate which he has brought under cultivation'. Leo mentioned no names but notable among those of this viewpoint was Turgot (1727-1781), finance minister to Louis XVI who concluded that a rational tax was a single tax on land. Another, English entrepreneur and economist, Ricardo (1772-1823), gave prominence to similar ideas when he featured unearned increment on land. But it was American, Henry George (1839-1897), who gave the whole idea international prominence when he became its prophet in the 1880s. "Rent does not arise spontaneously from the soil", he wrote in *Progress and Poverty*; "it is due to nothing the landowner has done. It represents the value created by the whole community. But rent, the creation of the whole community, necessarily belongs to the whole community". Words like these indicate how easily the term agrarian socialism was applied to Georgism. They were met by Leo's observation that improvements belonged to the improver, and that private property in land was indisputable. Just as no argument was directed by Leo at Marx's surplus value in his rejection of socialism, nothing was urged here directly against Georgian rent. However undeniable the reality of rent, it was implied, it was not to interfere with private property in land or anything else. This was to say that its reality, as a social factor, was best committed to the devices of fiscal policy and action. Correctly, therefore, the encyclical concludes, the common opinion of mankind, in a careful study of nature, has found, in the law of nature, the origin of the system of private property. The practice of the ages, too, and civil and divine law, confirm that this system is pre-eminently in accord with nature, and conducive to social peace and tranquillity.

The right of the individual, as individual, to private property is enhanced by his further right as the

head of a family. But marriage and family were under attack from both liberal and socialist thinking at this time. Their prior defence was, therefore, a necessity. In an encyclical on the *Evils affecting Modern Society* 21 April 1878, Leo defended marriage and family, and regretted that too often "citizens make use of legalised concubinage in place of marriage". In February 1880, too, when the French government was about to legalise divorce, a short encyclical, *Arcanum,* that was not translated into English, noted that "divorce tends to the certain destruction of society". But socialist thinking was no less directed against marriage and family than was the liberal.

Some anthropological writers in late nineteenth century, [4] created and developed the theory that the original form of the family was one in which all the women of a group, horde or tribe, belonged promiscuously to all the men of the community. Many socialist writers, following the lead of Engels in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State,* adopted this theory as quite in harmony with their materialistic interpretation of history. The assumption was that, as in primitive times property was common, so too were women. This type of reasoning drew a sharp rejoinder from Leo. "No human law can abolish the natural and original right of marriage, nor in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage ordained by God's authority from the beginning: 'Increase and multiply.' Hence the imperative of the family, the 'society' of a man's house, is of right: a small society but no less a society and one older than the state. It has as a consequence, rights and duties peculiar to itself, quite independent of the state. The rights, therefore, that man has to private property as an individual, he has even more so as head of a family for whose needs he must provide. The family, like the individual, is antecedent in fact and in idea to the state and so has rights and duties prior to those of the state. This is a recurrence of Ketteler's principle of subsidiarity. The state is, therefore, bound in normal circumstances to honour parental authority and exercise a subsidiary role. But in abnormal circumstances of family need, the state is bound, as a last resort, to come to the aid of the family. The child, however, belongs to the parents and the socialist proposal to substitute state for parent in the matter of the child, is contrary to natural justice and the integrity of the family. In addition, the socialist interference with the family would have disastrous effects throughout the whole of society.

The main tenet of socialism, '*illud socialismi placitum*', community of goods, must, therefore, be utterly rejected, and the first and most fundamental principle for alleviation of the condition of the masses must be the inviolability of private property.

The Pope, faced with demands of absolutism from right and left, insists that "this most serious question demands the attention and efforts of" rulers of states, employers and workers. But equally he affirms that "all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church". On conflict, the Church has a word to say. The socialists foment the class war towards a classless society in the interests of equality. But inequality of capacity, skill, health and strength engender inequality of condition and fortune. Such various kinds of capacity, with their accompanying variation in equality, are furthermore necessary for the business of life. Each chooses his own path in freedom; with an expectation of proportional equality at least. In addition, bodily labour, pain and hardship are the lot of humanity, and are useful indicators of the real world. The 'great mistake' of the socialists is to contend that the employer class is naturally hostile to the working class. This could, but need not, be so. The body politic depends on the harmony and agreement of the two classes. Each needs the other. Harmony means order: conflict leads to savage barbarity.

In the prevention of conflict, religion has a role to play. It teaches the worker honesty in contracts and agreements, respect for property and the person of the employer, and the rejection of violence, riot and discord. The employer is reminded of the human dignity of the worker, the honourable nature of his work for wages, and the necessity of providing for his soul's sake. The worker for his soul's sake should have time for religion, and should be saved from exposure to corrupting influences that lead away from the family and squander wages. Furthermore, "the employer must never tax his workers beyond their strength or employ them in work unsuited" to their sex or age. But his great and principal duty is justice. "To defraud anyone of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of heaven." There are precepts here that, if honoured, should check conflict and all its causes.

But the Church aspires to ever higher values. "God has not created us for the perishable and transitory

things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting.” Both employer and employee are equally children of God, equally in need of Redemption. The Church teaches the wealthy that when the demands of life are met, charity insists that, out of surplus, assistance be delivered to the indigent. It also has a message for the poor. The true nobility of man rests in virtue which is the common inheritance of all men, rich and poor, and leads to eternity. This legacy challenges pride to generosity, and heartens the lowly to modesty of demands. Loyalty to such Christian precepts should join men in not only friendship but brotherly love. They have a common Father, who is God, and are redeemed by Jesus Christ. These blessings of nature and grace belong to, and are common to, the whole human race. Only the unworthy are excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven. There are duties and rights in the Gospel, therefore, that, if imbibed, must terminate civil conflict. The Church teaches doctrine and precepts, but it also teaches, trains and educates men through bishops and clergy. It aims to influence minds and hearts, even the innermost heart and conscience, and so have man join with man. History portrays the Church as transforming civil society. It presented Jesus Christ as first Cause and final End. His life served every race and nation. His faith, precepts and law permeated them and became the principles of their Christian life and institutions. When society is perishing it must return to the principles from which it sprang.

The Church would help alleviate the plight of the poor; and its call to virtue, when answered, is a step towards temporal prosperity. Virtue restrains greed for possession and thirst for pleasure. It promotes economy and frugal living, and discourages dissipation of resources.

Finally, the Church has ever promoted alms for the poor. The apostles founded the order of deacons for this purpose. St Paul encouraged Christian communities to mutual aid. The patrimony of the poor was a logical development and was guarded by the Church with zealous care. Congregations of religious arose within the Church to bring help and mercy to the needy. This momentum of charity drew its life from Christ, and consequently from his Church. But the Church alone will not achieve its aim. All human agencies must concur in its endeavour. Prominent among these human agencies is the state; but this call upon the state was anathema to the school of Angers. It was nevertheless the path the Pope chose to follow. To soften its impact on that school, but above all to counter undue state intervention, he began with an emphatic preface. The state envisaged was not the particular form of government prevailing in this or that nation, but the state ‘rightly apprehended’, i.e., any government conformable to the natural law and the principles enunciated in *Immortale Dei*. The state so defined had to effect the common good – the supreme goal of the state, according to the natural law. The defence of that law fell to justice, and its threefold division into legal, distributive and commutative. Commutative governs the right of private persons or groups, and equality between person and person, person and group, private or public, private group and private group. Commutative justice is justice in the strict sense. Legal justice is to achieve the common good, the good of the whole, but not at the expense of the part, the individual person. Its goal is achieved when the laws of the state realise the personal rights of its constituent citizens. Distributive justice attends to the good of the part in the whole, i.e., each person in the community during a strike, and ensures that each receives his right or good. Legal and distributive justice are obviously complementary in their contribution to the person in the state. Where there is a right to the common good and its distribution, there is, in the person, a corresponding duty of contribution. The right of the worker, in a weak position because of his lack of means, should be guarded conscientiously by the state, as it attends to the obligations of legal and distributive justice.

At the same time, the Pope recalls earlier words: “We have said that the state must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammelled action so far as is consistent with the common good and the interests of others”. These latter are at issue, he continues, when employees promote a strike that endangers public peace, or when employers disallow time for the practice of religion; or endanger morality by mingling the sexes, or degrade the worker through imposing conditions of excessive labour, or labour unsuited to sex or age, that endangers health. In such circumstances, “there can be no question but that within certain limits it would be right to invoke the aid and authority of law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law’s interference – the principle being, that the law must not undertake more, or proceed further, than is required for the remedy of evil or the removal of mischief.” These were words that

came down with great care on the side of the school of Liège. But the school of Angers had cried socialism. To anticipate its renewal, the Pope now said: “It is expedient to bring under special notice certain matters of moment. The chief thing is the duty of safeguarding private property by legal enactments and protection … neither justice nor the common good allows any individual to seize upon that which belongs to another”. The Pope notes that the workers, by and large, seek property by honest labour. But then he returns to his encyclical’s opening theme. “Not a few are imbued with evil principles and (are) eager for revolution (*rerum novarum*), whose main purpose is to stir up disorder and incite their fellows to acts of violence. The authority of the state should intervene to put restraint upon such firebrands, to save the working classes from being led astray by their manoeuvres, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation”.

Strikes had already been mentioned as being the occasion for invoking the authority of the state. The Pope returns to the topic here and observes: “The law should forestall and prevent such troubles from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between employers and employed” – in a word, to a subject like wages. Wages and wage justice according to liberal philosophy were a matter for the free market. The night watchman state was satisfied to protect property and contracts. So long as the parties fulfilled each their own side of the contract, justice was honoured. The Pope went to no little trouble to argue that the worker’s labour was not only personal, but that it was his only means of ensuring self-preservation. To satisfy this need, he had a right to a living wage.

And this is a right in strict or commutative justice. “There underlies” the wage contract, “a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, that wages ought not to be insufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage earner.” Freedom of contract was acceptable therefore only so long as it included the worker’s life as a necessary consideration. This was another case of the Pope preferring the school of Liège to that of Angers.

The family wage proposed by Liberatore in his *Principi de economia politica* as of right was not given that status. It was rather proposed for its pragmatic value – the extension of property for the worker, which must help bridge the gap between employer and employee, provide an incentive to produce, and even foster love of country. It should not be neutralised by heavy taxation – single tax! Finally, employers and employees are called upon to exercise their right of association, and make their contribution to the problem of social conflict. “The most important of all are Workingmen’s Unions.” The medieval guilds joined employer and employee in their day. But their restoration could only be effected by their modification to ‘suit the requirements of this our age’. Some associations of either workers alone or workers and employers exist, and they should be multiplied. In view of the fact that worker organisations are extolled as ‘most important’, and worker-employer joint bodies are merely mentioned, the latter would seem to be a mild concession only to Vogelsang’s call for the corporative organisation of industry. This comment is hardly weakened when the Pope addresses the problems of Catholics forced to join anti-Christian trade unions. His counsel was that they form their own confessional unions.

In contrast to his mild concession to Vogelsang on corporations, the Pope is insistent on the right to form private associations which attend to cultural, social, charitable and sporting organisations. They, like the individual person and the family, have a right of freedom from state intrusion. This is Ketteler’s principle of subsidiarity that the encyclical repeated again and again. It is a recurring theme that emphasised the encyclical’s supreme value, the freedom of the human person.

The range of topics so covered by the encyclical – private property, living wage, strikes, trade unions, state intervention to control working conditions, subsidiarity were all matters pioneered by Ketteler, between 1848 and 1869. It is not difficult to see how Leo called Ketteler ‘my great predecessor’. Leo could well have acclaimed a contemporary of his, August Lehmkuhl, S.J., a fellow Westphalian of Ketteler, who made notable contributions to the preparatory work for the encyclical. Against Vogelsang he had upheld a lawful rate of interest; against the school of Angers he upheld a minimum wage and the duty of the state to intervene to protect the worker and the right to strike; against fellow Jesuit, Liberatore, he upheld the minimum wage against a family wage. These doctrines were all included by Leo in *Rerum Novarum*.

What di Leo and *Rerum Novarum* achieve in the face of competing ideologies and their impact on the worker? Political liberalism was the prevailing God of Revolution; it was the natural son of the capitalist economy. Two ideologies arose to transform this politico-economic situation. One was socialism, the other corporatism. Leo rejected the first and gave token recognition to the second. His rejection of socialism was outright. It was indeed his proclamation to the world against the rising nineteenth-century God of Revolution. This had two effects. It fortified the members of he Catholic Social Reform Movement against the statolatry of socialism, and alerted his general flock, otherwise imperceptive, to the rise and reality of socialism. This was one factor in holding back the progress of socialism and communism.

While *Rerum Novarum* rejected the twin Gods of Revolution it was no less emphatic in the choice of a way ahead. In the light of important antecedents – the Fribourg Union and the Liège International Congresses – Leo chose the path of reform. Common to both these developments was Neo-Scholastic philosophy. This Leo promoted, and made it a force to unite various schools. In the face of political liberalism and some intransigent monarchists, he advocated in *Immortale Dei,* a modus vivendi with the republicans. And in *Rerum Novarum,* in the face of a capitalist economy, and some Catholic free market and corporatism resistance, he cautiously advocated state intervention and unionisation in the interest of the worker. It is not too much to say that Leo was a powerful voice for an economy at the service of man; and for a free market subject to human dignity and the rule of law.

## FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

### Chapter 1

1. Hubert Jedin, (ed.) *History of the Church*. New York, 1989. English translation from German 1981 vol. IX. p.10. Introduction by Oskar Kohler. Jedin is probably the most eminent Catholic Church historian of recent times. He was born in 1900 at Breslau in Silesia, and ordained priest at the age of 24. He was arrested in 1938, because his mother, a convert to Catholicism, was Jewish. He escaped to Rome and, in the years 1939-1949, did the research for a major work, a four volume definitive *History of the Council of Trent*. He returned to Bonn as Professor, and in the years 1949-1965, edited the above-mentioned ten volume *History of the Church,* which is regarded as a standard reference. The tenth volume was translated to English in 1981. He died in 1980.

2. Francesco Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*. London, 1895, p.369. Nitti was Professor of Political Economy in the University of Naples. He was not a Catholic. He was Prime Minister of Italy for a time during World War 1.

3. Latin title *Quod Apostolici Muneris*. English translation in *The Pope and the People*. London, 1937, p.12.

4. Philip Hughes, *A Popular History of the Church*. London, 1946, p.276. Hereinafter *A Popular History. Hughes* is also author of a four volume *History of the Church* published 1934-1939.

5. Philip Hughes, *The Popes' New Order* London, 1943, pp.53-58.

6. *The Pope and the People.* op.cit., p.45

7. Hughes, *op.cit. A Popular History,* p.276

8. Jedin, *op.cit.* vol IX, p.17, note 29

9. Henri Daniel-Rops, *A Fight for God.* London, p.96. This is volume 9 of a ten volume *History of the Church of Christ* translated from the French. The ten volume work appeared in 1957-1959. Its author, whose family name was Petiot, was born in 1901. He made his higher studies in the faculties of law and letters at the University of Grenoble. In 1952, he obtained a degree in history, and until 1946 taught history at various secondary schools. He adopted the pseudonym Daniel-Rops to avoid the difficulties of obtaining the permission from the Ministry of Education required of public school teachers who wished to publish. He was elected to the French Academy in 1955 and died in 1965.

10. Jedin, *op.cit.* vol IX, p.207 note 58.

11. Dr Smith's *Latin-English Dictionary,* London, 1st edition 1851, 25th impression May 1926, p.959.

12. Translated by H.J. Edwards, Harvard University Press 1986.

13. Translated by J.C. Rolfe, Harvard University Press 1985.

14. Translated by John Henry Freese, Harvard University Press 1967.

15. Hughes, Philip, *A Popular History, op.cit.,* p.169

16. Hughes *Idem,* p.169

17. *Idem,* p.212

18. Daniel-Rops *op.cit.* vol.7, p.40

19. As quoted in Daniel-Rops *op.cit.* vol.6, p.407

20. Jedin, *op.cit.* vol.7, p.14, article by Roger Aubert, Docteur en histoire, Docteur et Maitre en theologie, Dr (h.c) Professor, University of Louvain, Belgium.

21. Christopher Dawson, *The Gods of Revolution* London 1972, p.22 with an Introduction by Arnold Toynbee.

**Chapter 2**

1. As quoted in Christopher Dawson, *The Gods of Revolution,* p.27.

2. *Idem, op.cit.,* p.28

3. *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (hereinafter *N.C.E.*), N.Y., 1967, vol. 12, p.345. Article Renaissance.

4. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 7, p.48, note 1.

5. *Idem,* pp.45 and 46.

6. Hughes, *op.cit.,* p.212.

7. *N.C.E., op.cit.,* vol. 10, pp.476-477.

8. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.* vol. 6, p.420

9. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.* vol. VII, p.222.

10. Hughes, *op.cit.,* p.221.

11. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 7, p.222.

12. Hughes, *op.cit.,* p.222.

13. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.218.

14. Hughes, *op.cit.,* p.220.

15. Paul Hazard, *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century.* London, 1965, pp.436-437.

16. As quoted in Dawson, *op.cit.,* pp.29, 30, 34.

17. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.* vol. 7, p.52.

18. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.35.

19. H.A.L.Fisher, *A History of Europe* London 1936, p.701.

= 20. *Idem.*

**Chapter 3**

1. Fisher, *op.cit.,* p.795.

2. *Idem,* pp.796-797.

3. Jedin, *op.cit.* vol. VII, p.3.

4. *Idem*

5. *Idem,* p.4.

6. *Idem.*

= 7. *Idem,* p.12.

FOOTTNOTE 8. *Idem,* p.15.

9. *Idem,* p.13.

10. *Idem,* p.18. The writer quoted is André Latreille, Docteur ès lettres Dr (h.c.) Professeur and Dean Emeritus, Faculté des Lettres de Lyons, Facultés Catholiques de Lyon, Lyons, France.

11. *Idem,* p.19.

12, Simon Schama, *Citizens.* London, 1989, p.343.

13. Hilaire Belloc, *Danton,* London, 1899. Revised 1928, p.62.

14. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.387.

= 15. Belloc, *op.cit.,* p.76.

**Chapter 4**

1. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.* vol. 8, pp.5-6.

2. *Idem,* p.6.

3. Duff Cooper, *Talleyrand.* London, 1932, p.28.

4. *Idem,* p.18.

5. Idem, p.25.

6. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.351.

7. Jedin, *op.cit.,* vol. VII, p.22.

8. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.8.

9. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.483.

10. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.513.

11. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.491.

12. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.10.

13. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.548.

14. *N.C.E. op.cit.* Article French Revolution, vol. 6, p.188, by A. Latrielle.

15. Schama *op.cit.,* p.529.

16. Fisher, *op.cit.,* p.795.

17. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.527.

18. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.70.

19. As quoted in Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.70.

20. Schama, *op.cit.,* pp.575.

21. *Idem,* pp.576,577.

22. Schama, op.cit., p.581.

23. Dawson, op.cit., p.72.

24. *Idem.*

25. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol.8, p.15.

26. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.75.

**Chapter 5**

1. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.* vol. VIII, p.12

2. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.585.

3. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.76.

4. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.613.

5. *Idem,* p.615.

6. *Idem,* p.792.

7. *Idem,* p.624.

8. *Idem.*

9. *Idem,* p.615.

10. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.80.

11. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.630.

12. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol 8 p.18.

13. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.631.

14. *Idem,* p.634, 5, 6, 7.

15. *Idem,* p.637.

16. Donald Attwater, *Martyrs.* London, 1944, p.197.

17. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.39.

18. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.646.

19. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.649.

20. *Idem,* p.651.

21. *Idem,* p.648.

22. *Idem,* p.665.

23. *Idem,* p.669.

24. *Idem,* p.710.

25. *Idem,* p.708.

26. *Idem,* p.715.

27. *Idem,* p.714.

28. *Idem,* p.706.

29. *Idem.*

30. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.92.

31. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.718.

32. *Idem,* p.723.

33. *Idem,* p.729.

34. *Idem,* pp.737-741.

35. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.91.

36. Fisher, *op.cit.,* p.817.

37. Dawson *op.cit.,* p.83.

38. *Idem,* p.92.

39. *Idem,* p.57.

40. Dawson *op.cit.,* p.xi, Arnold Toynbee's Introduction.

41. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.757.

42. *Idem,* p.759.

43. Burke, *Selections.* Oxford, 1924, p.133.

44. Schama *op.cit.,* pp.796-800.

45. *Idem,* p.804.

**Chapter 6**

1. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.93.

2. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.765.

3. *Idem,* p.758.

4. *Idem,* p.766.

5. *Idem,*

6. *Idem.*

7. *Idem,* p.829.

8. Idem, p.778: *N.C.E.* vol. 6, p.535.

9. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.778.

10. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.95.

11. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.781.

12. *Idem,* p.785.

13. *Idem,* p.789.

14. *Idem,* p.792.

15. *Idem.*

16. *Idem,* p.766.

17. *Idem,* p.815.

18. *Idem,* p.813.

19. *Idem,* p.816.

20. *Idem,* p.818.

21. *Idem,* p.831.

22. *Idem,* pp.836-837.

23. *Idem,* p.837.

24. *Idem,* p.839.

25. *Idem,* p.844.

26. *Idem,* p.846.

27. *Nouveau Petit Larousse,* 1971, p.1721.

28. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.115, p.118.

29. Dawson, *op.cit.,* pp.122-123. Albert Vandal 1853-1910 wrote several works on the Napoleonic period.

30. Schama, *op.cit.,* p.754.

31. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.95.

32. *Idem,* p.99.

33. Louis Madelin, *Fouché,* Paris 1903 vol 1, p.154.

34. *Idem,* p.168.

35. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.99 where in a Dawson remarks that this is the first case he knows of the use of the word socialism in the modern sense.

36. *Idem,* p.121.

37. *Idem,* p.122.

38. *Idem,* p.124.

**Chapter 7**

1 Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.147.

2. *Idem,* p.148.

3. Jedin, *op.cit.,* vol. VII, p.60.

4. Hughes, *Popular History op.cit.,* p.241.

5. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.136.

6. *Idem,* p.137.

7. *Idem,* p.138.

8. Viscount de Chateaubriand The Genius of Christianity, Transl. 1856 London and New York, p.9 which quotes Jaime Balmes (1810-1848).

9. *Idem,* p.8.

10. Louis Madelin, *Talleyrand,* London, 1948, p.158.

11. *Idem,* p.5.

12. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. VIII, pp. 327-328.

13. *Idem,* pp.329-330.

14. *Idem,*

15. *Idem,* p.168.

16. *L'Avenir* cited in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique,* vol. IX, part 1, Paris, 1926, s.v. *Liberalisme Catholique,* column 518.

17. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.169.

18. *Idem,* p.170.

19. *Idem,* p.199.

20. *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, op.cit.,* col. 519.

21. *Idem,* c. 539.

22. *Idem,* c. 541.

23. *Idem,* c. 540.

24. *Idem,* c. 536.

25. *Idem,* c. 530.

26. *Idem,* c. 550.

27. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.209.

28. *Idem,* p.204.

29. *Idem,* p.207.

**Chapter 8**

1. Duff Cooper, *op.cit.,* p.374.

2. Fisher, *op.cit.,* p.885.

3. Wilfred Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* London 1897, vol 1., p.107.

4. *N.C.E., op.cit.,* vol. 12, p.957.

5. J.A. Derum, *Apostle in Top Hat.* Michigan U.S.A., 1962, pp.60, 68.

6. I*dem,* p.130.

7. *Idem,* p.156.

8. *Idem,* p.158.

9. Jedin, *op.cit.,* vol. VIII, p.53.

10. Derum, *op.cit.,* pp.145-146.

11. Thomas Gilby, *Principality and Policy.* London, 1958, p.287.

12. *Idem,* p.54.

13. *N.C.E., op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.546. Article by J.C.H. Wu.14. Derum, *op.cit.,* p.249.

15. Parker Moon, *The Labour Problem in the Catholic Social Movement France.* New York, 1921, pp.25, 26. A note on these pages 25 and 26 is given on p.409. It says: these principles were stated in Ozanam's notes for a course of lectures 1840. the notes are published under the caption of '*Notes d'un cours de droit Commercial'* in Ozanam's *Oeuvres completes* (Paris 1862-1873) vol. VIII, pp. 537-545." Parker Moon was an instructor in history at Columbia University U.S.A.

16. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.20.

17. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. VIII, p.336.

18. Fisher *op.cit.,* p.908.

**Chapter 9**

1. Fisher, op.cit., p.909.

2. Idem.

3. H.E. Berthon, *Nine French Poets.* London, 1931, p.191.

4. Derum, *op.cit.,* p.199.

5. *Idem,* p.201.

6. *Idem.*

7. *Idem,* p.203, footnote.

8. See chap. 8, note 15.

9. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.35.

10. Derum, *op.cit.,* pp.96-97.

11. Hales, *op.cit.,* p.49.

12. *N.C.E., op.cit.,* vol. 8, pp.306-307.

13. Derum, *op.cit.,* p.219.

14. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol.VIII, p.247.

15. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.35.

16. Derum, *op.cit.,* p.209, Fisher, *op.cit.,* p.910.

17. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. VIII, p.250 footnote.

18. V. Cathrein, S.J., *Socialism.* New York 1904, p.24 footnote.

19. Gilby, *op.cit.,* p.292.

20. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. VIII, p.326

21. Gilby, *op.cit.,* p.292.

22. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.45.

23. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. IX, p.129.

**Chapter 10**

1. N.C.E. *op.cit.,* vol.6, p.175, French Literature.

2. Dawson, *op.cit.,* p.145.

3. J.N. Moody, *Church and Society,* New York, 1953. Article on Church and Society in Germany pp.325-583 by Edgar Alexander: Section, Joseph Gorres (1776-1848) pp.389-393. Alexander was a former member of the German Centre Party and a member of the Cultural Policy Committee of the Reichstag. He fled Nazi Germany in the mid-’30s for the USA where he died in January 1970.

4. *Idem,* p.387.

5. Golo Mann *A History of Germany since 1789,* Trans. London, 1968, p.61.

6. *N.C.E. op.cit.,* vol.6, p.988, article on Hegel.

7. Hughes, A Popular History, op.cit., p.244.

8. Moody, *op.cit.,* p.392.

9. Moody, *op.cit.,* pp.344-358.

10. *Idem,* p.360.

11. *Idem,* p.393.

12. *Idem.*

13. *Idem,* p.396.

14. *Idem,* p.397.

15. *Idem,* p.398.

16. *Idem,* p.400.

17. *Idem,* pp.536-537.

**Chapter 11**

1. J. Hearnshaw, *Survey of Socialism.* London 1929, p.214.

2. L. Feuerbach, *The Essence of Christianity.* trans. by George Eliot, N.Y., 1855.

3. F. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach.* N.Y., 1934, p.28.

4. C.J. McFadden, *The Philosophy of Communism.* Benziger N.Y. 1939, p.19.

5. E. Carr, *Karl Marx.* London, 1934, p.32.

6. *N.C.E., op.cit.* vol. XIII, p.373 Socialism.

7. F. Engels, *Preface* to *Marx's Poverty of Philosophy.* N.Y., 1936, p.7.

8. M. Oakeshott, The Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe. Cambridge University Press, 1939, pp.82-101.

9. Von Ketteler, "Offenes Schreiben des Deputierten in der deutschen Nationalversammlung Pfarrers von Ketteler an seine Wahler". 17 September 1848, in: Iserloh, *von Ketteler Samliche Werke und Briefe, op.cit.,* Abt. II, *Briefwechsel und Offentliche Erklarungen,* Bd. I, *Briefe 1825-1850,* p.330. This reference is indebted to *German Social Catholicism 1815-1914,* a doctoral thesis, University of Queensland by Dr Gregory Munro.

10. George Metlake, (pseudo) J.J. Laux, *Christian Social Reform.* Philadelphia, Dolphin Press, 1912, p.24.

11. *Idem, op.cit.,* pp.23-24

12. *Idem,* p.25.

13. *Idem,* p.31.

14. *Idem,* p.33.

15. *Idem,* p.38.

16. Moody, *op.cit.,* p.414.

17. Metlake, *op.cit.,* p.31. Decurtins (1855-1916) was editor of the 12 volume *Rätoromanische Chrestomathie.*

18. Edward Gargan, Leo XIII and the Modern World. Ignatius Spencer, p.129.

19. Charles de T'Serclaès, *Le Pope Leo XIII.* Desclées, MD CCCXCIV, p.139.

20. *Idem.*

**Chapter 12**

1. *N.C.E. op.cit.,* vol. 6, p.135, article Freemasonry.

2. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.289.

3. *N.C.E. op.cit.,* vol. 6, p.135.

4. E.Y. Hales, *Pio Nono.* London, 1956, p.111.

5. *Idem,* p.108.

6. Hales, op.cit., p.57.

7. F.A. Simpson, *Louis Napoleon and the Recovery of France,* (1923), p.57.

8. Hales, *op.cit.,* p.98.

9. *Idem,* p.105.

10. *Idem,* p.129.

11. *Idem,* p.106.

12. *Idem,* p.154.

13. Fisher, *op.cit.,* p.909.

14. Hales, *op.cit.,* p.179.

15. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. 8, p.263.

16. Hales, op.cit., p.203.

17. *Idem,* p.204.

18. *Idem,* pp.205-206.

19. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.274.

20. Hales, *op.cit.,* p.224.

21. *Idem,* p.223.

22. *Idem,* p.234.

**Chapter 13**

1. P.H. Clapham, *Economic Development of France and Germany,* C.U.P. 1966, p.1, quoting from Gustav Schmoller *Volkswirthscaftskehre,* vol. 11. 520.

2. *Idem,* p.326.

3. Moody, *op.cit.,* p.402.

4. Clapham, *op.cit.,* p.280.

5. *Idem,* p.326.

6. Metlake, *op.cit.,* pp.98-99.

7. *Idem,* p.100.

8. *Idem,* p.102.

9. *Idem,* p.107.

10. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.152.

11. Metlake, op.cit., p.109.

12. *Idem,* p.123.

13. *Idem,* p.127.

14. *Idem,* p.135.

15. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.121.

16. Metlake, *op.cit.,* p.135.

17. *Idem,* p.159.

18. *Idem,* pp.160-168.

19. Idem, p.159.

20. *Idem,* pp.176-183.

21. Victor Cathrein, *Socialism,* op.cit., p.56.

22. Metlake, *op.cit.,* pp.157-158.

23. Michael Fogarty, *Christian Democracy in Western Europe* 1820-1953, p.176, London, 1957.

24. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.125.

25. Metlake, *op.cit.,* p.246.

26. *Idem,* p.245 *Germany and the Germans* was published London, 1894. It was one of several notable works on Germany at this time by this highly reputed author.

27. *Idem,* p.245.

**Chapter 14**

1. Moon, *op.cit.,* pp.82-83.

2. *Idem,* p.108.

3. *Idem,* p.154.

4. Jedin, *History of the Church, op.cit.,* vol. IX. p.202.

5. J.M. Keynes, *Economic Consequences of Peace.* 1919, p.75.

6. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.131.

7. Moody, *op.cit.,* pp.420-421. Article by Edgar Alexander.

8. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.130.

9. Jedin, *op.cit.,* pp.203-204.

10. Moody, op.cit., p.422.

11. Lewis Watt, (S.J.), *Usury.* Oxford, 1945, pp.37 and 48.

12. Jedin, *op.cit.,* p.198.

13. *Idem,* p.197.

14. *Idem,* p.309.

15. Idem, p.310.

16. *Idem,* p.314.

17. Christopher Dawson, *Enquiries* Sheed & Ward 1933, p.246.

18. *De Republica* III, 22, Cicero, extant fragments are found in Lactantius, Divinarum Institutionum, Liber VI, De Vero Cultu, translated from Migne, P.L.6, col. 660-661, Parisiis, 1844.

19. *N.C.E.,* vol. 10, p.256. Article by John J.C.H. WU, Professor of Asian Studies Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J.

20. Moody, *op.cit.,* pp.493-494.

21. *Idem,* pp.491-492.

22. *N.C.E.,* vol. 10, p.256. Article by John J.C.H. WU.

**Chapter 15**

1. Eduardo Soderini, *The Pontificate of Leo XIII,* Translated by Barbara Barclay Carter, Great Britain,

1934, vol. 1, p.69.

2. *Idem.*

3. Hughes, *A Popular History, op.cit.,* p.229.

4. *Idem, op.cit.,* p.266.

5. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* vol. IX, p.43.

6. Jedin, op.cit., vol.IX pp.307-308.

7. Ehler Morrall, *Church and State through the Centuries.* London 1954, pp.285-286.

8. Hughes, *op.cit.,* p.275.

9. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.88.

10. Idem, op.cit., p.96.

11. *Idem,* p.101.

12. *Idem,* p.96.

13. Hughes *op.cit.,* p.273.

14. Catholic Encyclopedia (New York 1910), vol. IX, p.215.

15. *N.C.E. op.cit.,* vol. 3, p.305.

16. The Christian Constitution of States, *The Pope and the People,* p.51, London, 1937.

17. Jedin, *op.cit.,* vol. IX, p.237.

18. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.107: Moon *op.cit.,* p.168.

19. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.108.

20. Moody, *Church and Society, op.cit.,* p.153.

## Chapter 16

1. Francesco Nitti, *op.cit.* p.364, quotes the words of the Archbishop of Perugia.

2. Jedin *op.cit.,* p.207.

3. *N.C.E. op.cit.,* vol. 9, p.523.

4. Moon *op.cit.,* p.142.

5. *Idem,* p.133.

6. Daniel-Rops, op.cit., vol. IX, p.93.

7. Moon op.cit., p.132.

8. *Idem,* p.139.

9. *Idem.*

10. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.176.

11. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.354.

12. Nitti, op.cit., p.239-240.

13. John Maloney, *The Worker Question.* Australia, 1991, p.58 quoting from Propagation of the Faith Archives, Rome, vol. 258, 1888.

14. Clapham *op.cit.,* p.57.

15. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.65 and p.59.

16. Jedin *op.cit.,* p.193.

17. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.231.

18. *Idem,* p.372.

19. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.155.

20. *Idem,* p.64.

21. *Idem,* p.58.

22. *Idem,* p.133.

23. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.251.

24. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.135.

25. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.176 footnote.

26. Moon, *op.cit.,* p.154.

27. *Idem,* p.155.

28. Jedin, *op.cit.,* p.228.

29. Maloney, op.cit., p.83 quoting from Vatican Secret Archives.

30. Daniel-Rops, *op.cit.,* p.136.

31. Eduardo Soderini, *op.cit.,* vol. 1, p.193.

32. Schmidlin's testimony is paramount. He collaborated with Ludwig Pastor in his monumental History of the Popes from 1417-1799, which, in its English translation, ran to 40 volumes (1891-1953). he author had access to Vatican archives, something made available to all scholars by Leo XIII in 1883. It was therefore the first thoroughly documented history of the Papacy, and surpassed the works of both von Ranke and Mandell Creighton. Schmidlin in his *History of the Recent Popes* in four volumes but not translated into English, continued Pastor's works and covered the nineteenth century. Schmidlin was born in Alsace in 1876 and after a life of lecturing and research, which was interrupted by his opposition to National Socialism, he died in 1944 in the concentration camp near Schirmeck. Jedin, *History of Church,* vol. IX, p.572.

33. Jedin *op.cit.,* p.208.

**Chapter 17**

1. Usury of itself was not rapacious as was shown by Lehmkuhl ch. 14, no.11.

2. See Oakeshott, *op.cit.,* quoted above ch. 11, n.8.

3. Nitti, *op.cit.,* p.369.

4. *Catholic Encyclopedia op.cit.,* vol. V, p.782. Bachofen *Das Mutterecht,* Stuttgart 1861; American Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* London, 1877; Scotchman, John Ferguson McLennan (*The Patriarchal Society* London 1885); London journalist, Andrew Lang, (*Custom and Myth,* London 1885) and John Lubbock (*The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man,* London 1889). Translated 1902 from the German, Chicago, The German title *Der Ursprung der Familia des Privateigenthumus und des Staats* (with acknowledgements to Lewis H. Morgan) Hottingen, Zurich 1884.

## Appendix

The translations of the words *Rerum Novarum* vary. The English translation made by the Catholic Truth Society and published in *The Pope and the People* (London 1937) diluted the word revolution and made it 'spirit of revolutionary change'. This, it was claimed, was because England and the United States had not experienced the extreme forms of revolution that had been the lot of the Continent. Dr John Maloney in *The Worker Question* goes even further. Revolution, in his translation, becomes 'burning desire for change' [1] which he says is a direct translation of the official Italian version. He further contends that "the official version in Italian, 'burning desire for change', translated the opening sentence in a way that made it conform to the sense of the old Latin authors" [2] and he adopts this version.

Was this departure, however, from the meaning of the late Republican authors, and its replacement by the 'sense of the old Latin authors', justified? It would seem not. Maloney admits that the translator of the official Italian version from the Latin is not known. [3] Then, the old Latin authors, if they exist, cannot be verified. Dr Smith, in his *Latin-English Dictionary* says:

"In the present (18th) edition, every reference to the following authors has been verified with original texts:– namely Cicero, the quotations from whose works occupy a fourth of the whole volume, Caesar, Sallust, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Perseus, Suetonius". [4]

None of these may be classified a s of old Latin authors. All except Terence are late Republic. Thus the late Republic, classical texts of Cicero, Caesar and Sallust have been listed and verified, and their *rerum novarum* means revolution. By contrast, Dr Smith does not, and, it would seem, cannot list, and therefore cannot verify, any old Latin authors at all, for the words *rerum novarum*. This would seem to destroy Maloney's claim.

A comparative examination of original and official Italian versions provides further evidence for the late Republican sense of *rerum novarum*. The official Italian version of *Osservatore Romano* has as opening sentence: "*L'ardente brama di novità, che da gran tempo ha incominciato ad agitare in populi*" [5] (the burning desire for change which for so long has begun to stir up the masses). This differs from the original Italian, composed by Gabriele Boccali (1843-1892), a close associate of Leo. It read: "*Le gravi agitazioni e turbamenti che travagliono da tempo la presente societa*". (The serious agitations and commotions which for so long have distressed modern society.) 'Burning desire', a thing of emotion, vague emotion, which has not stirred up, but which has begun to 'stir up' is obviously different from

‘serious agitations and commotions which have distressed’ and which express action, sustained action, and violent action. The official, but anonymous, Italian version’s ‘burning desire’ is, by comparison with Boccali’s ‘serious agitations and commotions’, at a much lower pitch of definition, and is a notable departure from the original; it should therefore be rejected. Boccali’s version, however, an authentic original, must be accepted as preferable.

Boccali’s version was translated into Latin by Alessandro Volpini (1846-1903) who translated all Leo’s encyclicals into Latin, and who worked closely with Boccali. His Latin translation was: *Rerum Novarum, semel excitata cupidine, quae diu quidem commovet civitates*. This translated to English, with due regard for later Republican authors, becomes ‘revolution which has so long prevailed in the political domain.’ This translation – revolution – may be more definitive than Boccali’s ‘serious agitations and commotions’ but it certainly connotes them, and must be accepted, therefore, as the authentic interpretation. The liberty that Maloney says was taken by the official Italian version of translating *Rerum Novarum* as less than revolution was thus not justified. Its translation fails, and so does that of Maloney. It would seem that Maloney was placing undue emphasis on the Worker Question or Condition of Labour at the expense of the more basic, more general, factor, the revolution, political and socio-economic. There is no doubt that Leo aimed to treat the problem of the worker, but he did so within the context of European revolution. This is borne out by Volpini’s last word. On the definitive text of *Rerum Novarum* of 52 pages, he wrote the date of 15 May 1891, with the words, after the date, *‘De Conditione Opificum Rerum Novarum’*, The Condition of the Workers: Revolution. [6]

### Appendix Footnotes

1. John Maloney, *The Worker Question.* Australia, 1991, p.102.John Maloney has doctorates in theology, canon law and history. He was formerly Manning Clarke’s Professor of Australian History and Head of the History Department of the National University, Canberra. His research in Rome on *Rerum Novarum* had access to secret Vatican archives (V.S.A.).

2. Maloney *op. cit.,* p.102

3. *Idem,* p.148

4. Dr Smith’s *Latin-English Dictionary,* London, 1st edition 1851, 25th impression May 1926, p.iv of preface

5. Maloney *op. cit.,* p.102

6. Maloney *op. cit.,* p.149

**TOPICAL INDEX**

Acquired Right

*Aeterni Patris*

anarchism

Angers

Aquinas, Thomas

Assembly, National, France
Avenir
Bader
Babeuf
Bakunin
Barras
Bastille
Benefices
Bismark
Blanc
Blöme
Boccoli
Buonarotti
Bureau de Surveillance
Cabet
Cahonne
Cancellaria
Capital
Carbonari
Cathrein
Cavour
Centre Party
Charles X
Chateaubriand
Chenier
Christianity and Labour Question
Church in exile
Cicero
*Circulo dei studi sociali ed economiche*
Civic Guard
Civil Constitution of Clergy
Civil oath of loyalty
Committee of Public Safety
Committee of Public Security
Concordat
Consulta
Convention
Corday

Cordeliers

*Correspondant*

Council Plenary, First

Council Plenary, Second

Council Plenary, Third

Courtois

Danton

Dawson

*Debaptisée*

Dechritianisation

Declaration of Independence

Declaration of Rights of Man

Decurtins

Descartes

Desmoulins

Diderot

Directory

Droste-Vishering

Elections France 1789, 1791, 1792, 1795

Elections Germany

Encyclopaedia

Enlightenment

Engels

Equality, proportional

Event of Cologne

Faubourg St. Antoine

Faubourg St Marceau

Feast of Federation

Feuerbach

Feast of Supreme Being

Fichte

Fouché

Freppel, Mgr

Fribourg, Union of

Gallican Articles

Gallicanism

Garibaldi

George, Henry

Girondins

Gorres

Gregory XVI

Harmel

Hazard

Hébert

Hegel

Heine

Hitz

Hotel de Ville

Hughes, Philip

*Immortale Dei*

Indulgent Policy

Insurrectionary Commune

Iron Law Wages

Jacobins

Jacobini, Cardinal

Jansenism

Jedin

Jesuits

Justice commutative

Justice, distributive

Justice, legal

Kant

Ketteler, Archbishop

Keufstein

Lacordaire

Lafayette

*Laissez faire*

Lamartine

Lamennais

Lassalle

Latin & English dictionary

Lavigerie, Cardinal

La Tour du Pin

Law, Eternal

Law, Natural

Law, (Canon) Universal

Law, (Canon) Particular
Lehmkuhl
Leo XIII
Le Play
Leroux
Liège Congress
Liège, school of
Locke
Louis XIV
Louis XV
Louis XVI
Louis XVIII
Louis, Napoleon
Louis, Philippe
McGlynn
Madelin
de Maistre
Maloney
Manifesto of Communist, Party
Manning, Cardinal
Marat
Marx
Mazzini
de Melun
Mermillod
Metternich
Military Tribunal
Mirabeau
Montalembert
Montesquiou
Moral Modernism
Moufang
de Mun
Napoleon
Napoleon III
New Era
Noailles, Cardinal
Nonjurors

Notre Dame

*Osservatore Romano*

Ozanam

Palais Royale

Palmerstone

Parlement de Paris

Perin

Pius VI

Pius VII

Pius VIII

Pius IX

Pius XII

Prairial Law

Proudhon

*Quadragesimo Anno*

*Raison generale*

Reformation

*Regimini Ecclesiae Sanctae*

Renaissance

Republic, Second

Republic, Third

*Rerum Novarum*

Robespierre

Roman Curia

Rousseau

Roux

Schama

Schmidlin

Schultze-Delitzsch

St Augustine

St Bernard

St Gregory I

Saint-Simon

Saint-Just

St Vincent de Paul

*Sans-culottes*

*Sens Commun*

Sieyès

Sicardi laws

Single tax

Socialism

Society of Jesus

Solidarity

States General

Strikes

Subsidiarity

*Ubi Arcano*

Ultramontanism

*Univers*

Veuillot

Vergniaud

Vendée

Vigilance Committee

Villeneuve Bargemont

Vogelsang

Volpini

Voltaire

Terror, Great

, Little

, , Economic

Wages

Windthorst

Worker Question