THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

A Program for a Christian Social Order:
The Organic Democracy of René de La Tour du Pin

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the

School of Theology and Religious Studies

Of The Catholic University of America

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Joseph F.X. Sladky

Washington, D.C.

2012

A Program for a Christian Social Order:
The Organic Democracy of René de La Tour du Pin

Joseph F.X. Sladky, Ph.D.

Director: Rev. Jacques M. Gres-Gayer, Th.Dr., Hist.Dr.

René de La Tour du Pin was one of the leading social Catholic theorists during the latter half of the nineteenth century. This dissertation examines La Tour du Pin's role in attempting to lay the foundations for a more just and representative Christian social order. There is a particular focus on the analysis of his social theories and the examination of the utility and foresight of his many contributions to Catholic social thought.

La Tour du Pin was at the helm of *Association catholique,* the most influential social Catholic journal in late nineteenth century Europe. He was also the secretary and moving spirit behind the Fribourg Union, a multi-national group of prominent and influential social Catholics, whose expertise was drawn upon by Pope Leo XIII in the drafting of *Rerum Novarum*. Later, some of his ideas found their way into *Quadragesimo anno.* Through his corporative system he promoted a program which organized society by social function and which gave corporations public legal recognition and autonomy in all areas pertaining to their proper sphere. As this corporative system extended itself into

the political arena, it would grant a proportionate, yet real representation to all segments of society by true participation.

Concerning sources, I have drawn primarily upon La Tour du Pin's central work, *Vers un ordre social*, his articles from *Association catholique,* and his shorter work *Aphorismes de politique social.* This dissertation begins with a survey of the historical, religious and socio-economic environment of the nineteenth century. The thought of important thinkers who shaped La Tour du Pin's views is then examined. This is followed by a brief biography of the thinker's life. Next, his social theories are investigated and analyzed. His ideas on the family, the Church's role in society, corporations, decentralization of power, the role of the State**,** and political representation are comparatively analyzed with the social works of thinkers such as Locke, Rousseau, and Tocqueville. La Tour du Pin's ideas are also assessed and critiqued by the Church's social teaching, especially that of the popes. Lastly, his influence on later thought and politics is assessed.

This dissertation by Joseph F.X. Sladky fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Church History approved by Jacques Gres-Gayer, Th.Dr., Hist.Dr., as Director, and by Joseph Capizzi, Ph.D., and Claes Ryn, Ph.D. as Readers.

Jacques Gres-Gayer, Th.Dr., Hist.Dr., Director

Joseph Capizzi, Ph.D., Reader

Claes Ryn, Ph.D., Reader

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

René de La Tour du Pin was a key figure in the development of French social Catholicism during the latter part of the nineteenth century. He was a bitter foe of the French Revolution and all its fruits, especially individualism. An inveterate opponent of modern democracy, he was a staunch monarchist at heart. After his "conversion" to the social Catholic movement in the early 1870s, he dedicated the remainder of his life to the restoration of a Christian Social Order. With the sense of duty of a true nobleman, he wished to serve the needs of the working class.

In their precipitous rush to tear down the infrastructure of privilege and exalt equality and liberty, La Tour du Pin observed that the French Revolutionaries had torn down the rich organic social fabric which had developed over centuries. Following this, the intermediate social bodies[1] which had acted as a buffer between the State and the individual were weakened or abolished. La Tour du Pin felt that these intermediate bodies needed to be resurrected, nurtured, and put firmly in place to occupy the void left between the individual and the State. In particular, he felt that Catholicism had the answers to society's problems, especially in principles enunciated by the supreme pontiffs.

---

[1] Examples of these include the following: families, towns, cities, provinces, churches, parlements, and corporations or guilds.

Although La Tour du Pin had a great respect for the social structure of the medieval period, he was not one who merely desired to turn back the clock. He wished to distill social principles from the medieval period and apply them to the modern age. Among other things, he thought that authority and liberty should be carefully balanced by means of intermediate bodies as was the case during the Middle Ages. These social bodies were natural groups which mediated between the individual and the State. The family was the most basic of these groups, but they also included communes, provinces, corporations,[2] and *parlements.*[3] These numerous and varied intermediate bodies established a rich network of social ties among men; in addition, they restricted the absolute liberty of the individual from within the group as well as acting as a check on the abuse of authority from without.

La Tour du Pin stressed the importance of duties and responsibilities over rights. As a member of a group, a man was much more conscious of duties toward the group than of his rights. On the other hand, the atomized individual, apart from any group, saw

---

[2] The word "corporation" will be transliterated into English in this paper. The French "corporation" is understood in English as "guild"—not as a joint-stock company, the word for which in French is "*société anonyme.*" The words "guild" and "corporation" will be used interchangeably in this paper.

[3] The *parlements* of the old regime were the chief judicial bodies of France. Concerning the *parlements*, James Collins states, "They heard on appeal all important cases: civil cases involving more than fifty *livres*; criminal cases involving the death penalty. Many privileged individuals had the right to be heard in the first instance in a Parlement. The Parlements also registered royal edicts and ordinances; without such registration, the edict or the ordinance did not have the force of law. Except under Louis XIV, Parlements could delay registration by sending the king remonstrances (emendations)." James B. Collins, *The State in Early Modern France* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1995), xxix.

himself primarily as a possessor of rights. As duties and responsibilities imply a common good, an individual, by being a conscious member of a group, learns to sacrifice his own desires for the good of the community. Liberals did not recognize the existence of a common good and they claimed they owed duties to no one. Their attitude hinted of the brutal animal kingdom where Darwinian natural selection reigned—the survival of the fittest. The socialists also saw no use for intermediate bodies because by their very nature, such bodies implied a social hierarchy, and therefore, inequalities. In addition, they regarded the State as competent to take over all former responsibilities of intermediate social bodies. For them it was better to be equal, but in the thralldom of the State—"… the State will be a good master because they themselves will be the master."[4]

La Tour du Pin views society as a natural and living organism. Consequently, he does not consider society to be a mechanical grouping of men united by contracts, but rather an organic grouping of men united by social functions. In his biological portrayal of society he points out that every part has a role to play in the whole. It is reminiscent of St. Paul's description of Christ's mystical body.[5] Describing the social body, he states:

> The social body has a soul of the same collective kind as its own composition: this soul is the religious society which creates, animates and transforms civil society, in the same degree that the human soul truly forms the individual.
>
> The social body has its natural laws, which it ought to obey in the economic order as well as in the political order, under pain of wasting away; its cellular tissues, which are families with their essential constitution; its members, which are the professional bodies with their various functions; its natural nerve centers, which Le Play has so justly called the social authorities; its historic forms

---

[4] René de La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes de politique sociale* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1930), 48.

[5] See: 1 Cor. 12: 12-26, RSV.

finally, consecrated by traditions and conserved by customs and manners.[6]

La Tour du Pin believed that a nobleman's duty was to serve the public good and especially the oppressed lower classes. As the wealthy bourgeoisie had recently supplanted the nobility in the social hierarchy, while ignoring, if not oppressing the working classes, nobles like La Tour du Pin made common cause with the worker against their common enemy, the liberal bourgeoisie. After reading books by the French deputy Émile Keller and the German Bishop von Ketteler while in exile, Albert de Mun recalls how he and his friend, La Tour du Pin, developed an "ardent desire…to devote themselves to the people [working class]."[7] Even as a young boy, the young René was made aware of his duties as a member of the nobility. His father, while visiting some of the peasants on his estate with his young son, said, "Always remember that you will only be the administrator of this land for its inhabitants."[8] It would appear that he had reflected deeply on Christ's command to those in positions of authority.[9] This appreciation of his social duty would bolster his idea of the social function of property.

Moreover, La Tour du Pin felt that one must first know his fellow man in order to

---

[6] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes,* 15.

[7] Albert de Mun, *Ma vocation sociale: Souvenirs de la fondation de l'Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1908), 22.

[8] René de La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social chrétien: Jalons de route, 1882-1907* (Paris: La Librairie Français, 1987), 16.

[9] "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you, must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you, must be your slave; even as the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life for a ransom for many." Matthew 20: 25-28, RSV.

love him and then serve him. This is why he created the *Oeuvres des Cercles Catholique d'Ouvriers* (OCCO) in 1871 with Albert de Mun. It enabled the ruling (*dirigeants*) classes to associate with the working classes in an informal club atmosphere. Moreover, he also insisted on mixed associations of workers and employers (corporations) over simple worker associations and trade unions. By bringing together employers and workers into corporations, he felt that they would better understand each other, respect each other, and reconcile their interests. In his opinion, trade unions seemed to exacerbate the class struggle.

Eventually, La Tour du Pin became the secretary of the *Conseil d'Études,* the doctrinal wing of the OCCO. This section of the OCCO was devoted to research—establishing and formulating "firm principles of Catholic social teaching."[10] In the pages of *Association catholique,* the review of the *Conseil d'Études,* La Tour du Pin elaborated a program with the stated purpose of restoring a Catholic social order within late nineteenth century France. This program was a response to the prevailing individualism and liberalism of his time, as well as its paradoxical offspring, socialism.

As the nineteenth century saw the rapid rise of industrial capitalism, familiar traditions and time-honored social roles underwent a process of increasing disintegration. The small tradesman could not compete with the large industrial concerns. Either he found himself reduced to unemployment or he was co-opted by the larger industries as a

---

[10] Paul Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), 176.

dependent wage laborer. The social hegemony of the landed aristocracy had been supplanted by the bourgeoisie. Whereas the aristocracy had theoretically understood that they had social duties to their social inferiors, the bourgeoisie felt they had social obligations to no one. It was out of the crucible of both the Industrial Revolution and French Revolution that the new liberal state arose, and whose stated purpose was not to secure the common good, but the good of a part, the wealthy few.

La Tour du Pin maintained that the interests of all members of the civil society must be secured, not merely those of a part, whether that of the wealthy few or that of the impoverished many. To that end he promoted a social program which empowered all members of society to acquire a certain measure of property and, at the same time, also furthered a proportionate, yet realistic political participation by all segments of society. His approach to social order has usually been referred to as corporatism, but it might also be called "organic democracy," thereby distinguishing it from what La Tour du Pin would deem modern mechanistic democracy.

The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze thoroughly the social theories of René de La Tour du Pin and examine both the utility and foresight of his many contributions to Catholic social thought. For many years he was at the helm of *Association catholique*, the most influential social Catholic journal in late nineteenth century Europe. In addition, he was the secretary of and moving spirit behind the Fribourg Union, a multi-national group of prominent and influential social Catholics. During the preparatory phases of the drafting of *Rerum Novarum*, Leo XIII actively drew

on the expertise of this group and a few of its ideas directly influenced the encyclical. Moreover, some of La Tour du Pin's ideas, which were initially not accepted by Leo, were later reflected in Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*. Lastly, La Tour du Pin's corporatist ideas heavily influenced certain intellectual and political leaders, such as Charles Maurras and Maréchal Philippe Pétain.

A large percentage of La Tour du Pin's work was published in *Association catholique,* the journal of the *Conseil d'Études,* founded in 1876. In 1907, under the inspiration of his secretary, Mlle. Bossan de Garagnol, La Tour du Pin personally collected what he thought to be his most significant articles into a single-volume collection, titled *Vers un ordre social chretien: Jalons de route, 1882-1907.* This volume included articles written not only in *Association catholique* but in other journals[11] as well. In this paper, for those *Association catholique* articles which are also in the collection *Vers un ordre social chretien*, the latter will be cited as the source. This work will hold the central place as a primary resource in this paper. Other important articles from the journal *Association catholique,* the main vehicle of La Tour du Pin's social doctrine, will be drawn upon as well, in particular "Le parlementarisme, voilà l'ennemi!" and "Le régime representative." La Tour du Pin's shorter work, *Aphorismes de politique sociale*, written in 1909, as well as his essay on "Individualisme" in the *Dictionnaire*

---

[11] The periodicals include the following: *Réveil français, Le coin de terre et le foyer,* and *Action française*. *Le coin de terre et le foyer* was a monthly review founded by the French priest, deputy, and Christian democrat, Jules-Auguste Lemire. The *Revue de L'Action française* was a biweekly periodical headed by the positivist, monarchist leader, Charles Maurras. In 1908 this publication became the daily newspaper *L'Action française*. The *Réveil français* was a French royalist weekly review.

apologetique de la foi catholique, will also play an important role as primary sources. *Feuillets de la vie militaire sous le Second Empire, 1855-1870,* La Tour du Pin's reflections on his life in the military, will be utilized to describe his life and appointments in the French army.

The main biographical source for La Tour du Pin's life is *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin d'après lui-même* by Mlle. Élisabeth Bossan de Garagnol. In the early years of the nineteenth century, Mlle. Bossan de Garagnol, the daughter of La Tour du Pin's best friend in the army, resided at Arrancy and collaborated with La Tour du Pin, becoming his secretary. She helped him organize his writings, engaged him in deep conversation, and witnessed his daily regimen for many years, even in exile. According to Robert Talmy, she was his "spiritual heiress."[12] Consequently, she was in a better position to write a biography of him than anyone else. Her biography of La Tour du Pin, therefore, is definitive and, other than his own writings, it plays the chief role in providing an accurate account of his life.

Unfortunately, the archives of René de La Tour du Pin were destroyed by a fire which gutted the Chateau d'Arrancy, his home, in the year 1917 during the Great War.[13]

---

[12] Robert Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1964), 52.

[13] Philippe Levillain, *Albert de Mun: Catholicisme français et catholicisme romain du syllabus au ralliement* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1983), 48. According to Levillain, Count Aymar de La Tour du Pin was later able to collect a number of René's letters, some of which were later published. As René's brother Aymar predeceased him, this Aymar appears to be La Tour du Pin's great-nephew, i.e. his brother Aymar's grandson who shares the same name. Count Aymar highlights one group of letters written by La Tour du Pin to his friend and fellow social Catholic, Louis Milcent. The letters ranged from 1875-1910. Certain of these letters were published in the periodical *La Revue universelle,* in issues 25 mars and 10 avril 1941, under the title *Un précurseur de la Révolution nationale.* See: Levillain, *Albert de Mun,* 48, 279.

As I began my research, my awareness of this regrettable loss convinced me to restrict my research of La Tour du Pin's social ideas to the examination of his aforementioned published works.

In Chapter One of this paper I will survey both the historical and social landscape of late nineteenth century France. Chapter Two will then focus on important earlier Catholic social theorists whose thought shaped La Tour du Pin's own ideas. These thinkers include Louis de Bonald, Frédéric Le Play, and Charles Périn. Chapter Three will concentrate on the works of Émile Keller and Bishop Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler. The works of both men were pivotal in securing the "social vocation" of La Tour du Pin and his close friend, Albert de Mun. Chapter Four will be devoted to a biographical sketch of the life of La Tour du Pin. Considerable weight will be given to the period after his social Catholic "conversion." In addition, his friendships with and the reciprocal influences of Albert de Mun, Léon Harmel, Karl von Vogelsang, and the Comte de Chambord will also be highlighted in this chapter. Chapters Five and Six will be devoted to La Tour du Pin's social theory. In this theoretical section of the paper, the work of political and social theorists, especially Rousseau, Locke, and Tocqueville, will be drawn on to make a comparative analysis of La Tour du Pin's work. In addition, Catholic social teaching, especially papal encyclicals, will be drawn upon to assess and critique both the work of La Tour du Pin and the institutions which he was attacking. Whereas Chapter Five will treat of La Tour du Pin's views on individualism, original sin, the family, and the role of the Church in society, Chapter Six will focus on his ideas

concerning intermediate bodies, such as corporations, the corporative regime, decentralization, and the true political representation. Lastly, in Chapter Seven, I will examine La Tour du Pin's influence on other prominent individuals and groups. This will include the Fribourg Union, an international think-tank for social Catholic thought; in addition, it will encompass papal social thought, in particular, the encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno;* finally, it will comprise other social theorists and political leaders.

No thorough investigation of La Tour du Pin's thought, with comparative analysis, has yet been undertaken. Moreover, although his corporatism has been examined in light of some earlier Catholic social teaching, it would be apropos to examine it with respect to the teaching of the Second Vatican Council and more recent popes. Since La Tour du Pin exerted an indirect influence on papal social teaching, this dissertation will contribute to a deeper understanding of the historical development of the Church's social doctrine.

CHAPTER 1.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A. Political and Religious Milieu

1. The French Revolution

During the nineteenth century[1] there were a number of different political regimes in France. The Revolution of 1789 had abolished the absolutism of the *ancien régime* only to replace it with the liberal constitutional monarchy of the Legislative Assembly. This was very short lived.[2] The latter regime was then supplanted by the First Republic which exerted a new form of absolutism through France. This was achieved by the newest legislature, the radical National Convention.[3] Often enough, the local government

---

[1] For general political histories of nineteenth-century France in English, see: Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times*, 3rd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981); Robert Tombs, *France, 1814-1914* (London; New York: Longman, 1996); J.P.T. Bury, *France, 1814-1940*, 6th ed. (London; New York: Routledge, 2003); Alfred Cobban, *History of Modern France*, 3 vols. (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1961). For general religious histories of nineteenth-century France, see: Adrien Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, trans. John Dingle, 2 vols. (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961); Gérard Cholvy and Yves-Marie Hilaire, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine, 1800-1930*, 2 vols. (Toulouse: Bibliothèque historique Privat, 1985). For general histories of the Church during this period, see: Roger Aubert, *The Church in a Secularized Society*, vol. 5, *The Christian Centuries* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1978); Hubert Jedin and John Dolan, *History of the Church*, 10 vols. (London: Burns & Oates, 1981), especially vols. 7, 8, and 9; Jean-Marie Mayeur et al., *Histoire du christianisme: Des origines à nos jours*, 14 vols. (Paris: Desclée, 1990-2001), especially vols. 10, 11, 12, and 13.

[2] This lasted from early October 1791 to mid-late September 1792.

[3] This lasted from mid-late September 1792 to late October 1795.

of Paris, the Commune, wielded control over the Convention by mobilizing the lower class workers, the *sans-culottes*, and using them to threaten members of the Convention to do its bidding. Paris, then, was able to exert its will over the whole country by this means. Eventually, in 1795, a more conservative republic was erected with the Directory. Because of its corruption and limited franchise, the Directory was extremely unpopular with the people. With the aid of the cunning priest Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, the popular young[4] general Napoleon Bonaparte engineered the *coup d'état* of *18 Brumaire* or of 9 November 1799.

2. The Napoleonic Era

Bonaparte instituted an authoritarian regime, the Consulate. While it gave lip service to representative government, those who had "eyes to see" observed that it was but a façade. All real power was concentrated in the hands of the First Consul, the dictator Napoleon Bonaparte. This successful general, by means of a series of "plebiscites,"[5] ratified a constitution which placed him in power for 10 years, then

---

[4] At this time Bonaparte was only 30 years old. He had become extremely popular by a means of spectacular victories over the Austrians in his Italian campaigns.

[5] These "plebiscites" of Bonaparte are the first great examples of large-scale "voter fraud" in modern history. Alan Schom relates, "The vote announced—3,572,329 for the creation of the Empire, 2,569 against—reflected less than half the votes actually cast. Even by government figures this meant that in just under half of the nation's six thousand or so cities, towns, and villages, only a single negative vote each had been registered in rejection of the Empire, or from another perspective, that in 57 percent of those communes, not a single person had opposed Napoleon. Approximately, 99.9993 percent of the French people had approved the Empire, a virtual statistical impossibility. But Napoleon controlled the nation's armed forces, police, press, publishing, and theater. There existed no independent means of contesting or questioning the voting procedure and results. The coronation could now take place, and Napoleon just laughed, for all had been foreordained on his personal orders." Alan Schom, *Napoleon Bonaparte* (New

confirmed him as consul for life, and eventually gave birth to the "French Empire" with Napoleon, of course, as the emperor. In order to create legitimacy for his newly-wrought French Empire, Napoleon sought out and received the *sacre* at the hands of Pope Pius VII. In this well-orchestrated theatrical display he aped the coronation of Charlemagne by Pope Leo III. However, unlike Charles the Great, he would not let the pope crown him—he took matters into his own hands and crowned himself, for he made it a point not to show any subservience to the spiritual power.

3. The Restoration of the Bourbons and the July Monarchy

After Napoleon fell from power, the Bourbons, the hereditary royal family of France, were restored to the throne. Louis XVIII, the younger brother of the executed Louis XVI, accepted the limitations of a parliamentary monarchy in which the sovereign power was divided. During the "Restoration," the aristocracy and the Church were both restored to positions of prominence within French society. After his short reign, Louis XVIII's younger brother Charles X succeeded him. He, however, champed at the bit of "limited monarchy"—he was a diehard absolutist; his attempt to return to the absolutism of the *ancien régime* exasperated many in French society who, since the Revolution of 1789, had acquired many of the vaunted liberties of '89 and had also risen to ascendancy in the following years. This provocation led to his downfall in the July Revolution of 1830. Louis de Bonald, one of the great French political theorists and proponent of the

---

York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 1997), 333-334.

principle of the indivisibility of power, loathed the resurgent Bourbon parliamentary monarchy of Louis XVIII. His biographer, David Klinck, captures his ideas in the matter thus:

> In a representative political system monarchy constitutes the foremost form of uselessness. Elevated to his throne in order to see all, hear all, and govern all, the king in a representative system was blind, deaf, dumb, and impotent. A great man would not tolerate being king under such circumstances. Imagine Charlemagne, Charles V, Gustavus Adolphus, Peter the Great, Henri IV, Frederick II, or Bonaparte having to take orders from two deliberative assemblies, and then being able to act only through their ministers![6]

After the July Revolution of 1830, Louis Philippe, son of the regicide Louis Philippe "Égalité" of the Orleanist branch of the Bourbon family, was content to rule as a parliamentary monarch. His monarchy catered to bourgeois interests just as the Bourbons had worked for aristocratic and clerical interests. Nevertheless, the Orleanist regime eventually became very unpopular with the lower classes and the Revolution of 1848 brought it to an end. With a very limited suffrage, many in the lower classes of society felt that the liberal regime of the "July Monarchy" ignored their interests and curried favor with the wealthy elite, especially the burgeoning French industrialists. A series of bad harvests and large-scale unemployment acted as catalysts for this revolution. Unlike the July Revolution of 1830, however, anticlericalism was not prevalent, for the Church was not perceived to be in as close alliance with the Orleanist regime as it had been with the Bourbons. Louis Philippe abdicated in favor of his grandson and fled to England. Constitutional monarchy had failed for a second time in France.

---

[6] David Klinck, *The French Counterrevolutionary Theorist Louis de Bonald, 1754-1840* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 223. Bonald and Joseph de Maistre's theory of the indivisibility of power would greatly influence René de La Tour du Pin.

4. The Second Republic and the Second Empire

In the wake of this, the Second Republic was formed. At first this regime favored the workers, but it shortly led to the bloody June Days, in which many rebel workers were killed. Immediately, political reaction set in. This prepared the way for the advent of Louis Bonaparte, the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte, as the president of the Second Republic. At this time the unicameral Legislative Assembly was dominated by the monarchists. Although this election was conducted by universal suffrage, the forces of conservatism were still prevalent in the lower echelons of French society, especially among the peasants. As the guarantor of social order, Louis won a landslide victory in the election. Later, after his coup d'état of 2 December 1851, an authoritarian regime was set up by Louis Bonaparte, the legislature's powers were curtailed, and a plebiscite confirmed the president in power. The following year another plebiscite easily shifted the authoritarian Republic into the Second Empire. French republicanism had now failed a second time as well.

The Emperor Napoleon III had followed the script of his uncle very closely, plebiscites and all—it paid off. From 1852 to 1859 the Empire was closely allied with clerical interests and Napoleon III showed determination in protecting the pope's temporal power. Nevertheless, the emperor was also aiding Camillo Cavour and the Piedmontese, who were fighting the Austrians; for this reason the enraged French clericals turned on him in 1859. Many of them suspected that he was creating conditions that would leave the Papal States open to Piedmontese aggression. In fact, the

Piedmontese gobbled up eighty percent of the papal territories in 1859. In 1864 secret negotiations were carried out by the French and Piedmontese governments concerning the "Roman Question." Without consulting Pius IX or his Secretary of State, Cardinal Giacomo Antonelli, the famous September Convention of 15 September 1864 was concluded, and it incensed French supporters of the Pope's temporal power against Louis Napoleon. Frank Coppa, describing the September Convention, relates:

> The terms of the September Convention, providing that Napoleon would withdraw his forces from the Eternal City within two years, while the Italian government promised not to attack the patrimony of St. Peter and to prevent others from launching an attack from its territory, upset the Holy See. Pius did not trust the 'wolves' to guard the 'lamb' and suspected they would stoop to devouring their ward. [7]

Following on the heels of the September Convention, Pius IX published the encyclical *Quanta Cura* and appended a *Syllabus errorum* (eighty propositions) to it on 8 December 1864. The principal errors of the Modern Age were catalogued and condemned in the *Syllabus;* at the time it was widely viewed as a vigorous response to the September Convention.[8] Establishing order at home through an authoritarian government, while promoting revolution abroad, Napoleon III was seen by some as a Caesarean Revolutionary. One of his chief clerical opponents saw him as a modern day Pilate,[9] who wished to wash his hands of the "Roman Question" and leave the remainder

---

[7] Frank Coppa, *The Modern Papacy Since 1789* (New York: Longman, 1998), 107.

[8] Coppa, *The Modern Papacy,* 107-108. Émile Keller, as well as Bishop Dupanloup, saw a close relationship between the September Convention and the Syllabus. In fact, Pius IX reminded the world that the principle of non-intervention was an error concerning natural and Christian ethics in article no. 62 of his *Syllabus errorum.*

[9] Étienne Catta, *La doctrine politique et sociale du Cardinal Pie* (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions

of the Papal States to the tender mercies of the Piedmontese government.

5. The Third Republic: The Monarchist Republic

After the debacle of the Franco-Prussian War, Napoleon III surrendered to the Prussians at Sedan on 1 September 1870. His government fell precipitously and he went into exile. Three days after this defeat, a Government of National Defense was set up. Léon Gambetta, the Jacobin firebrand, became the Minister of the Interior and took up the defense of the country against the Prussians. Nevertheless, on 19 September 1870 Paris was besieged by the Prussians. Gambetta escaped from Paris to Tours and attempted to reduplicate the "miracle of Valmy" (1792)[10], but failed to mount any effective opposition to the Prussians.

Against Gambetta's will, an armistice was signed between the French and the Prussians on 28 January 1871. On 8 February an election was held in which a National Assembly was created for the purpose of making peace with the Prussians. The

---

Latines, 1991), 312-313. Louis Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, made the famous comparison between Pilate and Napoleon III in 1861.

[10] At the Battle of Valmy on 20 September 1792, a French "citizen" army, composed largely of raw recruits under Generals Dumoriez and Kellerman, defeated the well-disciplined and experienced Prussian and Austrian armies led by the experienced Duke of Brunswick, the nephew of Frederick the Great. The victory was a bit overblown as it was merely an artillery engagement which was not tactically conclusive. Nevertheless, the Duke of Brunswick, seeing himself outnumbered, gave up the field and left France. This ensured that the French Revolution would not be crushed by foreign powers, but would persist. See: François Furet and Denis Richet, *The French Revolution*, trans. Stephen Hardman (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), 158-159; Alfred Cobban, *History of Modern France*, vol. 1, 205; Leo Gershoy, *The French Revolution and Napoleon* (New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1964), 226-227; Edward S. Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World: From Marathon to Waterloo* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1994), 325-340.

monarchists controlled the legislature. On 1 March the Assembly agreed to the terms of peace set by the Prussians. Among these terms it was stated that the Prussians would occupy eastern France until a five billion franc indemnity could be paid off. In addition, one-third of Lorraine was handed over to the Germans as well as all of Alsace, with the exception of Belfort. Adolphe Thiers was chosen as the executive for this provisional Republic. He was an experienced statesman and was given extensive powers, uniting the positions of both president and premier in his person.[11] During March plans were made to move the seat of the government to Versailles where it would be free from the political pressures of radical Parisian elements. In the end, Paris refused to submit to the new government. In mid-March a Commune was set up by the artisans and workers of Paris because they thought their needs would be ignored by the National Government.[12]

After a struggle between the Parisian mob and government troops, Thiers stormed Paris on 2 April and began the bloody repression of the Communards. In retaliation, the Communards murdered Archbishop Darboy and other clerics, the fruit of a growing anticlericalism within the Commune. By the end of May, Thiers had recaptured the city and he mercilessly had many Communards shot or deported.

Under Thiers' strong leadership the "Republic" became more stable and began to acquire prestige. Over time this self-styled "monarchist" slowly turned into a

---

[11] Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times*, 3rd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981), 225.

[12] Ibid., 223-226.

"republican." The monarchist majority in the Assembly, however, decided he must go. Through a scheme, they persuaded Thiers to resign and a substitute, Marshal Patrice MacMahon, was chosen to fill his shoes. Hence, in May of 1873, MacMahon became president. In a short time, the war indemnities were paid off and the Prussians evacuated the country in September.[13] What resulted was a "Monarchist Republic"[14] in which monarchist assemblymen held control of the Assembly, yet no king existed.

It is no exaggeration to state that the Bourbon Pretender, the Comte de Chambord, could have become king as "Henry V," yet he refused the throne and issued a manifesto declaring that "Henry V cannot abandon the flag[15] of Henry IV."[16] Following Bonald's line of thought, he did not want to become a constitutional monarch "who reigns but does not govern."[17] After Chambord refused the throne, Adolphe Thiers made an incisive comment on the matter:

> I am accused of wishing to found the Republic! Now I am free from all reproach; henceforth no one will be able to deny that the true founder of the Republic in France is M. Le Comte de Chambord.

---

[13] Ibid., 230-231.

[14] For a brief political history of the Third Republic up to WWI, see: Alexander Sedgwick, *The Third French Republic* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970); John McManners, *Church and State in France, 1870-1914* (London: SPCK, 1972). McManners also delves deeply into the religious situation as the title indicates.

[15] He refused to adopt the Revolutionary Tricolor.

[16] Marvin L. Brown, Jr. *The Comte de Chambord: The Third Republic's Uncompromising King* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1967), 91.

[17] Charlotte T. Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines Since the Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), 176. Muret's book is quite comprehensive. She unfolds the royalist doctrines of Bonald and Maistre through Chambord, La Tour du Pin, and up through Charles Maurras.

Posterity will speak of him as the French George Washington. [18]

Some of the ultra-royalists were proud that Chambord had stood up for his principles. On the other hand, moderate monarchists were very disappointed because the nation was becoming more and more acclimated to the Republic as time went on. The monarchists wanted a president and a republic only as a temporary stopgap until they were settled on how to restore the monarchy. This new Republic, however, was free from war-mongering[19] and began to appeal more and more to the populace. Eventually, in November of 1873, the Law of the *Septennat* was voted on by the Assembly which made MacMahon the president for seven years. Unlike Thiers, however, MacMahon acted only as head of state and not as prime minister. He allowed the Duc de Broglie, the leading monarchist politician of the time, to organize and direct a cabinet. This short-sighted precedent would come back to haunt MacMahon when he had to later work with republican majorities. [20] For his position was weakened when he had to work with republican prime ministers, such as Jules Simon, with whom he disagreed.

During the 1870's the Church of *Sacré Coeur* was built on Montmartre to commemorate those who died at the hands of the Commune and to make reparation for

---

[18] Brown, *The Comte de Chambord*, 93.

[19] Given the prostrate and humiliated position of France after the Franco-Prussian War, the country was in no position to carry out a war even had the leaders wished it.

[20] Wright, *France in Modern Times*, 231. He did not attempt to direct a cabinet as "prime minister," but rather restricted his position to that of executive leader.

the "sins of the nation."[21] For the twin disasters of the Franco-Prussian War and the uprising of the commune were seen by some as a divine punishment for the sinful excesses of the nation, especially under the Second Empire.

In 1875 a constitutional law was passed that provided a bicameral legislature which included a Chamber of Deputies and Senate. The Senate was created so as to preserve a conservative element in the legislature. In the mid-1870's Republican victories in the Chamber of Deputies (1876) and the Senate (1879) entrenched a government which was hostile to both the restoration of the monarchy and the Catholic Church. The Church had maintained close ties with the Second Empire in its early years and, in the early 1870's, with the "Monarchist" Third Republic. Nevertheless, in the late 1870's concentrated opposition began to mount against the Church and anticlericalism was on the rise. As Owen Chadwick astutely states, "Anticlericalism was a function, not of the weakness of the Catholic Church, but of its growing power in a modern democratic society."[22] There had always been some anticlericalism in countries where celibate priests dwelt. Now, however, republicans saw Catholics as being in close alliance with reactionary politics, i.e., the monarchy. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, Comtean positivism, the clerical neglect of the proletariat, as well as an aggressive and fanatical freemasonry, all contributed to the rise of anticlericalism. The unifying themes in the new wave of

---

[21] Wright, *France in Modern Times*, 226.

[22] Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, G.B.: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 118.

anticlericalism were resistance to the "absolute authority"[23] of the Catholic Church as well as an opposition to any "blind submission" to her. The chief nemesis of the anticlericals was the *Syllabus errorum*, especially proposition 80, which stated that the pope should reconcile himself to "progress, liberalism, and modern civilization."[24]

The Syllabus had been interpreted by many non-Catholics as well as progressive Catholics as a sign of stubborn obscurantism on the part of the papacy and the Catholic Church. Many anticlericals readily denounced the Vatican Council's *Pastor aeternus* (1870). This statement of the infallibility and primacy of the pope taken together with the propositions condemned in the Syllabus was all grist for the mill of the anticlericals. Consequently, they were quite delighted when the Piedmontese put an end to the "Roman Question" by occupying[25] the remainder of the papal territory during September and October of 1870. From the perspective of anticlericals, modern freedoms, such as freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and scientific inquiry were all seen as totally incompatible with the view of the Catholic Church. Since the religious orders of the

---

[23] It is interesting to note the hypocrisy of some of the most vocal anticlericals who were also freemasons. Freemasons accused the Jesuits of plotting in secrecy when they themselves were, in fact, doing the same thing. More importantly, they followed the absolute authority of their leaders with a blind submission which exceeded that which good Catholics would ever give to the pope. See: Leo XIII, *Humanum genus*, no. 9.

[24] John McManners, *Church and State in France, 1870-1914* (London: SPCK, 1972), 18-19.

[25] On 20 September 1870 the Piedmontese bombarded the gates of Rome; on the following day, Rome itself was occupied. On 9 October 1870 after an "election and vote," Rome and its outlying provinces were incorporated into the kingdom of Italy. Following this illegality, Pius IX declared himself a prisoner of King Victor Emmanuel II. See: Coppa, *The Modern Papacy*, 112.

Catholic Church controlled private and much of public education[26], these "obstacles to progress and science" also needed to be removed from their position of influence over the young.

6. The Third Republic: The Anticlerical Republic

Thus, in 1879, Jules Ferry, Minister of Education, began the first of many attempts at introducing anticlerical legislation. In fact, it was more than just anticlerical; in essence, it was anti-Christian and aggressively anti-Catholic. Under the guise of religious neutrality, it attempted to forcibly disembowel Catholicism from society and politics. The reason for this deeply-rooted animosity against the Church was on account of the privileged social and political status which it had wielded during the past and, to some extent, continued to wield in post-Revolutionary nineteenth century society, albeit in abated form.

---

[26] By means of the Falloux Law of 15 March 1850, the Church was able to set up its own secondary schools (*collèges*) and was able to exert a supervisory role over state primary schools. By allowing the Church a role in secondary education, the Second Republic established an environment of "liberty of education" or "liberty of teaching." Both authorized and unauthorized (such as the Jesuits) religious orders of both men and women were involved in the staffing of these *collèges.* This law broke the monopoly control of the Napoleonic *Université* over education at the secondary level. Earlier in the 1840s many members of the middle class had begun to return to the Catholic faith just as the nobility had done so at the time of the Restoration. In particular, the riots of the "June Days" had convinced many bourgeois Voltaireans to view the Church as the last bastion of the social order, especially with regard to property rights. Although the Church had been lobbying to secure greater influence in education for a about a decade, the passage of the Falloux Law also owed much to the support of Voltairean liberals like Adolphe Thiers. In fact, many of these Voltaireans began to send their sons to *collèges* run by the Church. Within a few decades about half of the students were enrolled in Catholic *collèges*. Thus, the Falloux Law, allowing "liberty of teaching," wielded immense influence in the recatholicization of the bourgeosie. See: Wright, *France in Modern Times*, 142; Robert Tombs, *France, 1814-1914* (London; New York: Longman, 1996), 137-138; McManners, *Church and State in France*, 21-22; Roger Aubert, *The Church in a Secularized Society*, vol. 5 of *The Christian Centuries* (New York: Paulist Press; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1978), 28-29.

In the 1880's the State adopted the *laïc* laws, which secularized education. In addition, Sunday rest was abolished, divorce was once again allowed, prayers were abolished from state functions, and the Jesuits, as usual, were expelled with other non-authorized congregations.[27] This set the tone for later and greater anticlerical measures. After the anticlerical uproar in the wake of the "Dreyfus Affair," the Law of 1901 concerning associations was easily passed. According to this law, unauthorized religious orders were required to apply for authorization with the State and they were no longer allowed to teach. Many of the orders were not given authorization and some were expelled forcibly. In 1905 the Law of Separation was passed. This unilaterally repudiated the Concordat of 1801 by which the Church was given financial support from the State.[28] The Church was now completely separate from the State. Many radicals had wanted this for a long time so as to remove the taint of the "politics of the sacristy" or the "politics of the Syllabus" from the political sphere. Nonetheless, more cunning anticlerical politicians were opposed to this new law because the Concordat, in the past, had allowed the State to control the Church through the Organic Articles.[29]

---

[27] Many of the religious did not leave at this time, but instead, waited to see if the authorities would evict them.

[28] By means of articles 13 and 14 of the Concordat of 1801, the Church received support from the State because the Church agreed that it would not attempt to reclaim its alienated property from its current possessors. See: Adrien Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, vol. 1, trans. John Dingle (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961), 121-122; Sidney Z. Ehler and John B. Morrall, eds. and trans., *Church and State through the Centuries* (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1954), 251, 254.

[29] This refers to police regulations or administrative controls. See: William Roberts, "Napoleon, the Concordat of 1801, and Its Consequences," in *Controversial Concordats: The Vatican's Relations with Napoleon, Mussolini, and Hitler*, ed. Frank J. Coppa (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of

B. Socio-Economic Milieu

1. Social Dislocations Caused by the French Revolution

Between the Fall of 1789 to the Fall of 1792, the French Revolution caused grave dislocations in French society. Time-honored social institutions were seriously crippled or abolished altogether by waves of profound anti-social forces that permeated through the nation during the first four years of the Revolution. These anti-social forces affected key pillars of French society, such as the Church, religious life, the historic provinces, the corporations or guilds, and even the institution of marriage. The scars from these dislocations would last well into the nineteenth century and beyond.

On 2 November 1789 the property of the Church was confiscated by the National Assembly[30] which had usurped power from the Estates-General.[31] Part of this property had always been devoted to the poor. It was used to provide both educational services as well as social services such as hospitals, orphanages, and houses for fallen women, etc. This "patrimony of the poor" was all destroyed by the confiscation. The beneficiaries were the wealthy bourgeois and well-off peasants who could afford to buy such

---

America Press, 1999), 45-46; Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France,* vol. 1, 135-136; Ehler and Morrall, *Church and State,* 251.

[30] This was also known as the Constituent Assembly or the Constituent National Assembly. These two names are both fitting because the representatives of the "National Assembly" met at a tennis court and vowed not to adjourn until they had drafted a new French constitution. This was the famous Tennis Court Oath of 20 June 1789.

[31] "Decree Confiscating Church Property," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 158-159.

properties. The lower rural and urban classes attained nothing from this dissolution. They were now worse off than before.

On 28 October 1789 the taking of religious vows was suspended, and on 13 February 1790, such vows were abolished altogether.[32] This marked the end of the religious orders. The Revolution here destroyed the "social groups" that were organized for pure contemplation of God or for active service to their fellow man in Christ's name.

On 26 February 1790 the historic provinces of France were suppressed and replaced by uniform departments.[33] This was a blow to provincial localism and the varied local patriotisms of Frenchmen. More and more citizens of the provinces would begin to see themselves more as "Frenchmen" rather than as Normans, Bretons, Burgundians, or Provençals.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was passed on 12 July 1790. This completely subjugated the Catholic Church to the State in France. The National Assembly rewrote diocesan circumscriptions. The dioceses were reduced from 135 to 83. They were cut up and apportioned so that they were made to correspond with the territorial divisions of the administrative departments. Some dioceses were completely suppressed. Salaries of pastors and bishops were now to be paid by the State.[34] On account of this arrangement,

---

[32] "Decree Prohibiting Monastic Vows in France," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 168-169.

[33] "Decree Dividing France into Departments," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 137-141.

[34] "The Civil Constitution of the Clergy," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed.

the State would exert its control over them. As a result, the Church lost its independence. Bishops and pastors were to be elected by Protestants, Jews, deists, atheists, as well as Catholics. The clergy were made to take an oath to the Civil Constitution. Seven bishops out of 107 took the oath[35] and about half the lower clergy did so as well. This caused great social dislocation as well. It divided the clergy itself into two camps, but it also caused divisions among the laity who supported one group or the other. At times, this created grave tensions between the laity and the Constitutional clergy imposed on them. The unified Church of the Old Regime was now split into a Church which supported the Revolution and a Church which was opposed to the Revolution. The Civil Constitution and its resultant oath were so divisive that they were seen to be among the greatest mistakes that the revolutionaries had made.

On 2 March 1791 the corporations or guilds were dissolved. On 14 June of that same year the "Chapelier Law" was passed in which workers were not allowed the right to organize and assemble. Those in the same occupation or profession were not free to organize, make resolutions, or determine prices. Such assemblies were considered seditious.[36] In the end this denied the worker the right to strike or organize; as a consequence, the Assembly left the workers to the tender mercies of their employers.

John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 169-181.

[35] Those who took the oath were called "jurors" or constitutional clergy. Those who refused were called "non-jurors" or refractory clergy.

[36] "The Chapelier Law," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 165-166.

This broke asunder social bonds between workers within the same profession and led to the "liberty of work."[37] Although individuals had rights, as stated in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*, groups did not have rights. This is a reflection of Rousseau's animus against "partial societies" which he thought distorted the "General Will."

On 20 September 1792 divorce was legalized. As a logical outcome of individual liberty, laid out in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*, marriage cannot be considered permanent for it would doom spouses to "indissoluble engagements." Here the social bonds within the family are broken, both between spouses, between parents and children, and between brothers and sisters. Divorced parties could remarry other divorced parties, thereby leading to all kinds of confusion in the family setting and its destruction thereof. Technically, girls and boys under the age of seven are to be entrusted to the mother in the case of divorce by mutual consent. Boys above the age of seven are to be entrusted to the father.[38] In the end, then, these various social groups, some

---

[37] La Tour du Pin states that the "liberty of work" is another name for capitalism. See: La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 37. "Liberty of Work" refers to the freedom of the worker to negotiate his wage with the employer. This situation arose after the suppression of the guilds. While the guilds existed, wages for workers were equitably determined by each guild. During the regime of the "liberty of work," however, the worker was often at the mercy of the employer. As the weaker of the two parties, the worker often had to accept whatever wage was offered to him by the employer, even if it was insufficient for his needs. He simply had no other choice. If he refused the wage, there was no shortage of other workers who would accept it. This, of course, is prior to the time in which workers were allowed to associate together in order to secure higher wages. La Tour du Pin states "The *absolute liberty of work* is the substitution of the law of arbitrariness to that of equity in the work contract engaged between the employer and the worker. Under this system, it is free competition which determines the salary of the worker, the conditions of the working hours, of health, and of morality in which the work is carried out." La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 63.

[38] "Decree Regulating Divorce," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 333-340.

consecrated by nature, others hallowed by custom and tradition, were sacrificed at the Revolutionary altar of liberty and individualism.

2. Property Rights

> The first task of a revolution is to destroy the old aristocracy; the second is to create a new one. [39]
>
> --Gustave Le Bon

The French Revolution of 1789 destroyed the privileges of the aristocracy and the clergy and replaced them with the privileges of the bourgeoisie. At that time certain liberal revolutionaries like the Abbé Sieyès[40] spoke well and fluently on behalf of the "People" and the "Third Estate." For them, however, the "People" or the "Third Estate" was a mere "code word" for the bourgeoisie. Ostensibly, urban workers and peasants also belonged to the "People," but the liberal revolutionaries were not really interested in empowering these classes. The privilege of birth and clerical immunity now gave way to the privilege of wealth. This was enshrined in article 17 of *The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*, which states:

> Since property is a *sacred and inviolable right*, no one may be deprived thereof unless a legally established public necessity obviously requires it, and upon condition of a just and previous indemnity. [41]

---

[39] Gustave Le Bon, *Gustave Le Bon: The Man and His Works*, trans. and ed. Alice Widener (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Press, 1979), 300.

[40] He wrote *What is the Third Estate?* in January of 1789. See: Doyle, *Oxford History of the French Revolution*, 94.

[41] "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 115. The italicized emphasis is my own.

As in England during the sale of the lands proceeding from the dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII, only the wealthier classes in France were able to buy alienated church property after the State confiscated it.[42] Even though there was a glut of ecclesiastical real estate on the market, members of the lower classes still did not have enough money to invest in it. The lower classes received civil equality but did not otherwise benefit from the Revolution of 1789. They traded one pair of masters (the nobility) for another (the wealthy).

The renowned political theorist, John Locke, also influenced certain of the liberal revolutionaries' ideas on the purpose of government. Locke claimed:

> The great and *chief end*, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is *the preservation of their property*.[43]

As a result of his rejection of the common good as the *raison d'être* of the

---

[42] Geoffrey R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation: England, 1509-1558* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 247-249, 335-337; J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation of the English People* (Oxford; New York: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 168. In order to pay off the debts of the state, the National Assembly claimed that the state owned all ecclesiastical property. As a result, the Assembly decided to confiscate all ecclesiastical property from the Church; from then on, the nation would pay the clergy's salaries. See: Nigel Aston, *Religion and Revolution in France, 1780-1804* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000), 133-134; John McManners, *The French Revolution and the Church* (London: SPCK, 1969), 24, 27; Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, vol. 1, 44; This confiscation and nationalization of ecclesiastical property was clearly an insurance policy against a return to the old order. For the buyers of Church property, wishing to protect their newly acquired property interests, would clearly defend the new order. As John McManners has ably stated, "The sale of the Church lands was seen as a sort of guarantee that the forces of reaction would not prevail. From the auctions would rise a multitude of proprietors whose interests were bound up with the Revolution, who would fight to defend the new Constitution. A salaried clergy too would be dependent on the new regime." McManners, *The French Revolution and the Church*, 29.

[43] John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1980), 66. The italicized emphasis is my own. It should be noted that Locke's understanding of property was an extended one, including not just property in a strict sense, but also a person's life and liberty.

commonwealth, Locke's theories conveniently buttressed the bourgeoisie's views that that the State existed for the preservation of the lives, liberties, and wealth of their own propertied class.

The Revolution of 1848 was a failed social revolution.[44] The growing numbers of socialists who defended the workers' rights were more consistent than the liberals—they wanted to carry the Revolution to its logical extreme. They insisted on social and economic equity. By abolishing private property altogether, Marx and Engels wished to carry this out to the extreme. They exclaim:

> You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population: its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.
>
> In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.[45]

The French deputy Émile Keller also questioned why property should be such a sacred and inviolable right when nothing else is so respected. He declares:

> Why not attack the evil in its root? In the Declaration of the Rights of Man, they have added (art. 17) that property is an inviolable and sacred right. These are the owners who have imagined this inconsistency and this contradiction in order to save their fortune. If neither religion nor power is sacred, why should property alone have this privilege? And if it is true that the people are good, that it only becomes bad by poverty and ignorance, and that at bottom it belongs to it to make the law and to decide everything, is not the first use to make of this sovereignty to divide more equitably the goods of this world.[46]

---

[44] Wright, *France in Modern Times,* 133-134; Tombs, *France, 1814-1914,* 374, 377-385; J.P.T. Bury, *France, 1814-1940,* 6th ed. (London; New York: Routledge, 2003), 71-78.

[45] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto,* trans. Samuel Moore (London: Penguin Books, 1985), 98.

[46] Émile Keller, *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'état et la*

This liberal attitude of absolute ownership of property would lead other anti-liberal Catholics, such as Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler and René de La Tour du Pin to question the "sacred and inviolable character" of property and to propose that property has a social function.

3. The Abolition of the Corporations

Since many of the revolutionaries had imbibed the ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, it is requisite to look at Rousseau's assessment of intermediate bodies[47] within the State. He felt that "partial associations" or intermediate bodies of men within the State were a pernicious influence, because they thwarted the "general will" which "is always right and always tends toward the public utility."[48] Concerning this "baneful influence" of partial associations, Rousseau comments:

> If, when a sufficiently informed populace deliberates, the citizens were to have no communication among themselves, the general will would always result from the large number of small differences, and the deliberation would always be good. But when *intrigues* and *partial associations* come into being at the expense of the large association, the will of each of these associations becomes general

---

liberté, (Paris: Poussielgue et Fils, 1865), 253. All French-English translations from French works are my own unless otherwise noted.

[47] An intermediate social body is simply a group of individuals united by a common interest or a common geographical locale. It is "intermediate" because it is located between the all-encompassing state or nation and the unit of the individual person. Intermediate social bodies include the family, the parish church, the diocese, the commune or town, the county or province, the guild, corporation or labor organization, as well as a variety of clubs or voluntary associations. Healthy intermediate social bodies bond men together in a rich network of social ties and they often act as a buffer on the "irresponsible" freedom of the individual as well as the "arbitrary" power of the state. See: Michel Creuzet, *Les corps intermédiaries* (Martigny, Suisse: Édition des Cercles Saint-Joseph, 1963; repr., Paris: Club du livre civique, 1964), 23.

[48] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," in *Basic Political Writings*, trans. Donald A. Cress (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1987), 155.

> in relation to its members and particular in relation to the state.…
>
> For the general will to be well articulated, it is therefore important that there should be no *partial society* in the state and that each citizen make up his own mind.…If there are *partial societies*, their number must be multiplied[49] and inequality among them prevented, …These precautions are the only effective way of bringing it about that the general will is always enlightened and that the populace is not *tricked*.[50]

Rousseau, the proto-totalitarian, is suspicious of any communication or association of the citizens among themselves regarding political deliberation. He seems to think that private interests will be emphasized to the detriment of the public utility, which he refers to as the common good. Unlike Locke, he does stress the importance of the common good, but it is a community without any intermediate groups, inequalities or hierarchies. He wants no diversity within unity, but rather wishes to impose uniformity on all. His fanatical hatred of intermediate bodies held sway in the minds of many nineteenth-century French leaders. Because of this, the State was readily able to steamroll over the rights of atomized individuals who had no legal right to associate.

---

[49] The thinking of James Madison is very similar to Rousseau in this regard. He too believes that factions can impair the interests of other citizens and the "aggregate interests of the community." In *Federalist* no. 10 Madison states, "There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests." Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers*, no. 10, ed. Clinton Rossiter (New York: New American Library, Inc., 1961), 78. Moreover, Madison agrees with Rousseau that the multiplication of sects and factions is a good thing. Whereas Rousseau claims that this will cause the general will to be articulated in an enlightened fashion, Madison maintains that this will ensure that the rights of individuals are secured. In *Federalist* no. 51 Madison remarks, "Whilst all authority in it [the federal republic of the United States] will be derived from and dependent on the society, the society itself will be broken into so many parts, interests and classes of citizens, that the rights of individuals, or of the minority, will be in little danger from interested combinations of the majority. In a free government the security for civil rights must be the same as for religious rights. It consists in the one case in the multiplicity of interests, and in the other in the multiplicity of sects." Madison, *The Federalist Papers*, no.51, 324.

[50] Rousseau, "The Social Contract," 156. The italicized emphasis is my own.

Thus, with no buffers against the sheer power of the State, the individual person was completely helpless.

Prior to the Revolution, Louis XVI's controller-general, Anne-Robert Jacques Turgot, attempted to introduce economic reforms in order to streamline the absolutist government of the *ancien régime.* In 1776 Turgot issued a series of reforms in his *Six Edicts.* Most prominent of all the edicts, were two, one abolishing the *corvée,*[51] another suppressing the *jurandes*[52] and *maîtrises,*[53] by which the trade guilds or corporations maintained their privileges. There was much that called for reform in the corporations at this time, although abolishing them altogether was arguably not the best solution. In any case, after an outcry by the artisans, the king soon reinstated the corporations and Turgot fell into disgrace.

Years later, in the midst of the French Revolution, the law of 2 March 1791 definitively suppressed the corporations; this was closely followed by the Chapelier Law of 14 June 1791 which deprived artisans of the liberty of association. Lawyers, doctors, butchers, and bakers, unlike the artisans, were, however, later organized into

---

[51] This refers to the forced labor service which commoners owed to a feudal overlord or to the State. This was often used in constructing public works.

[52] This is best translated as "jurymen." These "jurymen" were masters who were elected to office by their peers. It was their responsibility to ensure that the statutes of the corporation were enforced in the relations between employer and employee. Ultimately, they had the right to punish or expel members from the corporation who failed to abide by the statutes.

[53] This is best translated as "mastery" or "mastership." It refers to the superior knowledge or skill which makes one a master in a particular trade. With the suppression of "mastery" by Turgot, one would no longer have to attain mastery in a particular trade in order to be a practitioner of it.

corporations.[54] Although the guilds needed reforms—they imposed oppressive restrictions or regulations on members and monopolized the market—their abolition caused more problems than it solved. The ideas of Adam Smith, the chief proponent of laissez-faire economics in his day, were indicative of widespread opposition to guilds by the leading economic lights of the time. Somewhat cynically, he alleges:

> People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices. [55]

He then adds that corporations, in fact, lead to shoddy work and fraudulence. Smith claims:

> The pretense that corporations are necessary for the better government of the trade is without any foundation. The real and effectual discipline which is exercised over a workman, is not that of his corporation, but that of his customers. It is the fear of losing their employment which restrains his fraud and corrects his negligence. An exclusive corporation necessarily weakens the force of this discipline. [56]

Others thought differently. Throughout the Napoleonic period, many petitions were drafted to revive the corporations; yet these attempts were all futile. In 1817, however, the lawyer Antoine Levacher-DuPlessis drew up a *Mémoire*[57] to Louis XVIII

---

[54] Matthew H. Elbow, *French Corporative Theory, 1789-1948* (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1966), 17.

[55] Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (Washington, D.C: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 1998), 152.

[56] Ibid., 153.

[57] The full title was *Requête au roi et mémoire sur la nécessité de rétablir les corps de marchands et les communautés des arts et de métiers, présentés à sa majesté le 16 septembre 1817 par les marchands et artisans de la ville de Paris.* This *Mémoire* was published *in extenso* within the August 1883 (vol. XVI) issue of *Association catholique.* Many social Catholics saw it as a base on which to build the *régime corporatif.* Incidentally, the term *régime corporatif* is mentioned here for the first time. La Tour du Pin was the social Catholic who would make it more widely known in the 1880's, but he also would give it a different meaning from that of the *Mémoire*.

which again requested the restoration of the corporations. Although this appeal was in vain, the *Mémoire* was

> of importance because it contained all the arguments for a guild system current at that time, and because its later influence was great. Large sections of the writings of the social Catholic corporatist La Tour du Pin and many of the speeches of Pétain also savor of this work. In particular, they repeated its condemnation of economic liberalism, its reference to tradition, and its emphasis on morality, discipline and order. [58]

The *Mémoire* describes 1) the history of the corporations before the French Revolution; 2) the effects of their disappearance on commerce and industry; 3) responses to the objections brought against the corporations; 4) the political and moral considerations which argued in favor of their reestablishment.[59] Because of its great influence on the French social Catholics of the 1880's, the *Mémoire* deserves special attention. Levacher-DuPlessis notes that lawyers, notaries, and others can form corporations; universities and scholarly societies are able to regulate their disciplines; and finally, certain trades (butchers, wine sellers, bakers, pharmacists) can to join together into communities.[60] "Why," he asks, "should other branches of commerce and industry be refused the same privilege?"[61] The *Mémoire* claims that the system of corporation is favorable to public morality, decent customs, sentiments of patriotism, and the spirit of

---

[58] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 20.

[59] Antoine Levacher-Du Plessis, "Requête au roi et mémoire sur la nécessité de rétablir les corps de marchands et les communautés des arts et de métiers, présentés à sa majesté le 16 septembre 1817 par les marchands et artisans de la ville de Paris," *Association catholique*, XVI (1883), 177.

[60] Ibid., 204.

[61] Ibid., 204-205.

the family, all of which are the source of the most sweet social virtues.[62] At the same time, these wise institutions exercise a useful surveillance on workers, maintain good faith between workers, uphold morality, and promote love of the sovereign and of the faith. Lastly, they allow a small patrimony to be handed down to the children of the artisan.[63]

The suppression of the corporations, on the other hand, has led to a "most shameful license" in the arts and trades. The *Mémoire* declares:

> …the domestic authority of the master is destroyed, and the insubordination of simple workers no longer has a bridle. The apprenticeship, so necessary for the propagation and for the perfection of the mechanical arts, is almost abandoned, because the regulations which determine the conditions and duration of it are no longer executed. Without skill in his art, without capital for taking the first steps in the trade, the journeyman hurries to establish himself as a master. Ignorance is thus introduced every day in the workshops, the workmanship degenerates, and commerce is inundated with badly manufactured works, which dishonor French Industry. [64]

Contrary to what Adam Smith thought, Levacher-DuPlessis asserts that the suppression of the guilds actually did lead to shoddy workmanship. Consequently, the victim is the consumer. Furthermore, it was observed that the abolition of the corporation isolated men from one another, dried up their hearts and led to the cold calculation of egoism.[65]

According to Levacher-DuPlessis, the corporation served the interests of the family and the community; for it accumulated a patrimony which was used to succor the

---

[62] Ibid., 208.

[63] Ibid., 175.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

widow, the aged, the indigent, and infirm, as well as the orphans.[66] The wise and irreproachable life of a guild member could lead to positions of leadership in the community.[67] Moreover, the *Mémoire* claims that the "system of corporations is essentially linked up with the principle of a limited monarchy."[68] The political theorist of absolutism, Jean Bodin, was quoted by Levacher-DuPlessis to emphasize this point. Bodin states:

> Just and legitimate monarchies are maintained by the middle stratum of well-governed corporations and communities; as the tyrant strives to abolish them, knowing well that the union of his subjects among themselves is his inevitable ruin.[69]

Drawing from this *Mémoire*, as well as other sources,[70] La Tour du Pin would stress the importance of corporations and other intermediate bodies as provisions for a limited monarchy and as an antidote to absolutism or tyranny.

4. Liberty of Work

Arising from the suppression of the guilds, the "liberty of work" subjected the workingman's labor and wages to the merciless law of supply and demand. The English

---

[66] Ibid., 206.

[67] Ibid., 205.

[68] Ibid., 204.

[69] Ibid., 204. Jean Bodin, *De la république*, bk. 3, ch. 7.

[70] Pierre-Paul Royer-Collard and Juan Donoso Cortés. For Royer-Collard's ideas on limited monarchy, see: Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines*, 48-67, 215. For Donoso Cortés' ideas on the means of checking absolutism, see: Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, "Donoso Cortés and the meaning of Political Power," *Intercollegiate Review*, 3, (Jan.-Feb. 1967): 109-127.

economist David Ricardo famously defined the price of labor. This was often denoted the "iron law of wages." Because of its importance, it will be quoted *in extenso*. He writes:

> *Labor*, like all other things which are purchased and sold, and which may be increased or diminished in quantity, has its *natural* and its *market price.* The *natural price of labor* is that price which is necessary to enable the laborers, one with another, to subsist and to perpetuate their race, without increase or diminution.
>
> …The *market price of labor* is the price which is really paid for it, from the natural operation of the proportion of the supply to the demand; labor is dear when it is scarce and cheap when it is plentiful. However much the *market price* may deviate from its *natural price*, it has, like commodities, a tendency to conform to it.
>
> …When the *market price of labor* is below its natural price, the condition of the laborers is most wretched: then poverty deprives them of those comforts which custom renders absolute necessaries. It is only *after their privations have reduced their number*, or the demand for labor has increased, that the market price of labor will rise to its natural price, and that the laborer will have the moderate comforts which the natural rate of wages will afford. [71]

Ricardo writes with the strictest detachment of the scientist—there is no empathy toward the worker at all, no concern about the justice of the situation; the matter is observed as dispassionately as the empirical results of a laboratory experiment. Notice especially his nonchalant description of starvation—the laborers deprived of "absolute necessaries," and death—"after their privations have reduced their number." Indeed, Ricardo's attitude may look insensitive, but others went further in their celebration of the "liberty of labor."

Arguing that poverty or wretchedness is an inevitable element of social progress and that it is compatible with as well as inseparable from civilization, the French liberal

---

[71] David Ricardo, *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1987), 52-53. The italicized emphasis is my own.

economist, Charles Dunoyer, writes:

> It is good that there exists in society certain lower places where families which do not conduct themselves well are liable to fall, and from where they are unable to recover except by resolution of conducting themselves well. Poverty is this formidable hell. It is an inevitable abyss, placed next to fools, spendthrifts, the dissolute, of all sorts of vicious men, in order to restrain them, if it is possible, in order to admit them and chastise them, if they do not know how to control themselves…. It is made to fill them with salutary fright. It encourages them to [practice] the difficult virtues which they need to reach a better condition. [72]

He writes as though poverty is the well-deserved punishment for vice. It does not occur to him that a workman of virtue may not be able to rise out of the depths of poverty. In line with his liberal view of matters, Dunoyer celebrates the "liberty of work" and "competition" and displays his annoyance with systems that promote the "organization of work" and the "association of workers." According to him, such systems lead down the path of impotence and confusion as exemplified by the Utopian socialists, Owen, Saint-Simon, and Fourier.[73] Dunoyer also condemns government intervention and he superficially concludes that the evils under which the working classes are suffering can be alleviated by expanding the system of liberty and competition.[74] Such thinking has no time for duties and responsibilities to one's fellow man.

A bit later, after Darwin published his *On the Origin of Species* (1859), Darwinism and Liberalism began to shore each other up. Parker Moon asks:

> If the struggle for existence has been demonstrated to be the agent of natural selection and biology,

---

[72] Charles Dunoyer, *De la liberté du travail, ou simple exposé des conditions dans lesquelles les forces humaines s'exercent avec le plus de puissance*, vol. 1 (Paris: Chez Guillaumin, Libraire, 1845), 457.

[73] Ibid., 435.

[74] Ibid., 448.

> why not also in human society? [75]

The British social theorist Herbert Spencer united Darwinism and Liberalism into a hybrid theory called Social Darwinism. It is he that coined the term "survival of the fittest" which is the logical outcome of the system of "unrestrained competition." [76] In a very scientifically detached passage, Spencer lays out his own certain truth. He states:

> That organisms which live, thereby prove themselves fit to live, in so far as they have been tried; while organisms which die, thereby prove themselves in some respects unfitted for living; are facts no less manifest, than is the fact that this self-acting purification of a species, must tend ever to ensure adaptation between it and its environment….That the average vigor of any race would be diminished, did the diseased and feeble habitually survive and propagate; and that the destruction of such, through failure to fulfill some of the conditions to life, leaves behind those which are able to fulfill the conditions to life, and thus keeps up the average fitness to the conditions of life; are almost self-evident truths.[77]

This appears to reflect a resurgent pagan outlook on social matters. It is somewhat reminiscent of the ancient Spartans placing handicapped, crippled, diseased, or weak children on the side of a hill to die by exposure like so much "human garbage." Spencer's approach is amoral and scientific; it is among the first buds of the later rotten fruits of racism and eugenics. According to him, the survival of the weak and the

---

[75] Parker Thomas Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France: A Study in the History of Social Politics* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921), 13.

[76] The American cultural and economic critic Wendell Berry chastises the proponents of competition soundly for claiming that human beings should live by the same laws as brute animals. No distinction is made between them. Berry comments, "The great fault of this approach to things is that it is so drastically reductive; it does not permit us to live and work as human beings, as the best of our inheritance defines us. Rats and roaches live by competition under the law of supply and demand; it is the privilege of human beings to live under the laws of justice and mercy. It is impossible not to notice how little the proponents of the ideal of competition have to say about honesty, which is the fundamental economic virtue, and how very little they have to say about community, compassion, and mutual help." Wendell Berry, *What Are People For?* (New York: North Point Press, 1990), 135.

[77] Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Biology*, vol. I (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1875), 445.

diseased dilute the vigor of the race; nature itself reaps and winnows where it wishes. In an earlier work, *Social Statics*, Spencer maintains that the principle of non-intervention is the best approach to managing the miseries of one's fellow human beings. It is in humanity's best interest. In his description of the "large, far-seeing benevolence" weeding-out of weaker human beings, one almost sees a glimpse of Adam Smith's invisible hand helping matters along their natural course. Spencer relates:

> Meanwhile the well-being of existing humanity, and the unfolding of it into this ultimate perfection, are both secured by that same beneficent, though severe discipline, to which the animate creation at large is subject: a discipline which is pitiless in the working out of good: a felicity-pursuing law which never swerves for the avoidance of partial and temporary suffering. The poverty of the incapable, the distresses that come upon the imprudent, the starvation of the idle, and those shoulderings aside of the weak by the strong, which leave so many "in shallows and in miseries," are the decrees of a large, far-seeing benevolence. It seems hard that an unskilfulness which with all his efforts he cannot overcome, should entail hunger upon the artizan. It seems hard that a labourer incapacitated by sickness from competing with his stronger fellows, should have to bear the resulting privations. It seems hard that widows and orphans should be left to struggle for life or death. Nevertheless, when regarded not separately, but in connection with the interests of universal humanity, these harsh fatalities are seen to be full of the highest beneficence—the same beneficence which brings to early graves the children of diseased parents, and singles out the low-spirited, the intemperate, and the debilitated as the victims of an epidemic.[78]

Why attempt to obstruct the laws of nature by ethical justice and Christian charity? Why help widows and orphans as they struggle? Why help the working classes who are destitute and barely able to take care of their most basic needs? Why attempt to provide workers with days of rest, limited working hours, better working conditions, better living conditions, and even insurance? Spencer sees no role for the State in helping alleviate human misery. In fact, State intervention acts as an obstacle for it "artificially preserves"

---

[78] Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics: or, The Conditions essential to Happiness specified, and the First of them Developed* (London: John Chapman, 1851), 322-323.

the helpless.[79] If the weak cannot survive on their own, they ought to die. This is nineteenth century individualism at its worst. It is within this corrosive environment that the social Catholics found themselves. They would combat such thinking tirelessly and mightily until opinion began to change.

Economic liberals saw the State as a menace to the free play of economic forces. Many adherents of liberalism denied the effects of original sin, especially selfishness and the "unquenchable thirst for riches and temporal goods."[80] By nature man was understood to be good and his individual actions would naturally tend toward the benefit of the community. For these theorists, the economic law of supply and demand is similar to the law of universal gravitation. The laws which apply to man's relations with his fellow men in human society are no different than the physical laws of the universe. It was a rigorous formulation. Just as there were the physical laws of the universe so also were there social laws which could be discovered and even quantified. These liberal economists celebrate the autonomy of economics; it is no longer considered a subsidiary science of ethics, concerned primarily with the virtue of justice, both commutative and distributive.

Certain liberals wanted no state interference in international trade—they saw protectionism as a throwback to the mercantilist era. They advocated for free exchange.

---

[79] Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism* (New York: Knopf, 1977), 8.

[80] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 132, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1903-1939*, vol. 3, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 436.

At the same time they wanted no domestic government intervention in the relations between owners and workers. Nevertheless, the liberals demonstrate an inconsistency with their one-sided conception of freedom. Although they saw no problem with employers being "free" to treat their workers as slaves in all but name, they would not tolerate the workers being "free" to associate and therefore "free" to strike. Likewise, they would not sanction the State's right to be "free" to intervene on the workers' behalf. In other words, the employers were in a position of superior force vis-à-vis the worker, yet they would prevent a coalition of workers or the State itself from using external pressure against them.

Judging state intervention as inefficient and unproductive, liberals demonstrated that they were not really concerned about a moral economic system or the dignity of the human person; rather, they showed solicitude only for utility and the notion of profit. Catholic economic liberals also frowned on state intervention in the economy; nevertheless, they did believe that the State should intervene to eradicate manifest abuses. They encouraged workers to practice the virtues of thrift and self-control and urged employers to lend a generous hand to the workers in the spirit of Christian charity. On account of “honoring man’s free will,” they not did believe that the State should force owners to be “generous.” Rather, owners should voluntarily demonstrate solicitude for the working classes. Summarizing the main ideas of the French physiocrats who developed the tenets of economic liberalism, Igino Giordani remarks:

> Their point of departure was Rousseau’s theory that man is naturally good and therefore, to attain well-being in life, has only to follow his natural impulses; thus they fashioned even an economic law that would give absolute freedom to the development of these impulses. *Laissez-faire:* the State

> was to remain indifferent to economic conditions, confining itself to the protection of this freedom among its citizens.[81]

Left untrammeled by the State and unthwarted by associations of workers such as guilds, economic liberals, wanting in human charity, began destroying the foundations of human society. Workmen, the possessors of so many abstract rights, were often treated worse than beasts. A wise farmer or even a prudent slaveholder would not treat his property, whether beast or slave, as poorly as many a factory owner treated his workers. Having invested in their "property," the farmer or slaveholder would attempt to derive the maximum benefit from it. Workers, however, were seen as an expendable commodity. If one worker was too weak to work or had died because of poor treatment, there would always be a large supply of potential workers to fill his shoes.

Although social Catholics and socialists did not agree on the nature of man or on the solution to the worker problem, their critique of liberal capitalism had much in common. With his rhetorical flourish, Karl Marx probably captures better than anyone else the essence of the bourgeoisie. Many social Catholics would find no disagreement with much of the following:

> The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his 'natural superiors,' and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment.' It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it

---

[81] Igino Giordani, *The Social Message of Jesus*, trans. Alba I. Zizzami (Boston, MA: Daughters of St. Paul, 1977), 2.

has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.[82]

5. Situation of Workers and the Response of the Church

"For you always have the poor with you." (Mark 14:7, RSV) Many nineteenth century churchmen[83] and conservative laymen understood these words of Christ to confirm the current social order of things, i.e., the division of society into rich and poor.[84] No doubt they saw the duty to contribute to the needs of the poor by charity, but they did not see the poor as victims of injustice whose miserable state should be changed for the better.[85] As a matter of fact, some of them, such as Bishop Freppel of Angers, were suspicious of those who wished to use government intervention to alter the social landscape and usher in a more just social order. They saw this as "state socialism."[86]

The Church was unprepared to deal with the situation of the proletariat. Industrial capitalism was something of an innovation in the social and economic arenas. Before the Reformation, in the now Protestant countries, and before the French Revolution in the more recently Catholic countries, the Church performed many social services, including

---

[82] Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, 82.

[83] For a recent work on the relations between the workers and the Catholic Church during the last two-thirds of the nineteenth century and the first forty years of the twentieth century, see: Pierre Pierrard, *L'Église et les ouvriers en France, 1840-1940* (Paris: Hachette, 1984).

[84] Paul Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), 35, 40.

[85] Ibid., 40.

[86] Ibid., 208.

education at the primary, secondary, and university levels. The Church managed charitable operations such as hospitals, orphanages, and houses for fallen women. The religious orders of men and women were the backbone of many of these services. They provided these services with a personal touch rather than out of philanthropic utility.

Nevertheless, after the Reformation and the Revolution respectively, the Church was stripped of its property and could no longer effectively contribute to these social services as before. The French secular clergy received a state pittance through provisions of the Concordat of 1801 so that they could perform the services of the cult. Religious orders (associations), however, were not recognized by the Concordat and they had to survive on private donations. A Church without economic independence or property was ultimately a Church with little social and political power. The Church was more and more denied any role in society at large and was restricted to the purely religious sphere.

On account of industrial capitalism, the urban poor of the nineteenth century were in a much different situation than the poor of earlier times. To call them poor may well be an understatement; truly they were paupers, for they were destitute, lacking not only luxuries, but in many cases necessities as well.

Prior to the industrial era, most work was done by people out of their home or nearby fields. The family was not the nuclear family of today which includes father, mother, and children. It was the extended family which certainly included the nuclear family and then some. It often also included grandparents, unmarried aunts and uncles, perhaps even married uncles, and even cousins. They may have had separate dwellings,

but they lived together on the same property. As the family home was the primary locus of production as well as of consumption, strong bonds and ties were formed between all members of a family as they worked together.[87] This may refer to farmers living on rural domains as well as craftsmen who dwelled in urban areas. Oftentimes, in the town, the workshop was attached to the home or on the street level, whereas the living quarters were on the second level. As men begin to work in factories, they left their homes for purposes of production. Consequently, production moved outside the home and into the factory workshop. In many cases the strong family ties are broken now that family members are not closely working together. As a matter of fact, within the industrial environment, husbands and wives begin to compete against each other in the labor market at the same time that parents and children also begin to compete against each other. This, of course, will lead to a certain disintegration of family life. Remarking on this sate of affairs, Allan Carlson states:

> The reciprocal complementary tasks of husbands and wives in household production were quickly leveled, and questions grew about gender roles in the new order. Older children, too, could forgo the obedience demanded by lineage and birth and sell their own labor to manufacturers. In the industrial milieu, the inward-looking, autonomous, cooperative family changed into a collection of individuals in potential, and often real, competition with each other.[88]

This is especially true of those who came from a rural background and moved into the city. If there is any place where there could be ties and bonds maintained through production, it would be the factory. Nevertheless, in most factories, during the early and

---

[87] Allan C. Carlson, *From Cottage to Work Station: The Family's Search for Social Harmony in the Industrial Age* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 1-2, 10.

[88] Ibid., 2.

mid-nineteenth century, association was not allowed. Consequently, the workers were unorganized and isolated, with no strong bonds of solidarity formed among them.

Many young peasants from the provinces and rural areas left their secure family life and moved to the cities searching for work in the growing industries.[89] They often were dislocated and rootless.[90] Many stopped practicing their faith.[91] As Gordon Wright points out, "Alcoholism and promiscuity were common;…illiteracy among the workers was almost universal."[92] Those who were lucky enough to be employed worked extremely long hours in unsanitary and unsafe conditions and were not allowed any Sunday rest. Family life among the poor was almost unknown, for mothers and children worked long hours to help their husbands and fathers make ends meet. This was a new social development.[93] Certain clergymen refused to take an interest in the plight of these urban poor, thereby remaining totally out of touch with their needs. Others, while disbursing charity to these people, did not recognize the injustice of the prevailing

---

[89] For a description of the life of industrial working-class families in the first half of nineteenth century France and the social policies directed at them, see: Katherine A. Lynch, *Family, Class, and Ideology in Early Industrial France: Social Policy and the Working-Class Family, 1825-1848* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988).

[90] Joseph Moody, "The Dechristianization of the French Working Class," *Review of Politics,* 20, no. 1 (1958): 63.

[91] Ibid., 50.

[92] Wright, *France in Modern Times,* 172.

[93] Moon, *The Labor Problem,* 1.

economic order.[94]

In the case of most employers and employees, there were no social bonds. Often treated as a beast, the employee performed an unskilled task for small reward, toiled for extremely long hours, and often worked in unhealthy conditions.[95] Because employers did not have social ties to their workmen, many of them showed no interest in the physical or moral welfare of the employee and his family. Instead, they were merely interested in the productive efficiency of their workers so that they could realize a handsome profit. Alexis de Tocqueville captures well the disparity between the "old aristocracy" and its workers and the "new aristocracy" and its workers. He depicts these differences thus:

> The workman is generally dependent on the master, but not on any particular master; these two men meet in factory, but do not know each other elsewhere; and while they come into contact on one point, they stand very far apart on all others. The manufacturer asks nothing of the workman but his labor; the workman expects nothing from him but his wages. The one contracts no obligation to protect nor the other to defend, and they are not permanently connected either by habit or by duty. The aristocracy created by business rarely settles in the midst of the manufacturing population which it directs; the object is not to govern that population, but to use it. An aristocracy thus constituted can have no great hold upon those whom it employs, and even if it succeeds in retaining them at one moment, they escape the next, …
>
> The territorial aristocracy of former ages was either bound by law, or thought itself bound by usage, to come to the relief of its serving-men and to relieve their distresses. But the manufacturing aristocracy of our age first impoverishes and debases the men who serve it and then abandons them to be supported by the charity of the public. This is a natural consequence of what has been said before. Between the workman and the master there are frequent relations, but no real association.[96]

The economic liberal, the intellectual offspring of the eighteenth century

---

[94] McManners, *Church and State in France*, 30-31.

[95] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 1.

[96] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, trans. Henry Reeve (New York: Vintage Books, 1945), bk. 2, ch. 2, 170-171.

physiocrats, disapproved of government intervention on behalf of the workers and promoted a laissez-faire attitude regarding economic matters. On the other hand, the rising group of socialists sympathized with the misery of the workers and sought out regular government intervention on economic matters; the more extreme socialists wanted total government control of all capital and industries in the country. None of these groups was really interested in the moral or spiritual well-being of either workers or owners. Liberals defended the wealth of the owners and the socialists guarded the material interests of the worker. At this time a number of Catholic social thinkers were influenced more or less by either liberal thinkers or by socialist thinkers. Nevertheless, others rejected both extremes and formulated their own organic doctrine, while at the same time focusing not just on the material interests of owner and worker, but primarily concentrating on their moral and spiritual well being. Unlike their liberal and socialist opponents, they were not partisans, but rather defended both parties in the name of the common good.

CHAPTER 2.

FORERUNNERS IN THE SOCIAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT

A. The Early Pioneers

Félicité de Lamennais, in 1822, is the first French Catholic who displayed a theoretical awareness of the problems of industrialism. He is rightly described as the founder of French social[1] Catholicism.[2] Before he founded the journal *L'Avenir*, he wrote critically of the evils produced by industrialization in both the moral and social environment. However, two of his collaborators at *L'Avenir*, Charles de Coux and Philippe Gerbet, consistently wrote on matters of social Catholicism while Lamennais primarily devoted himself to liberal Catholicism. Gerbet was something of a socialist in the early 1830's although he would later, as a bishop, acquire a very conservative point of view.[3] De Coux reproached the capitalists for their greed and was an early proponent of

---

[1] For an overview of these men and their work in the early period of social Catholicism in English, see: Alec R. Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism, 1820-1920* (London: SPCK, 1964). For a brief treatment of the principal social Catholic leaders written during the 1930s, see: Henry Somerville, *Studies in the Catholic Social Movement* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1933; repr., Norfolk, VA: IHS Press, 2010). For the most recent and scholarly treatment of social Catholicism in the nineteenth century, see: Paul Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War* (New York: Crossroad, 1991). The standard work on the earlier period of social Catholicism is in French. See: J. B. Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social en France, 1822-1870* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951). For an older work on social Catholicism which is still useful, see: Georges Goyau, *Autour du catholicisme social*, 5 vols. (Paris: Perrin, 1897-1912).

[2] Alec R. Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism, 1820-1920* (London: SPCK, 1964), 4, 7.

[3] Owen Chadwick, *A History of the Popes, 1830-1914* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1998), 169-170. As bishop of Perpignan, he would later be a consultor for and a drafter of the *Syllabus errorum* of Pope Pius IX.

trade unions and limited working hours. In order to remedy the workers' plight, De Coux advocated universal suffrage.[4]

Beginning in the 1830's another social Catholic arose, this time from the conservative legitimist camp. Viscount Alban Villeneuve-Bargemont[5] had held administrative posts under the First Empire and the Restoration Monarchy. J. B. Duroselle states that, "he is truly the initiator of social Catholicism in the conservative surroundings."[6] He was a legitimist who was well acquainted with economic thought and he wrote many books on this subject including the *Traité d'économie politique chrétienne.* He attacked both Adam Smith and Jean-Baptiste Say, who promoted, in his view, a one-sided approach to economics. Whereas both Smith and Say stressed increased production of goods, Villeneuve-Bargemont, being more concerned for the welfare of the laborer, emphasized the distribution of wealth and property.[7] Say, for instance, wished to increase the needs of the people so as to increase consumption on their part. This, in turn, would lead to greater production. Villeneuve-Bargemont felt that this resulted in unregulated development of industrial production, leading to the

---

[4] Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism,* 7-10. For more on the life of Lamennais, see: Alec R. Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy: A Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Revolution* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954).

[5] For a good introduction to the life and thought of Villeneuve-Bargemont, see: Sister Mary Ignatius Ring, *Villeneuve-Bargemont, Precursor of Modern Social Catholicism, 1784-1850* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1935).

[6] Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social,* 70.

[7] Moon, *The Labor Problem,* 21.

production of goods which satisfied artificially created and immoral needs.[8] Creating luxury goods at a cheap price was not what the worker needed. The worker really required necessities at a low price.[9] Villeneuve-Bargemont realized early on that many of the ills of the workers were attributed not only to selfish employers, but also to the industrial environment. This led him to become an advocate of social legislation which would mollify the workers' life. He argued that the workers were owed a "just wage" which he equated with a "family wage." By promoting vocational schools, provident banks and corporations as well as advocating factory legislation which required safe working conditions, Villeneuve-Bargemont proved himself a major figure of the early period of social Catholicism.[10]

From 1850 to 1870, French Social Catholicism was dominated by conservatives. After the *Coup d'État* of 1851 by Louis Napoleon, the progressive wing of social Catholicism fell out of favor. Among these progressives are some illustrious names, such as Henri Lacordaire, Frédéric Ozanam, Henri Maret, and Philippe Buchez.[11] Their work was seminal for the advent of Christian democracy.[12] Although they did make some

---

[8] One might see this as an early type of consumerism condemned by Pope Paul VI in both *Populorum progressio* (no. 19) and *Evangelii nuntiandi* (no. 55.5), and later by Pope John Paul II in *Redemptor hominis* (no. 16.2), *Sollicitudo rei socialis* (no. 28), and *Centesimus annus* (nos. 19.4 and 36).

[9] Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social*, 65.

[10] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 21-23.

[11] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 52-55, 57-60, 84-87.

[12] Ibid., 87-90.

important contributions to social Catholicism, their work was marginal in the development of La Tour du Pin's brand of social Catholicism. Whereas these progressives believed that the workers should learn to lead themselves, conservatives, like La Tour du Pin, felt that the upper classes should direct the working classes. This management or leading of the working classes by the ruling classes is called *patronage*. Paul Misner explains *patronage* as:

> … a club or organization set up by members of the *classes dirigeantes* or at least by the moderately well-off for members of the *classes inférieures*, who, it will be remembered, neither had the vote (until 1848) nor were allowed to form any sort of organization on their own, even if they had the leisure or the means.[13]

Together with Villeneuve-Bargemont, Viscount Armand de Melun, who was influenced by the former, would be the second great leader of conservative social Catholicism. He developed the *patronage* model. Although not a man of theory, he was a man of practicable charitable works. He saw the *patronage* model as a means of "social regeneration no longer by force or science, but by charity."[14] In addition, he also said, "…it is necessary to make oneself the intermediary between the poor and the institutions erected for nourishing him, instructing him and defending him."[15] He wished all social classes to be involved in this work.[16] Concerning his accomplishments, Alec Vidler comments:

---

[13] Ibid., 63.

[14] Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social*, 186.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

> Among his achievements was the formation of something like a charity organization society, which prevented wasteful overlapping and ill-advised forms of charity. It set itself to study scientifically the best methods of serving the poor and of improving their conditions. He also founded a journal, *Annales de la Charité*, which served as an organ for the discussion of these questions and for the diffusion of good ideas. Villeneuve-Bargemont collaborated with him on this.[17]

In addition to the social Catholics already mentioned, other nineteenth-century clerical pioneers included Mgr. Affre, the Archbishop of Paris and Abbé Auguste Ledeuille.[18]

In the next few sections of this paper, I will examine the thought of five important social thinkers who all made serious contributions to the development of La Tour du Pin's social Catholic thought. The work of Louis de Bonald, Fréderic Le Play,[19] Émile Keller, and Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler specifically influenced La Tour du Pin's social vision in a positive manner. On the other hand, the ideas of Charles Périn carried less weight with him. Nevertheless, the tensions and disagreements between Périn and his followers and La Tour du Pin and his followers would help the latter better articulate his social vision.

B. Louis de Bonald

Louis-Gabriel-Amboise de Bonald[20] (1754-1840) was a French nobleman of the

---

[17] Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism,* 28.

[18] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 67-70.

[19] La Tour du Pin will have his disagreements with Le Play's thought as well. For Le Play is fundamentally an economic liberal like Périn. Nevertheless, Le Play's views on social hierarchies, the family, and testamentary freedom are positively received by La Tour du Pin.

[20] For information on the life and thought of Louis de Bonald, see: David Klinck, *The French Counterrevolutionary Theorist Louis de Bonald, 1754-1840* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996); Michel Toda,

Rouergue who, early in life, served as a soldier, but later became one of the leading counter-Revolutionary theorists in the nineteenth century. He also had practical experience as a statesman in that he served as mayor of his local town of Millau, as deputy to the Assembly from Aveyron, and finally as a peer of France. According to the sociologist Robert Nisbet, Bonald was also the first great French writer to distinguish between the State and society.[21] Furthermore, he would become one of the foundational theorists of what later would become the science of sociology. His own particular contributions would focus on families, intermediate bodies, and forms of social control.[22] Bonald's magnum opus is the *Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux dans la societé civile*. In this work he examines 1) domestic authority and political authority, 2) religious authority, 3) social education,[23] and public administration. At the same time that he was

---

Louis de Bonald: Théoricien de la contre-révolution (Étampes, France: Clovis, 1997); Henri Moulinié, *De Bonald: la vie, la carrière politique, la doctrine* (Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1916; New York: Arno Press, 1979); Jules Gritti, *Bonald, la révolution française et le réveil religieux* ([Paris]: Bloud & Gay, [1962]). For an examination of Bonald's contributions to social thought, see: Robert A. Nisbet, *The Social Group in French Thought* (New York: Arno Press, 1980), 100-130. For the complete works of Bonald in French, see: Louis de Bonald, *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne, 3 vols. (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859). Most of Bonald's larger works have remained untranslated. Nevertheless, in recent years a number of his shorter works have been translated into English. In particular, Nicholas Davidson has brought Bonald's work *Du divorce, consideré au XIXe siècle* into English. See: Louis de Bonald, *On Divorce*, trans. and ed. Nicholas Davidson (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1992). Christopher Blum has also translated and edited a number of his shorter treatises in two recent publications. See: Christopher O. Blum, ed., *Critics of the Enlightenment: Readings in the French Counter-Revolutionary Tradition* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2004), 43-129 and Louis de Bonald, *The True & Only Wealth of Nations: Essays on Family, Economy & Society*, ed. Christopher O. Blum (Naples, FL: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University, 2006).

[21] Robert A. Nisbet, *The Social Group in French Thought* (New York: Arno Press, 1980), 129.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Here he is referring to schools, corporations, communes, provinces, etc.

guiding influence over later sociologists, he also influenced the leading lights of social Catholic thought. La Tour du Pin was an avid admirer of Bonald and his writings. Nisbet notes:

> From Bonald two strands take their departure. On the one hand, beginning with Lammenais, is the Social Catholic movement; on the other, beginning with Comte, is Sociology.[24]

As an inveterate opponent of individualism, Bonald is adamant that society is prior to the individual man. He states that man does not constitute society, but rather society constitutes man by means of social education.[25] Furthermore, he claims that "man only exists for society, and society only educates him for itself."[26] As Bonald claims that man exists for the purpose and good of society, he will not be emphasizing individual rights, but rather duties and responsibilities towards society.

Bonald's views on authority are central to his social thought. He states that authority is unitary, independent, and definitive. While he maintains authority may have multiple functions, "its essence is to be one."[27] He adroitly utilizes Christ's words in Matt. 12: 25[28] and Luke 11:17[29] as a comment on why authority should not be divided.[30]

---

[24] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 129-130.

[25] Louis de Bonald, « Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux dans la societé civile » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 1:123.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Louis de Bonald, « Démonstration philosophique du principe constitutif de la societé » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 1:55.

[28] "Knowing their thoughts, he said to them, 'Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand.'" (Matt. 12:25 RSV) The word "kingdom" in English is translated from the Greek word *basilea*. This word can be translated as "kingdom," but it can also mean "royal power." See: *basilea* in *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.*

According to Bonald, authority must be indivisible; the division of authority weakens it and ultimately destroys it. Next, he states that "authority is essentially independent" for if it is dependent on something else it ceases to be an authority.[31] It, therefore, has to stand on its own. Furthermore, Bonald asserts that "power is definitive," for if an authority cannot definitively require obedience, it is ultimately not independent, because it may be disobeyed in order to serve a greater authority.[32]

In disclosing his core opposition to centralized state power, Bonald states that authority must be divided among various groups in societies, such as the family, religion (Church), and the State.[33] Commenting on Bonald's attitude towards authority, Robert Nisbet states:

> Bonald is anxious to separate *spheres* of authority. The exercise of control should be a function of social responsibilities; and just as society tends naturally to a diversification of responsibilities, so also should *pouvoir*[34] be a diversified and pluralistic process.[35]

Bonald, therefore, is a proponent of the decentralization of authority. He does not

---

[29] "But he, knowing their thoughts, said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and house falls upon house. (Luke 11:17 RSV). See note 27 above.

[30] Bonald, « Démonstration philosophique », 1:55.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Louis de Bonald, « Pensées sur l'économie sociale » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 3:1281.

[34] From the context, it appears that the best translation of Bonald's *pouvoir* is "authority" rather than "power." Authority is a species of power and it conveys the nuance of "legitimacy" and "moral right" which power does not. Hence, I have translated *pouvoir* as "authority" in Bonald's writings. For it is clear that he is referring to the legitimate exercise of power based on moral right.

[35] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 129.

recognize a sole locus of authority in the State, but recognizes multiple loci of authority within society. In his view, authority should not be consolidated in one social structure, but spread out over a large number of social bodies. It follows, therefore, that all authority should not be concentrated in the State. As Nisbet notes, the exercise of authority depends upon social responsibilities. It is social responsibilities, therefore, which legitimate authority. In discussing the father of a family, the master of a workshop, judgments of court, orders of a military leader, or the decrees of legislative bodies, Bonald states that they are

> each in their sphere the absolute and definitive authority, and more absolute if the authority is collective; and, if all these authorities cannot demand obedience, every domestic or political society, even every association of interests, would be impossible.[36]

In other words, there can be no true societies if the authorities are unable to require obedience from members of groups. Furthermore, Bonald adumbrates the principle of subsidiarity. Within their proper spheres, each authority should be definitive and its own authority should not be absorbed by a greater or higher authority. Each authority has a definitive role to play in exercising power within its proper sphere of competence.

Bonald states that the greatest of all authorities is sovereignty. According to him, it is the supreme authority, above all others. Furthermore, he maintains that sovereignty "gives being and impetus to all the subordinate authorities."[37] Bonald points out that all

---

[36] Bonald, « Démonstration philosophique », 1:57.

[37] Louis de Bonald, « Du gouvernement représentatif » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 2:891.

ancient and modern societies have understood that "supreme universal authority," i.e., sovereignty, belongs to God alone. He cites St. Paul's quotation[38] in Romans 13:1 in support of this. Those who now claim that sovereignty is an attribute of the people would logically make the people God.[39] Given that sovereignty belongs to God alone, only He has centralized authority; all human authority must be decentralized.[40]

Bonald holds that the family is the basic unit of society. Families constitute the elements of political society and every man is a member of a family.[41] Being a member of a family is what gives the "individual" importance. As mentioned earlier, however, the family is also an autonomous society in and of itself. Concerning its own sphere of competence, authority within the family is definitive. Bonald states:

> …the State exists after the family, by the family, for the family, and is constituted as the family. The domestic authority is, in its domestic action, as much authority, that is to say, as independent as the public power in its public action.[42]

Whereas the State is a society for the production and conservation of families, Bonald maintains that the domestic society or the family is a society for the production and conservation of individuals.[43] According to Bonald, the family existed before the State

---

[38] "For there is no authority except from God." Rom. 13:1, RSV.

[39] Bonald, « Du gouvernement représentatif », 2:891.

[40] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 108.

[41] Bonald, « Théorie du pouvoir », 1:163.

[42] Louis de Bonald, « Du perfectionnement de l'homme » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 2:200.

[43] Bonald, « Démonstration philosophique », 1:46.

and can exist without the State. On the contrary, the State existed after the family and cannot exist without the family.[44] This is a clear assertion of the priority of the family over the State.

Bonald maintains that that the family is monogamous; it is formed by the marriage of one man and one woman. Following this, he points out that polygamy or successive marriages does not produce a family, but rather families, as each wife has her own family. He considers divorce a type of successive polygamy in that a man has several wives, all of whom are living at the same time.[45] Bonald is adamantly opposed to divorce. Marriage, he says, cannot be treated as any ordinary contract. It is a society. When two people "terminate" a marriage, they cannot move back to the same state in which they were before forming the marriage.[46] He states that the man, the wife, and the children are indissolubly united. The natural law has made this a duty and it has founded this elementary society on a basis which is not as fragile as the mere affections of man.[47]

His biographer, Henri Moulinié, asserts that Bonald saw divorce as the most serious attack on the constitution of the family.[48] He understood divorce as more base

---

[44] Bonald, « Pensées sur l'économie sociale », 3:1282.

[45] Bonald, « Démonstration philosophique », 1:39.

[46] Louis de Bonald, « Du divorce » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 2:97.

[47] Ibid., 2:43.

[48] Henri Moulinié, *De Bonald: la vie, la carrière politique, la doctrine* (Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1916), 290.

than polygamy, even though he saw divorce as specific type of polygamy. Bonald viewed divorce as contrary to nature and to decency in that it allows the union of one woman with several men. Whereas polygamy itself does not separate children from their parents, divorce causes the separation of children from their father or mother.[49] Finally, divorce provides legal avenues whereby people can satisfy their passions. Rather than learning to curb and thwart their passions, they are habituated to gratify them, albeit "legally." In fact, it leads men to desire their neighbor's wife by giving them the idea that they have "the possibility of obtaining it."[50] The division and scandal caused by divorce will unleash terrible disorders in society.[51] Moulinié sums up Bonald's opposition to divorce by declaring that Bonald is interested in preserving the rights and the good of society over the rights and the happiness of individuals. In short, it is better that some individuals suffer rather than the whole of society.[52]

Regarding the domestic authority, Bonald notes that it is one. It is indivisible. As an advocate of strong paternal authority, he maintains that the father of the family holds the authority and the child is the subject. It is the duty of the child to obey, plain and simple. The mother is understood, in political terms, as a "minister" who transmits the authority of the father to the child. She has the duty to obey the authority, i.e., the father,

---

[49] Ibid., 291.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid., 291.

[52] Ibid., 296.

so that she is authorized to command the subject, i.e., the child. Bonald works out a mathematical proportion for this. He claims that the man is to the wife as the wife is to the child.[53] The wife is, therefore, a sort of social middle term. As we will see, La Tour du Pin believes that the mother has a more important role than Bonald would allot her. He maintains that she should be the counselor of her husband and the husband should undertake nothing without her counsel.

Bonald stresses that the paternal authority of the father is perpetual over his children. The child is always to be considered a minor vis-à-vis his parents within the family even if he is considered "of age" by the State. The paternal authority of the father is continued on after his death by means of his testamentary arrangement. Even further, it is carried on by the right of primogeniture where the eldest living son acts as head of the family or as a "father" to his younger brethren. The father's authority is independent and definitive.[54] La Tour du Pin's ideas on this will closely mimic Bonald. He will critique the new order which places a son, who has reached adulthood, on the same footing as the father. According to La Tour du Pin, this is unseemly as the father has many more responsibilities than his now adult son. It is responsibilities that provide the justification for exercising authority. Both Bonald and La Tour du Pin, who was influenced by him, are proponents of this idea.

Bonald is also a great opponent of the law of forced division of property into

---

[53] Bonald, « Démonstration philosophique », 1:44-46.

[54] Ibid., 1:44.

equal shares at the death of the father of a family. Recognizing the traditional wisdom of the Hebrews and Romans as well as of the English, Germans, and Spanish, Bonald observes that they all recognized the perpetuity of the family, the conservation of family property, entail, and the right of primogeniture.[55] In the past, the eldest son inherited the land, but his younger brothers had the right to work it and live off of it. It was truly family property. Within a rural setting, a father of a family has a strong attachment to the land upon which he works. By cultivating and working his land, he attempts to improve the property which he has received from his ancestors. Consequently, he tries to pass it on to his descendants in a better condition than he received it. Such fathers observe with sorrow and bitterness that the equality of division will dissipate the family property. The family property might find its way into the hand of strangers, possibly even an enemy.[56]

This forced division of property brings to pass a plethora of problems. For instance, it creates a situation where no one is willing to improve the land when the parents get on in age. No son is willing to stay on the family farm to help the parents with the work for free. Why would one son improve the land when his brothers will receive an equal share of it when their parents die? This forced division often led children to curse the father if he sold some of the land piece by piece to take care of his needs. For they feel that they have lost part of their patrimony. It might also lead to legal

---

[55] Louis de Bonald, « Du la famille agricole, de la famille industrielle, et du droit d'ainesse », in Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 2:252-253.

[56] Ibid., 2:253.

battles between brothers over the division. Bonald mentions that men's hearts end up becoming more divided than the parceled-up property.[57] In summarizing a few more of the injurious effects on the family, Robert Nisbet adds:

> Furthermore, the division of property weakens its value, when the whole has been a functional unit. It destroys the certainty of security which has always been the great merit of the family.[58]

With regard to the role of religion[59] in society, Bonald emphasizes the autonomy of religious society and its freedom from state control.[60] He states, "Religion ought thus to constitute the State, and it is against the nature of things that the State constitute religion."[61] He claims[62] that "religion is the grounds of every society, since outside of it,

---

[57] Ibid., 2:253-254.

[58] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 122.

[59] Bonald's use of the word religion can often be understood as "religious society." In that sense it refers to the Church.

[60] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 114-115.

[61] Louis de Bonald, « Législation primitive considérée dans les derniers temps par les seules lumières de la raison », in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 1:1260.

[62] Bonald was one of the founders of traditionalism with Felicité de Lammenais. According to this philosophical system, human reason is incapable of knowing, with absolute certainty, fundamental truths concerning religion, morality, the political order, and metaphysics. It is only through God's special revelation (at a very early point in history) and by an act of faith that we accept these truths as they are transmitted to us by society. Insofar as they are handed down to us through society by "common-sense" or common agreement, they are traditional. The Church, of course denies this, for certain truths can be known by reason as well as by faith. Examples of this would be the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul, and the freedom of man. The Church also teaches that reason precedes faith and it leads man to faith with the aid of revelation and grace. Traditionalism was condemned by the Church. For a description of French Traditionalism within nineteenth century theology, see: Gerard McCool, *Nineteenth Century Scholasticism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989), 37-58. In particular, pages 40-43 of this work focus on the contributions of Bonald. For the magisterial condemnations of Traditionalism, see: Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, nos. 1622, 1627, 1649-1652.

one can find neither the grounds of any authority, nor of any duties."[63] This, of course, denies the fact, that while all authority comes from God, political authority in the temporal order is independent of religion and can be grounded in reason.

Bonald thought that the State and the Church should work together in a balanced and harmonious manner. Each should exercise authority in their proper spheres. Each should respect the other's proper authority. Each should defend the other as well. The two powers are separate, but interdependent. He declares:

> Thus, the State ought to obey religion and the ministers of religion ought to obey the State in everything which it commands conformable to the laws of religion, and religion itself ought not to command anything which is not conformable to the best laws of the State.
>
> By this order of relations, religion defends the authority of the State, and the State defends the authority of religion.[64]

As a strong defender of religious bodies, e.g., religious orders and charitable associations, Bonald asserts that they should be legally recognized and entitled to own property.[65]

According to Bonald, religion also plays a very important role in succoring men during their time on earth. He points out that Church property exists to aid the weak. This includes those who are weak on account of their age, sex, or condition. First of all, children are provided with a social and religious education by the Church. Next, the Church provides sanctuaries for young people who wish to remove themselves from the

---

[63] Bonald, « Législation primitive », 1:1260.

[64] Ibid., 1:1261.

[65] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 115-116.

world or who have been rejected by the world.[66] Lastly, Bonald provides examples of how the Church has succored people on account of the weakness of their condition. Among other things, religion does the following:

> It instructs the people, assists the needy, comforts the sick, and does not even abandon the evil doer that political society rejects from its midst. It goes even to the home of the savages to deliver the slave, and to lead the savage to Christianity and by consequence to civilization.[67]

Above all, Bonald is the great defender of social groups. Whereas Rousseau wished to destroy all intermediate social bonds so that the "State should remain as the one channel of association,…Bonald's solution is the restoration of intermediate groups."[68] In highlighting the importance of groups within society, he places a special emphasis on corporations. Bonald observes that corporations draw men together who on their own might be condemned to obscurity. By gathering themselves together into a corporation, men are given consideration and importance.[69] As Nisbet notes, it is well-nigh impossible to have a stable society if the men composing it fail to have a sense of their social importance. As healthy groups create a stable society, Bonald is interested in providing rights and freedom to groups, rather than to individuals. [70]

In Bonald's view the corporations were excellent agencies of social control. In

---

[66] Bonald, « Théorie du pouvoir », 1:805.

[67] Ibid., 1:806.

[68] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 110.

[69] Bonald, « Législation primitive », 1:1374.

[70] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 110-111.

the eyes of the lower classes, the corporations were a sort of "municipal and hereditary nobility." Men who would normally have been condemned to obscurity were raised up in importance and dignity through being members of corporations.[71] Bonald is very specific about how the hierarchical machinery of social control works through the corporations. He claims:

> One of the great advantages of the orders and corporations is to give them authority with great opportunities for regulating families by regulating the body to which they belong, and by regulating the individual by regulating the family of which he is a member….
>
> Authority should thus give to the bodies, and above all to the bodies charged with public administration, particular constitutions which regulate the duties of the bodies toward the State, those of the family toward the body, those of the individual toward the family. [72]

Individuals, then, would be subject to a series of concentric levels of social control. Each corporation would have its own constitution regulating its relations with other social bodies. Groups are contained within groups or, better yet, societies are contained within societies, in an organic framework. Individuals are responsible to the groups to which they belong and the groups themselves are likewise responsible to the individuals within their midst. A sense of duty permeates these bodies. No one is isolated. With such a social framework a stable society can be achieved.[73]

Bonald also maintains that organizing people by professional groups will facilitate

---

[71] Bonald, « Pensées sur l'économie sociale », 3:1279.

[72] Louis de Bonald, « Essai analytique sur les lois naturelles de l'ordre social » in *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, ed. Abbé Migne (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859), 1:1040.

[73] Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 113-114.

political representation.[74] He views representation based on the criteria of population, taxation, and territorial limits as non-social representation. He cynically comments that being a vile scoundrel, paying oppressive taxes, or living on an arid rock are not criteria which justify entrance into a representative social body as an integral part.[75] Rather, according to Bonald, society should be organized by social function. Since society is a union of men and property, Bonald claims that only property owners can represent society. In addition, he notes that a constituted society does not recognize individual men, it recognizes only professions. Consequently, society can only be represented by those professions which are property owners.[76] The priestly profession, royal profession, and the noble profession are examples which he utilizes from feudal society. He also asserts that property ownership in a properly constituted society requires "service towards society." This was accomplished by the aforementioned professions.[77] Reflecting on the representation of the past, Bonald notes that it was accomplished by all of the social professions and by all of the professions which employ all of the property. He notes that it was a much better form of representation than the territorial representation of today.[78] Bonald sees territorial representation as haphazard and unorganized. Representation by

---

[74] Ibid., 113.

[75] Bonald, « Théorie du pouvoir », 1:262-263.

[76] Ibid., 1:262.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

profession or social function, on the other hand, is based on "organized permanent interests." La Tour du Pin will also have representation organized along functional lines, but his plan will be developed in much more detail. In addition, he will go much further than Bonald by clearly enunciating the role of corporations in functional representation.

Bonald also held the view that industrialization provided a fertile seedbed for the increasing problem of individualism. Time-honored social relationships were giving way more and more to money relationships and the former were being subordinated to the latter. In Bonald's opinion industrialism was acting as solvent on the social ties between men. Alienation was the grim result. Commenting on Bonald's view of industrialism, D. K. Cohen relates:

> It is here that we come to the heart of Bonald's thought. He held that the essential consequence of industrialization was that it had dissolved the elementary bonds of society: "We might say that agriculture unites men without placing them in proximity, and commerce, which heaps them together in cities and puts them in continual contact, puts them together without uniting them." Industrial and commercial society was characterized by a style of relations patterned on the marketplace. All the social bonds of church, family, and village were dissolved, and in their place were substituted money relationships, which alienated men from each other. This was a social disaster in which the most elementary social ties were dissolved. [79]

Having examined the work of Bonald, I will now consider the work of another earlier social thinker who influenced René de La Tour du Pin, viz. Frédéric Le Play.

---

[79] D. K. Cohen, "The Vicomte de Bonald's Critique of Industrialism," *Journal of Modern History*, 41 (1969): 479-480.

C. Frédéric Le Play

Frédéric Le Play[80] (1806-1882) was a mining engineer turned sociologist. Having studied at the *École Polytechnique* and the *École des Mines*, he received an excellent metallurgical engineering education. He was convinced that the prevailing social problems of the age required a scientific approach similar to that used in the physical sciences.[81] Being a foe of the Enlightenment, the Revolution, and democracy, he assiduously studied conservative political theorists such as Burke, De Maistre, and De Bonald, but especially Bonald.[82]

Le Play was particularly influenced by Bonald's attitudes toward industrialism. Catherine Silver comments, "De Bonald's analysis of the stages of France's transition to a modern economy directly influenced Le Play's own understanding of the period."[83]

---

[80] For information on the life and work of Le Play, see: Michael Z. Brooke, *Le Play: Engineer and Social Scientist*, (Harlow, U.K., Longmans, 1970; New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction Publishers, 1998); J.B. Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social*, 672-685; Dorothy Herbertson, *The Life of Frédéric Le Play*, ed. Victor Branford and Alexander Farquharson (Ledbury, England: Le Play House Press, 1950). For a more intimate view of the man, based on his letters, see: Charles de Ribbe, *Le Play, après sa correspondance* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1884). The most important and influential works of Le Play are *Les ouvriers européens* (1855) and *La Réforme sociale en France* (1864). See: Frédéric Le Play, *Les ouvriers européens*, 2e éd., 6 vols. (Tours, France: Alfred Mame et Fils, 1877-1879); Frédéric Le Play, *La Réforme sociale en France, déduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens*, 3e éd., 3 vols. (Paris: E. Dentu, Éditeur, 1867). A selection of Le Play's writings is also found in the study by Catherine Bodard Silver. See: Frédéric Le Play, *Frédéric Le Play on Family, Work, and Social Change*, ed., trans., and intro. Catherine Bodard Silver (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

[81] Catherine Bodard Silver, introduction to *Frédéric Le Play on Family, Work and Social Change* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), 16.

[82] Frédéric Le Play, *Les ouvriers européens*, 2e ed., vol. 1 (Tours, France: Alfred Mame et Fils, 1877-1879), 10; Michael Z. Brooke, *Le Play, Engineer and Social Scientist* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1998), 3-4; Nisbet, *The Social Group*, 197.

[83] Silver, introduction to *Frédéric Le Play*, 31.

Both Bonald and Le Play were keenly interested in the causes and results of the "social isolation and the economic vulnerability of the worker."[84] Indeed, both viewed industrial capitalism[85] as contributing to a growing individualism. Bonald criticized industrialism because it subordinated social relations to market relations. Le Play—and this is where he differed from Bonald and other conservatives—was intent on using empirical research as a basis by which to restore the social links between employer and employee as well as to provide economic security for members of the working class.[86]

Le Play had no time for the enlightened philosophes' *a priori* notions of reconstructing society. After all, these men were too lazy to prove their theories by empirical research.[87] Drawing on years of research and travel, Le Play, on the contrary, produced his *Les ouvriers européens* (1855),[88] which was the foundation of his own social doctrine. This was based on the lives of thirty-six families of different races. Le Play saw his work in a twofold manner for

> …he believed that the science of society must be directly linked to policy-making and that a sociologist must be simultaneously a scientist and a reformer, actively engaged in analyzing and changing society. [89]

---

[84] Ibid.

[85] Bonald was also upset with the dehumanizing effect of industrial labor and how this led to social isolation. See: Silver, *On Family, Work and Social Change*, 31.

[86] Silver, introduction to *Frédéric Le Play*, 31, 33.

[87] Ibid., 35, 37.

[88] In *Les ouvriers européens*, Le Play investigated the lives of different of types of working families throughout a large number of European countries.

[89] Silver, introduction to *Frédéric Le Play*, 39.

For the restoration of the social bonds in society, Le Play claimed that there are two conditions for basic human happiness—the teaching of the moral law, i.e. the Decalogue,[90] and the acquisition of daily necessities. Respect for the moral law would only be brought about by young children understanding the Decalogue under the influence of a strong paternal authority.[91] The father,[92] the social hierarch within the family, with a strong sense of duty, should look after the spiritual and moral needs of his dependents and form them well. With regard to the procurement of the workers' material

---

[90] Le Play regarded religion as a "social cement" and as the foundation of the moral law. His view of religion appears somewhat utilitarian. According to Le Play's view, religion did not involve any personal relationship with God. Indeed, Le Play does not show any interest in the New Testament in his writings. He was also opposed to religious orders and clerical celibacy as they both "undermined his view of the family." Furthermore, although Le Play believed in God for most of his life, he was not a practicing Catholic, but rather a universalist. See: Brooke, *Le Play, Engineer and Social Scientist,* 118 and 177, n. 30. Dorothy Herbertson also states that, although Le Play was brought up by a very devout Catholic mother, he himself was not a devout Catholic. In fact, he remained outside the Church most of his life and converted only a short time before his death. See: Dorothy Herbertson, *The Life of Frédéric Le Play,* ed. Victor Branford and Alexander Farquharson (Ledbury, England: Le Play House Press, 1950), 75, note. The late conversion of Le Play is also buttressed by his clerical friend, the Abbé A. Riche, a Sulpician priest. Riche relates that, in 1879, three years before his death, Le Play fell into a serious illness and asked to be received into the Church as a "practicing Catholic" by Riche. His conversion was sincere—a moving account of it is described by Riche. See: A. Riche, *Frédéric Le Play* (Paris: Ch. Poussielgue, 1891), 7-11.

[91] Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social,* 674.

[92] Le Play places a premium on strong social hierarchies, especially that of the father within the family. This moral and spiritual formation of children by a strong paternal authority is very biblically-based. The psalmist, for instance, states that when fathers personally teach their children, the faith will remain in their families unto the fourth generation. In Psalm 78: 5-7, he says,"He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers to teach to their children; that the next generation might know them, the children yet unborn, and arise and tell them to their children, so that they should set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments;..." In *Genesis* 18:17-19, the Lord charges Abraham to personally teach the "way of the Lord" to his children and household so that they keep the "way of Lord by doing righteousness and justice." In *Deuteronomy* 6:1-3, 6-7, the Lord stresses that parents "diligently" teach the statutes and commandments of the Lord to their children that their "days may be prolonged," that it will "go well" with them, and that they "may multiply greatly." Stephen Wood and Jim Burnham, *Christian Fatherhood: The Eight Commitments of St. Joseph's Covenant Keepers,* (Port Charlotte, FL: Family Life Center Publications, 1997), 90-92. All above biblical quotations are taken from the RSV.

needs, Le Play argues in favor of *patronage* "which bonds poor families to a rich family, assuring them of their daily bread.[93] There is then a strong social bond, based on a sense of duty and responsibility, in which a wealthy family (an example of a social hierarchy), looks after the material needs of "particular" poor families. These ideas are taken up again in Le Play's more streamlined *Réforme sociale* (1864), in which he also observes that the antagonisms between employers and workers are caused by moral disorders. In large part this comes about because social relations are subject to economic relations and labor is seen as mere merchandise. Le Play's *patronage* typically involves a lifelong attachment between employer and employee both inside and outside the workplace.[94] It might be likened to the relationship between a master of a trade and an apprentice. One should not construe, however, that Le Play favored corporations in any way.

Regarding corporations as so many magnets for abuse, Le Play criticized them severely. Commenting on the proposal for the partial restoration of the corporations of arts and trades, he stated, "Nothing justifies this return to the past."[95] He comments thus:

> In the middle of a throng of abuses, these corporations present several flaws justly repugnant to the modern spirit: they exercise a monopoly not justified by public interest;...[they] repress the vigor of the most clever and most intelligent personalities; they annul one of the principal strengths of modern societies, the liberty of work;…[96]

---

[93] Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social*, 674.

[94] Dorothy Herbertson, *The Life of Frédéric Le Play*, ed. Victor Branford and Alexander Farquharson (Ledbury, England: Le Play House Press, 1950), 90-91.

[95] Frédéric Le Play, *La Réforme sociale en France, déduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens*, 3e éd., vol. 2 (Paris: E. Dentu, Éditeur, 1867), 276.

[96] Ibid., 277.

Corporations, first of all, maintain a monopoly of trade which can lead to abuses, such as bad workmanship and high consumer prices. Secondly, corporations repress creativity in the more talented artisanal workers. Lastly, by repressing the "liberty of work" they prevent men who are not part of the corporation from carrying on that particular trade. It must be stressed that Le Play is, of course, referring to closed[97] corporations. Rejecting corporations for purposes of social reform, Le Play is convinced that true reform will only come about "by founding agriculture and industrial manufacturing on the stem-family and voluntary patronage."[98] For him, the family is the bulwark of order in society. Further commenting on Le Play's attitude toward corporations, Dorothy Herbertson relates:

> Most of these [corporations] are phenomena of social disease and point to the growing inefficiency of the family and the disappearance of *patronage*. Many of them do valuable work and alleviate the distresses and promote worthy objects, but in a healthy society there would be little scope for their effort. Insofar as they tend to render vice, improvidence and other evils chronic, their influence is mischievous. [99]

There is no doubt that Le Play judged the industrial society around him diseased, especially as it affected the family. It is for this reason that he wrote on sociological issues. Although he claims that corporations are useful in a diseased society, it is odd that he does not advocate them for the diseased society of the nineteenth century. There appears to be some inconsistency in his thought. Perhaps it is because closed

---

[97] A closed corporation is a corporation to which all artisans engaged in a particular trade or industry must belong in order to practice that trade.

[98] Le Play, *La Réforme sociale en France*, vol. 2, 278.

[99] Herbertson, *The Life of Frédéric Le Play*, 94.

corporations suppress the "liberty of work." For he claims that this "liberty of work," even with its problems, is what makes the modern era so superior to previous ages.[100]

In the economic sphere, Le Play is fundamentally a liberal. Because of his advocacy of the liberty of work, he is adamantly opposed to state intervention in the economic sphere. For him, the benefits of labor legislation were few and they were usually preventative. Among them might be included the enforcement of Sunday rest, prevention of the employment of women, and the repression of violations of industrial liberty. On the positive side, the State should favor and support enlightened capitalists.[101] According to Léon de Montesquiou, Le Play placed his confidence in social reform principally upon the moral reform of the upper classes.[102] No wonder the *Patrons du Nord*[103] and the wealthy held Le Play and his ideas in such high favor.[104] They too were opponents of worker associations and all but minimal state intervention in the economy.[105]

---

[100] Le Play, *La Réforme sociale en France*, 278.

[101] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 58-59.

[102] Léon de Montesquiou, *L'Oeuvre de Frédéric Le Play: Suivie de pensées choisies de nos maîtres: Joseph de Maistre, Bonald, Auguste Comte, Balzac, Taine, Renan* (Paris: Nouvelle Libraire Nationale, 1912), 145.

[103] This is the *Association catholique des patrons du nord de France*. It was an association of conservative Christian employers.

[104] Pierre Pierrard, *L'Église et les ouvriers en France, 1840-1940* (Paris: Hachette, 1984), 250, 351-353.

[105] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 208-209, 227-228.

In the early nineteenth century, Le Play saw the chief cause of family instability as the "compulsory division of property in every generation."[106] Reaffirming the Testamentary Law of 1793, the Civil Code of Napoleon required property to be equally divided among all heirs.[107] Le Play was at the same time opposed to the former law of primogeniture in which case the eldest son becomes the sole heir of his father's property. He believed such a practice produced a stable, but unprogressive family. The equal partition of family property is much worse. It wreaks great havoc and instability amongst rural families, causing the family property to be parceled out in smaller and smaller shares with each subsequent division. This causes many members of the family to leave rural life and look for work in the cities. Opposed to both primogeniture and equal division of property, Le Play supported the "freedom of testation."[108] This strengthened the father's authority over his heirs, for he was able to choose the heir whom he wished. Le Play refers to a family based on these criteria as a stem or *souche* family. As he sees the family as the most important societal unit, he wants to strengthen the family vis-à-vis the State. The freedom of testation, not hampered by State testamentary laws, would contribute to the stability of the family and the authority of the father. For Le Play

---

[106] Herbertson, *The Life of Frédéric Le Play*, 81.

[107] Leo Gershoy, *The French Revolution and Napoleon* (New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1964), 456.

[108] "Freedom of Testation" refers to the right of a person (usually the father) to choose who will be the heir of his property/estate upon his death. In such a case, the testator is not bound by custom (primogeniture) to pass on the property to his oldest son. Neither is he bound by the law of the land (Civil Code) to divide it equally among all of his heirs. "Freedom of Testation" truly provides the testator with the power or freedom to will his property to whomever he wishes.

assumed that a wise father would bestow the inheritance on the potential heir who most deserved it on account of merit. Consequently, no child would presume to receive an inheritance. They would all rely on the fruits of their own labor.[109] Those children who failed to found new homes and families were always welcome back to the old family home.[110]

Commenting on the ills that issued forth from the new testamentary laws, Le Play states:

> Children accustomed from early on to the thought that the simple fact of birth entitles them to wealth generally show little inclination to work or to follow the direction their parents set for them.[111]
>
> The right to an inheritance not only leads individuals to rely less on their own effort; it also leads them to entertain such future prospects as a lucrative marriage and the death of one's parents.[112]
>
> The French Law, awarding each heir a right to a share of an inheritance, regardless of the wishes of his father or the other heirs, awards to the least foresightful and experienced member of society the power to undo the accomplishments of the most skillful members of the previous generation.[113]

La Tour du Pin was a great admirer of Frédéric Le Play, but while accepting some of his ideas, he rejected others. Unlike Le Play, he opposed economic liberalism by accepting appropriate state intervention in the economy and by promoting corporations, thus promoting the organization of work. Nevertheless, he accepted Le Play's ideas on

---

[109] Frédéric Le Play, *Frédéric Le Play on Family, Work, and Social Change,* ed., trans., and intro. Catherine Bodard Silver (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 276.

[110] Herbertson, *The Life of Frédéric Le Play,* 82.

[111] Le Play, *Frédéric Le Play,* 272.

[112] Ibid., 273.

[113] Ibid., 274.

respect for customs and traditions, the freedom of testation, and the strengthening of social authorities—especially the father of the family. Furthermore, he agreed with Le Play's critique of individualism and his stress on the Decalogue as a means of moral regeneration. However, he went further than Le Play for he believed that the social principles of the Catholic Church, based on the New Law, would lead to a much greater moral renewal of society.

D. Charles Périn

Charles Périn[114] (1815-1905), a former student of Charles De Coux's, was one of the most renowned Catholic economists of his time. Although he was a professor of law at the Catholic University of Louvain, he also offered courses and lectures on political economy. On account of his great influence and authority on a Christian approach to political economy he was recognized as "the father of Christian political economy." His reputation grew, especially during the Second French Empire, with his book *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes* (1861).

There are clear similarities between the ideas of Le Play and Périn. Both men saw

---

[114] For works on the life and thought of Périn, see: Justin Fèvre, *Charles Périn créateur de l'économie politique chrétien*, (Paris: Arthur Savaète, éditeur, 1903); Victor Brants, *Charles Périn: Notice sur sa vie et ses travaux* (Louvain: Van Linthout, 1906); Joseph Kempeneers, *Charles Périn (1815-1905) de l'école libérale d'inspiration chrétienne* (Liège: La pensée catholique, 1930). Périn was a prolific writer, authoring numerous articles and over 15 books. Among his chief works are the following: Charles Périn, *Du Progrès matériel et du renoncement chrétien* (Paris: C. Douniol, 1854); Charles Périn, *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*, 2 vols., 2d éd. (Paris: Jacques Lecoffre, 1868); Charles Périn, *Le socialisme chrétien* (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1879); Charles Périn, *Les doctrines économiques depuis un siècle* (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1880); Charles Périn, *Premiers principes d'économie politique* (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1896).

the ills of society as a problem of morals rather than of institutions. Regarding freedom in the economic sphere as paramount, they were both economic liberals. For both men, government intervention in the economy was restricted to abuses such as lack of Sunday rest. Otherwise, the government meddling in economic affairs was viewed as the beginning of socialism. By rejecting government intervention, except in the cases of extreme necessity, both men hoped to prevent the development of socialism. Nevertheless, Le Play and Périn were conservatives in political and social matters, and furthermore, they were counter-revolutionary monarchists. Whereas Le Play, the scientist, came to his conclusions from empirical research, Périn, the theoretician, arrived at his conclusions from abstract principles. More sympathetic to modern freedoms such as the "free combat of truth against error," Le Play is ultimately more of a liberal than the ultramontane and intransigent Périn.[115] Lastly, Périn, at least later in his career, became a champion of corporations while Le Play always remained suspicious of them.

In *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*, Périn attempted to Christianize the economic theory of John Stuart Mill as represented in *The Principles of Political Economy* (1848).[116] Whereas Le Play had stressed the importance of the Decalogue, Périn emphasized Christian self-denial as the starting point for the solution of the Social Question. Unlike Le Play, Périn is clearly influenced by the teachings of the New Testament, not just the Decalogue. He maintained that men must voluntarily renounce

---

[115] Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social*, 697-698.

[116] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 103.

material things in order to build up capital and promote economic development. Workers should not frivolously waste their wages on gratifying their passions, but rather industriously conserve their earnings by means of thrift and savings. Likewise, the wealthy should also practice self-denial, and rather than spend their wealth on unnecessary luxuries, come to the aid of their less fortunate brothers with charity. Périn, an avowed Malthusian, also advocated sexual abstinence on the part of masses so as to prevent overpopulation.[117]

For Périn, the Church was the principal component in the solution of the Worker Question. The Church did not forbid wealth. Nevertheless, it did not regard wealth as an end in itself like many economic liberals, but as a means. In addition, the Church taught that men should live their lives with detachment from riches.[118] Agreeing with much of the thought of the economic liberals, Périn attempted to distance himself from these economists by infusing Christian principles into economic liberalism and, thereby, baptizing it.

Périn held that self-denial on the part of both the working masses and the prosperous should lead to an awakening of duties and responsibilities which would result in solidarity between the two classes.[119] This would be an antidote to the prevailing

---

[117] Ibid.

[118] Georges Jarlot, S.J., *Le régime corporatif et les catholiques sociaux: Histoire d'une doctrine* (Paris: Flammarion, 1938), 21-22.

[119] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 103.

reckless individualism promoted by economic liberals. Still, he unequivocally maintained that freedom is a prerequisite for Christian action, for men could not be forced to engage in patronage; this would only lead to a "mediocre morality."[120] Perin recognized that regulations, restraints, and government intervention are impotent to inspire the upper classes to do their duty.[121] He states:

> The patronage of the law and of the State, extended to all the woes and failures that patronage is called to allay and relieve, would be nothing other than the universal servitude of socialism.[122]

Moreover, the specter of socialism always loomed over the society which acquiesced to regular government intervention.[123]

At any rate, Périn cannot be tagged as a proponent of absolute economic liberty, since he advocated associations as well as social legislation for "flagrant economic abuses."[124] On account of the natural inclination of fallen man to evil, he recognizes that "the principle of absolute liberty of work can be nothing other than a revolutionary principle."[125] For him the social problem is a moral problem, not an economic

---

[120] Charles Périn, *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*, vol. 2, 2d ed. (Paris: Jacques Lecoffre, 1868), 317.

[121] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 26; Périn, *De la richesse*, 317.

[122] Périn, *De la richesse*, 317.

[123] Charles Périn, *Le socialisme chrétien* (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1879), 1, 18-19; Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*, 264.

[124] Charles Périn, *Premiers principes d'économie politique* (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1896), 40; Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 64.

[125] Périn, *Le socialisme chrétien*, 10.

problem.[126] Périn further states that it is possible to deduce a general principle of the social order from this, namely, "that the regulation of work, by which limits are imposed on free competition, is a thing conformable to the moral nature of man."[127] Witness Périn's aloofness from the principles of pure economic liberalism:

> We demand the solution of the worker question, in which nowadays the economic question is concentrated, we demand it by all the forces that the social organism offers us, by liberty and by the public power, and the just measure of its law and of its influence. If one is a socialist because he represses the liberty of evil and that he protests the weak by legal resolution against the injustice of the strong, Catholics are socialists. They are today so as they have been at all times, because they obey today as at all times the impulse of the Church, which does not cease to claim from the public power laws protecting the weak and which, in all places and always, has set up, organized and patronized associations, under the rule of justice and charity given to men by the Gospel. [128]

Like many other thinkers before and after him, Périn attempted to mark out a narrow path between the Scylla of Liberalism and the Charybdis of Socialism. He lays claim to a third way. He states:

> …we are neither liberals nor socialists. Liberalism demands everything for liberty; socialism demands everything for the state and for the law that it supports. We improve the share of liberty by charity and we only demand of the public power what charity is not able to do in a given state of society. [129]

Périn strikes a delicate balance between individual freedom and government coercion. Tempered by the positive contribution of charity, individual freedom is perfected. At the same time, the negative aspects of economic liberalism are to be removed by state intervention since charity is incapable of removing them on its own. This last point

---

[126] Nitti, *Catholic Socialism,* 264.

[127] Périn, *Le socialisme chrétien,* 10.

[128] Périn, *Premiers principes,* 40-41.

[129] Ibid., 40.

seems to demonstrate that Périn recognized that the social problem was not only a matter of morals, but also of institutions, even if ever so slightly.

It is also requisite to examine Périn's ideas on association. In addition to Christian charity, association was another component that separated Périn's system of political economy from that of the absolute liberals. As an anti-individualist, he supported the principle of association. Nevertheless, as a liberal he was opposed to the regulations of corporations.[130] Périn, therefore, attempted to maintain a balancing act between defending the principle of association against individualism and, at the same time, upholding liberalism against the corporation, which was an association with special privileges and restraints.[131]

In his early years as an economist, drawing on an historicist perspective of economic institutions throughout the ages, Périn saw the medieval corporations as useful in days past but outmoded in the modern economy which based on free competition.[132] He states:

> During the Middle Ages the corporations had their days of grandeur and prosperity; to attempt to restore them with the conditions of privilege and coercion in which they existed in former times, this would involve an impossible struggle against the deepest instincts of our societies.[133]

According to him, these corporations had sheltered tradesmen from the turbulent

---

[130] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 22.

[131] Ibid.

[132] Charles Périn, *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*, vol. 1, 2d ed. (Paris: Jacques Lecoffre, 1868), 309.

[133] Ibid., 306.

environment of the early feudal regime.[134] Elaborating further on the justification of corporations in the past, Périn claims:

> During these times when industry was little advanced, customs still ruder, justice imperfect and insufficient, the producers collected into industrial communities and supported each other, preserved themselves thus against the abuses of a liberty which would only have profited the strongest and which would have inevitably turned into oppression for the greater number; moreover, they found in their assembled and coordinated efforts means of perfecting their work to which, isolated and given up to themselves, they had been incapable of attaining.[135]

In the past, therefore, the insufficiencies of the public law needed supplementation. Consequently, according to Périn, the corporations of the past were conditional and not normative. In fact, Périn maintained that the modern movement to liberate work from the narrow regulations of the corporations was Christian both in its inspiration and in its principles even though this movement of emancipation operated for a time under revolutionary influences, often marked by a "spirit of hatred and of radical destruction."[136]

One might wonder how the emancipation of work in the late eighteenth century led to the enslavement of work in the nineteenth century. Périn has an answer for that too. He claims that, as unbelief and impiety made progress under the newfound expansion of liberty, the spread of individualism displaced the spirit of charity and association in the moral sphere.[137] Moreover, he states that "the natural and legitimate

---

[134] Ibid.

[135] Ibid., 306-307.

[136] Ibid., 302.

[137] Ibid.

love of independence will degenerate into a spirit of separation and often of hostility."[138] He is not altogether too convincing in this matter; for he sees individualism proceeding from unbelief while he views liberalism as arising from Christianity. Périn refuses to acknowledge that both might emanate from unbelief and that one cannot repress the one without repressing the other. For an "individualism" which does not recognize duties and responsibilities to others dovetails very nicely with a "liberalism" which does not recognize any objective limits erected by a transcendent God on one's "freedom to do as he wishes." [139]

Throughout his career, Périn had changing attitudes about corporations. His earlier views about corporations are inconsistent with his later views because over time his thought developed from a rejection of corporations to a guarded acceptance of them. Because he primarily stressed the religious and charitable aspects of worker associations, Périn upheld the confraternity, rather than the corporation, as the true worker association; the corporation, instead, had more of a civil and political character to it.[140] Concerning

---

[138] Ibid.

[139] In his encyclical on "Human Liberty," Leo XIII states, "What *naturalists* or *rationalists* aim at in philosophy, that the supporters of *liberalism*, carrying out the principles laid down by naturalism, are attempting in the domain of morality and politics. The fundamental doctrine of rationalism is the supremacy of the human reason, which, refusing due submission to the divine and eternal reason, proclaims its own independence, and constitutes itself the supreme principle and source and judge of truth. Hence, these followers of liberalism deny the existence of any divine authority to which obedience is due, and proclaim that every man is the law to himself; from which arises that ethical system which they style *independent* morality, and which, under the guise of liberty, exonerates man from any obedience to the commands of God, and substitutes a boundless license." Leo XIII, "Libertas Praestantissimum," no. 15, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 173.

[140] Périn, *De la richesse*, vol. 2, 267.

his later view of corporations, Matthew Elbow relates:

> Périn's thought thus advanced from a rejection of guilds in his writings during the Second Empire to a gradual acceptance of them as indicated in his works of the Third Republic. Perhaps his increased toleration of guilds after 1870 was due in part to contact with the corporative writings of La Tour du Pin, for these two prominent Social Catholics mutually affected each other. [141]

Consequently, in one of his later books such as *Premiers principes d'économie politique* (1895-1896), Périn is more emphatic in his support of corporations. By 1896 Périn had presumably been influenced by La Tour du Pin as Elbow mentioned, but more importantly he was probably influenced by *Rerum novarum* (1891), for this encyclical unequivocally supports corporations and trade unions. Demonstrating his support for corporations in his later years, Périn states:

> Concerning the diverse forms that association is able to take in the life of work, the corporation is the most complete, the most powerful, that which takes hold of the best man in all his industrial activity and procures for him the most stable and sure support.[142]

In *Premiers principes d'économie politique* Périn mentions that his treatment of corporations in *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes* was very general whereas his considerations of corporations in his later *Les doctrines économiques depuis un siècle* (1880) were more specialized and pointed toward a Christian solution to the economic question.[143]

Périn still showed antipathy to *syndicats* (trade unions) which were not corporations in the strict sense. He advocated mixed associations of employers and

---

[141] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 50.

[142] Périn, *Premiers principes*, 47.

[143] Ibid., 47, note 1.

workers which were truly corporations. Viewing trade unions as too democratic and opposed to a natural social hierarchy, he opposed them as institutions which fomented the revolutionary spirit. He saw the moral problem at the bottom of this as an over excited pride on the part of the lower classes who were grasping for equality.[144] Concerning these *syndicats,* he comments:

> The *syndicats* are, most of the time, associations formed for combat, which wish before everything else to destroy, and which think that by completing the ruin of the bourgeoisie they will lay the foundation for the wealth of the people. [145]

He also adds:

> For democracy, the patron is the enemy, and the worker conceives of no other relation with him that that of an irreconcilable antagonism. [146]

Hence, in the later period of his life, when Périn saw association in terms of a choice between trade unions or corporations, he opted for corporations because they respected the social hierarchy and brought about peace by reconciling the interests of employer and worker.

Even though he supported corporations, he never brought himself to support the compulsory and closed corporations of the more conservative branch of social Catholics.[147] As a result of his belief in the liberty of work, Périn was convinced that corporations should not determine the price of the workers' wages, but that wages should

---

[144] Ibid., 49.

[145] Ibid.

[146] Ibid.

[147] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 65.

be subjected to the law of supply and demand.[148]

For Périn, the corporation must not only serve the material interests of the worker, but also his moral interests. It must benefit the whole man. By concentrating on only material interests, trade unions became engines of socialism. Most importantly, corporations must proceed from a religious sentiment which will thoroughly permeate them and give rise to the Christian virtues of renunciation and charity. Consequently, solidarity between workers and employers will arise through such association and patronage.

Because of his firm conviction of the importance of the social hierarchy, Périn places a high premium on patronage. Through regular contact of employer and employee, employers would become more conscious of the moral and material needs of their employees. At the same time, employees would benefit from regular contact with their betters.[149] Examples of Périn's type of corporation would include the Catholic Professional Association of Printers, Booksellers and Bookbinders, and Leon Harmel's textile mill at Val-des-Bois.[150]

Both Le Play and Périn were political and social counter-revolutionaries. They were conservative monarchists who believed in a strong social hierarchy. Nevertheless, since they were both economic liberals, they stressed the "freedom of work" and

---

[148] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 28.

[149] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 65.

[150] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 28.

"freedom of trade" and were antagonistic to all but the slightest government intervention. On account of their belief in Christian solidarity, they were both opposed to individualism and statist collectivism. Nevertheless, they showed themselves to be somewhat inconsistent, for they did not see how their liberalism might be entangled with the individualism proceeding from the French Revolution. They both advocated social bodies as an antidote to the individualism of the age. Le Play, being suspicious of corporations, advocated strong familial bonds and supported family-owned businesses. Périn's theory steadily advanced from a rejection of corporations to an acceptance of his own variant. This corporation was certainly hierarchical, but neither compulsory nor teeming with regulations.

La Tour du Pin was in accord with some of the ideas of Périn, but he had serious disagreements with other aspects of his thought. La Tour du Pin and Périn saw eye to eye on the role of the Catholic Church as a moral force for the true progress of society. Both men were both rabid opponents of individualism, which they saw arising from the French Revolution. Both men also recognized the importance of association and patronage between workers and owners. La Tour du Pin, however, saw corporations primarily as natural intermediate bodies formed by men in the same profession, whereas Périn emphasized the spiritual bonds of these associations over the professional bonds.

A big disagreement between La Tour du Pin and Périn concerned the role of the State in the economy. Whereas La Tour du Pin believed that the State had a positive role in promoting justice, Périn presumed that the State should merely exercise a negative or

preventative role by protecting workers from gross injustices. Lastly, Périn believed that capitalism should be "baptized" by Christianity, but not necessarily even reformed as such. La Tour du Pin, on the other hand, believed that capitalism inherently included institutions that were evil *per se*, and that it should not even be reformed, but rather replaced with a corporative system.

In the next section I will give preferential treatment to the work of both Émile Keller and Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler. The social works of both men were introduced to La Tour du Pin and his friend Albert de Mun during the last stages of the Franco-Prussian War. These two Catholic social thinkers exercised a considerable influence over the thought of René de La Tour du Pin at the beginning of his "social vocation," while he was interned as a prisoner. Ketteler would influence him later at another pivotal stage in the development of his program.

CHAPTER 3.

THE INFLUENCE OF KELLER AND VON KETTELER

While interned as prisoners during the Franco-Prussian War, René de La Tour du Pin and his friend Albert de Mun, were introduced to the works of both Émile Keller and Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler. The works of both men exercised a great influence over the minds of the two young military officers. It was during this captivity that they found their "social vocation." While detained as prisoners, a Jesuit, Fr. Gustav Eck, gave them *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'état et la liberté* by Émile Keller. According to de Mun, both he and La Tour du Pin were enlightened by Keller's work which clearly laid out the "principles of Christian society and the false dogmas of modern society." [1]

Moreover, a certain Dr. Joseph Lingens introduced La Tour du Pin and de Mun to the work of the German social Catholic movement, especially the thought of Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler.[2] Georges Jarlot further argues that La Tour du Pin, while a prisoner of war, also read Ketteler's works, *Freedom, Authority, and the Church* and *The Labor Question and Christianity*. These works were translated into French in 1862 and

---

[1] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 21.

[2] Ibid., 22.

1869 respectively.[3] As the works of both Keller and von Ketteler exercised a pivotal influence on La Tour du Pin, they will be treated in detail.

A. Émile Keller

1. Introduction

More consistent than Le Play and Périn was Émile Keller[4] (1828-1909), who was anti-liberal through and through. He was opposed not only to political and social liberalism, but to economic liberalism as well. George Jarlot point out that

> … he realizes, beyond Le Play and Ch. Périn this double progress: on the one hand, to reckon that the economic regime itself ought to be modified: the reform will be both *economic* and moral; on the other hand, to advocate true corporations of trade.[5]

It is crucial to examine certain parts of Keller famous work *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'État et la liberté.* For this book would be of fundamental importance in the development of René de La Tour du Pin's thought.

Émile Keller was born at Belfort, France in 1828. As a young man he studied at *L'École Polytechnique*, but was eventually drawn to politics; in 1859 he was elected deputy from the Haut Rhin. Within the French Chamber of Deputies he was a tireless

---

[3] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 60.

[4] For the life of Émile Keller, see: Gustave Gautherot, *Un demi-siècle de défense nationale et religeuse: Émile Keller, 1828-1909* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1922). For Keller's chief work, see: Émile Keller, *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'État et la liberté* (Paris: Poussielgue et Fils, 1865).

[5] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 33.

and intrepid defender of the rights of the Church, especially those of the papacy and the Temporal Power. Leading French Catholic writers, such as Charles Montalembert and Louis Veuillot, both concurred that he was a great orator.[6]

Unlike Louis Veuillot, Donoso Cortés and many of the "courtesan bishops," Keller was never a supporter of Napoleon III, even at the beginning of his reign. He saw the coup d'état of 2 December, 1851 as a "brutal victory of force." Because it lacked the benign victory of moral force, he did not envision that Napoleon III's government would display any durability.[7] On account of his trenchant opposition to Napoleon III's policies, Keller's opponents castigated him as "the enemy of religion and of his country"[8] and "the personal enemy"[9] of the emperor. Keller saw Napoleon III as the embodiment of revolutionary Caesarism. Domestically, the emperor tightened his grip over the government machinery, whereas abroad he fomented revolution; in particular, he encouraged the adversaries of the Pope, viz. the Piedmontese.[10] Regarded by his biographer, Gustave Gautherot, as "the Pope's deputy,"[11] Keller believed that by defending the rights of the Holy See, he was also guarding the national interest of

---

[6] Gustave Gautherot, *Un demi-siècle de défense nationale et religeuse: Émile Keller, 1828-1909* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1922), 82.

[7] Ibid., 48-49, 64.

[8] Ibid., 103.

[9] Ibid., 105.

[10] Ibid., 88; Coppa, *The Modern Papacy*, 104; Chadwick, *A History of the Popes*, 174.

[11] Gautherot, *Un demi-siècle*, 63.

France.[12] For Keller, the Catholic faith was a sure bulwark against the excesses of the Revolution; the Papacy, moreover, was the guardian of true liberty. Addressing the National Assembly Keller exclaimed, "the struggle is between the Catholic Faith, at the same time French and Roman, and the Revolutionary Faith."[13]

During the peace treaty after the Franco-Prussian War, Keller, with Léon Gambetta, drafted a protest against the treaty on behalf of the deputies of Alsace-Lorraine.[14] Although the protest was ultimately unsuccessful, Keller played an important role in the negotiations that convinced the Germans to allow the French to keep Belfort, its outskirts, and his own valley of Saint-Nicolas. Furthermore, he became the sole deputy from the territory of Belfort, and for that matter, the sole deputy from the entirety of Alsace.[15]

2. Commentary on Quanta Cura and the Syllabus Errorum

In December of 1864, Pius IX issued his encyclical *Quanta Cura* to which he appended a *Syllabus Errorum*, a catalogue of 80 propositions which were considered the principal errors of the time.[16] The condemned errors included the following: absolute and

---

[12] Ibid., 64.

[13] Ibid., 79.

[14] Ibid., 194.

[15] Ibid., 201-202.

[16] Roger Aubert et al., *The Church in the Age of Liberalism*, vol. 8 of *History of the Church*, trans. Peter Becker, ed. Hubert Jedin and John Dolan (London: Burns & Oates, 1981), 296; Coppa, *The Modern*

moderate rationalism, naturalism, pantheism, indifferentism, socialism and communism. In addition, the pope denounced certain errors which concerned the Church and her rights. Among the condemned items were propositions regarding errors concerning civil society in itself and in relation to the Church, natural and Christian ethics, Christian marriage, the temporal sovereignty of the pope, and finally, moderate liberalism. Because *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus* denounced the chief errors originating from modern thought, they underscored the role of the papacy as a sign of contradiction to the prevailing Spirit of the Age.

Keller, like Louis Veuillot[17], warmly welcomed *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus errorum.* Both men wrote books on the papal missives. Unlike Veuillot, however, who used his *L'Illusion libéral* as a club with which to beat and to denounce liberal Catholicism, Keller, in his *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'État et la liberté,*[18] dwelt on the positive contributions to society which would result if only the encyclical and *Syllabus* were heeded. He felt that Mgr. Dupanloup's

---

Papacy Since 1789, 107-108; J. Derek Holmes, *The Triumph of the Holy See: A Short History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Burns & Oates; Shepherdstown, W.V.: Patmos Press, 1978), 145; Chadwick, *A History of the Popes,* 175.

[17] For more on the life and thought of Veuillot, see: Marvin Brown, *Louis Veuillot: French Ultramontane Catholic Journalist and Layman, 1813-1883* (Durham, NC: Moore Publishing Company, 1977); Pierre Pierrard, *Louis Veuillot* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1998). For Veuillot's commentary on the syllabus, see: Louis Veuillot, *L'Illusion libérale,* 5e éd. (Paris: Palmé, 1866). For an English translation of this same work, see: Louis Veuillot, *The Liberal Illusion* (Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 2005).

[18] Henceforth, the title of this work will be abbreviated to *L'Encyclique.*

commentary[19] on the pope's missives completely emasculated them. By distinguishing between the *thesis* and *hypothesis*[20] and pointing out that Catholic faithful were free to conform to the conditions in current society, Keller claimed that the bishop of Orleans was reducing "…pontifical teaching to a stillborn theory, relegating it to a platonic domain where it would remain without influence on individuals or over peoples."[21] He claimed that Dupanloup had told everyone "what the encyclical was not," but he wished to explain "what it was."[22] In Keller's opinion, these decrees of the Holy See were "the code of good sense and truth, not only religious, but political and social."[23] He praised the pope as a "watchman from on high" and as a "guardian" who "made known hidden dangers and the ambushes of enemies."[24] To those who thought that *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus errorum* might be inopportune, Keller pointed out that if the Church did not

---

[19] Mgr. Dupanloup's document was entitled *La Convention du 15 septembre et l'encyclique du 8 décembre.* It was a defense of the pope against his enemies as well as a denunciation of the September Convention concluded between Napoleon III and the Piedmontese government, in which the emperor agreed to evacuate French troops from Rome. In addition, Dupanloup attempted to portray the *Syllabus* in a manner more palatable to those hostile to the Roman Church. For Dupanloup's commentary on the Syllabus, see: Félix Dupanloup, *La convention du 15 septembre et l'encyclique du 8 décembre* (Paris: Charles Douniol, 1865). For an English translation of this same work, see: Felix Dupanloup, *The Convention of the 15th September and the Encyclic of the 8th December* (Cincinnati: Catholic Telegraph Print, 1865).

[20] *Thesis* refers to the ideal situation in society; *hypothesis* refers to what is possible in the currently existing state of society.

[21] Gautherot, *Un demi-siècle*, 125.

[22] Émile Keller, *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'État et la liberté* (Paris: Poussielgue et Fils, 1865), 8.

[23] Gautherot, *Un demi-siècle*, 126.

[24] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 24-25.

proclaim its teaching, it would become an accomplice to the Spirit of the Age, especially as exemplified by the excessive thirst for riches and independence from authority.[25]

3. Religious Truth: Principle of Religious Liberty

Keller's *L'Encyclique* was a lengthy commentary on *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus errorum*. It was a "Treatise on Christian Politics," which drew lessons from history as well from the errors which the Pope had condemned.[26] A large part of his book was devoted to analyzing the relationships between Church, State, and society throughout the history of the Church. Commencing with pagan Rome and concluding with post-Revolutionary France in the nineteenth century, he demonstrates that during the ages in which the Church was most independent, most free, and its influence permeated society, men in general were most free. On the other hand, during the times in which the Church was subjugated or enslaved by the State, and prevented from exercising any influence on society, men lost their precious freedoms, they were usually reduced to some degree of slavery, and the respect for the dignity of the human person was ignored. Although he saw religion, politics, and society as intimately intertwined, he recognized that his work was political and practical, rather than theological.[27]

Keller firmly maintained that the Church alone understood the true nature of man

---

[25] Ibid., 21.

[26] Gautherot, *Un demi-siècle*, 129.

[27] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 5.

which had been wounded by original sin and which stood in need of the Redemption by Jesus Christ. Keller relates:

> Based on Catholic teaching, the Fall and the Redemption are equally the hidden bond of innumerable errors which deny this dogma in various degrees, and which are today collected and associated in the condemnations of the encyclical.…all [of these errors] have the same origin and same purpose, to undermine and destroy the kingship[28] of Jesus Christ and the pre-eminence of his Church under the pretext of reason freeing itself. [29]

While discussing Reason's proud assertion that it can suffice by itself and has no need or use for the Church, Keller states: "Secularization of politics, of science, of industry, of work, there is the purpose which she [Reason] pursues, and which she proclaims as the first condition of progress and of genuine civilization."[30] According to Keller, however, men needed the Church to make progress in both their temporal and spiritual lives.[31] Maintaining that the Church is not limited to a mere sovereignty over individuals, he declares:

> If the Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Church is truly founded by God, and directed by God living within her, then she has been invested, as she affirms it, with full power, no less in regard to nations and princes, than in regard to individuals. [32]

---

[28] Many of Keller's ideas on the Kingship of Christ closely resemble those of Louis Cardinal Pie, Bishop of Poitiers. See: Théotime de Saint-Just, *La Royauté sociale de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ: d'après le cardinal Pie* (Chiré-en-Montreuil: Éditions de Chiré; Villegenon: Éditions Sainte Jeanne d'Arc, 1988), 45-80; Étienne Catta, *La doctrine politique et sociale du Cardinal Pie* (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1991), 78-93. Furthermore, many of these same ideas are similar to those in Pius XI's encyclical *Quas primas*. See: Pius XI, "Quas Primas," nos. 17-19, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1903-1939*, vol. 3, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 274-275.

[29] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 19.

[30] Ibid., 18.

[31] Ibid., 17.

[32] Ibid., 20.

It might appear that Keller, although a bitter foe of the Revolution, is a retrograde, taking the side of the *ancien régime*. This would be an incorrect assumption. Rather, he claims that the absolutism of the old regime, like the absolutism of the Revolution, was also extremely odious.[33] The old regime was responsible for enshackling the Church by subjugating it to the State. This is political Gallicanism.

Unlike the liberals, Keller argues in the later chapters of his book that truth is the source of liberty. To be quite particular, without a basis of social truth there could be no social liberty; without political truth there can be no political liberty; finally, without religious truth there could be no religious liberty. Keller understood religious liberty to be the safeguard of all other liberties.[34] He also states that there are repercussions in the political and social spheres when religious truth is altered. He comments:

> Now, political and social truth vary, at all times, with the purity of religious truth, and each alteration of dogma and of morals being, for the most strong, a most convenient manner of using power and fortune, a hidden means of taking the liberty, the wife and the wealth of another; the religious, political and social interests of the people imperiously demand that it be protected and defended against these sham emancipators, who, after having thrown to it as bait some goods to pillage, some institutions to destroy, will next hold it itself in a harsh captivity.[35]

In a particularly lucid passage, Keller argues that a symbiotic relationship between the Church and the State is in the best interest of both of them. He says:

> Thus, the State has need of the Church, alone capable of sustaining public and private morals; and

---

[33] Ibid., 4.

[34] Ibid., 340.

[35] Ibid., 341.

> the Church has need of the State in order to assure the peaceful exercise of its cults and faculties. [36]

On the other hand, the separation of Church and State has the most calamitous consequences in all areas of society. He remarks:

> She [the Church] declares that this fatal separation forcefully results in the triumph of brutal force, in the unbridling of the material appetites and the loss, not only of faith, but of all civilization and of all liberty. [37]

This last statement has much in common with a similar assessment made by Juan Donoso Cortés, another Catholic political thinker, about fifteen years earlier. He states:

> There are only two possible forms of control: one internal and the other external; religious control and political control. They are of such a nature that when the religious barometer rises, the barometer of [political] control falls and likewise, when the religious barometer falls, the political barometer, that is, political control and tyranny rises. This is a law of humanity, a law of history. [38]

Both writers agree that there is an inverse relationship between moral (religious[39]

---

[36] Ibid., 377.

[37] Ibid., 17.

[38] Bela Menczer, *Catholic Political Thought, 1789-1848* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962), 170. This is an excerpt from Donoso Cortés' *Speech on Dictatorship* before the Spanish Cortes in 1849. He further developed his point using historical examples. For more examples of the inverse relationship between moral (internal) and material (external) controls, see: Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of Our Time* (Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 1993), 105-110.

[39] In his book *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), John Bossy makes an interesting comparison between the interior controls used by Catholics and the exterior controls used by Protestants. He appears to hint that the totalitarian movements of the twentieth century find their beginnings in the exterior controls used by the early Protestants. Concerning Catholicism, he says, "the solution then…was to use the obligation to resort to the sacrament of penance as an incentive for the systematic interior monitoring [examination of conscience] by the individual of his own life" (127). Concerning the reformers, Bossy states that they were "attempting to supply the place of penance by the practice of exterior discipline" (128). In addition, Calvin "… gave the idea the particular form of moral supervision by ministry and congregational elders which was what most Protestants understood by discipline hereafter" (128). Lastly, Bossy concludes by noting that Martin Bucer "suggested the civil polity of the Spartans as the model for Christians to imitate: …he represented in a strong form the tendency in all reformers to envisage the structure of the Church in a totalitarian spirit" (129). Keller might also add that, because of this, Catholics, exercising self-control through the transforming power of grace, would be more

or internal) and material (political or external) controls in society. Either a person must voluntarily set limits to his own passions through self-control or the State would involuntarily set limits on said person's passions by means of raw force. Keller saw religion as the only moral force which was able to "remedy abuses of the material power." In addition, religion acted as a "bridle on the State" and the "supreme protector of the country, society, and the family."[40] The Church had to be independent of and superior to the State to have such an influence. In his chapter on "Religious Truth Principle of Religious Liberty," Keller asks:

> Who then will defend reason, justice, and the natural law, who will defend the people from the temptations of the most powerful? Who will defend the most powerful themselves from the seductions which surround them? Who will defend truth, threatened on all sides, and combated everywhere, against the organized disciplined and ingeniously combined forces of feudalism and of autocracy always springing up again, against the encroaching power of centralization and Caesarism? [41]

Keller answers that it is the Roman Catholic Church alone.[42] In his own day, Keller lamented that material force had become more and more necessary to keep order in

---

free than Protestants, who believed that human nature was utterly corrupted and incapable of improvement, thereby leading to the necessity of exterior force to keep order in society. Louis Gaston de Ségur states, "Confession, if every individual in society practiced it, would replace by a hundredfold all the constabulary and police. Each one would be kept by his own conscience and enlightened by the priest on his duties of every kind." Louis Gaston de Ségur, *Confession: A Little Book for the Reluctant*, trans. Sisters of Charity of New Haven, Connecticut (New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher, 1875; Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1989), 22.

[40] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 64.

[41] Ibid., 341-342.

[42] Ibid., 342.

society, because the moral force had disappeared.[43]

4. Social Problems: The Result of Exaggerated Social Liberty

Keller maintains that truth alone will give rise to true liberty or freedom. This cannot be emphasized enough. If the purity of truth is at all sullied by error, then to the degree error predominates, it follows that a lesser or greater slavery will ensue. Keller's view is reminiscent of Christ's words where he says, "…and you will know the truth,[44] and the truth will make you free."[45] Because Christ had physically left the world, Keller felt that the Church, and especially the pope, had a duty to "bear witness to the truth" in this Modern Age filled with errors. Further, "those who are of the truth" would listen to the Church's teaching in the words of the pope. By allowing free dissemination of all opinions, right or wrong, Keller argued that the modern world denied all certain truth.[46]

Keller reveals that unlimited liberty in the economic sphere, with no regard for either social truth or restraint, will "inevitably lead to the triumph of the strongest, the

---

[43] Ibid., 36.

[44] The words of John Paul II, elucidating this Gospel passage, make the same claim as Keller. In *Redemptor hominis*, the Pope states: "These words contain both a fundamental requirement and a warning: the requirement of an honest relationship with regard to truth as a condition for authentic freedom, and the warning to avoid every kind of illusory freedom, every superficial unilateral freedom, every freedom that fails to enter in to the whole truth about man and the world." John Paul II, *Redemptor hominis*, no. 12, trans. from the Vatican Polyglot Press (Boston, MA: Daughters of St. Paul, 1979), 23.

[45] John 8:32, RSV.

[46] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 50.

oppression and exploitation of the weakest."[47] Not only the poor, but the State itself, is brought under the control of capital.[48]

He points out that the despoliation of the clergy, nobility and corporations did not bring greater prosperity to the whole country, but rather enriched a few clever men.[49] These unpatriotic men, unlike the clergy and nobility of old,[50] refused gratuitous service and devotion to their country, but coveted all the high ranks and posts within the country.[51]

As a result of this despoliation, Keller maintained that the Revolution had created the proletariat and had divided society into two classes.[52] The structure of post-Revolutionary society had brought this about. Keller censured this order of things and indignantly commented, "It is not just that after six thousand years of labor, inventions, progress, a great part of the human race is born disinherited, without any share in the riches amassed by their ancestors.[53]

In accordance with what the Church had always taught, Keller maintained that

---

[47] Ibid., 248.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., 247.

[50] Among other services, the clergy had provided for education, charities (orphanages, hospitals, etc.) and cult. By tradition the nobility performed military service in defense of the country.

[51] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 248-249.

[52] Ibid., 251.

[53] Ibid., 253.

property had a social function.[54] Men were not absolute owners of property, but stewards of it. With resentment he asks:

> Why not attack the evil in its root? In the Declaration of the Rights of Man, they have added (art 17) that property is an inviolable and sacred right. These are the owners who have imagined this inconsistency and this contradiction in order to save their fortune. If neither religion nor power is sacred, why should property alone have this privilege?[55]

Reflecting on these words of Keller, it would appear that the vaunted Revolution did not bring about true social equality. In Orwellian language, "Some citizens were more equal than others." Ultimately, the propertied class believed that the government existed for their benefit, rather than for the advantage of everyone.

To the rich who claimed that unlimited liberty gave all men equal means to reach happiness, Keller responded that those who were already rich are free, but for those who had nothing, liberty was useless.[56] For the proletariat is not free to receive instruction, choose a trade, or even own his private shop.[57] Because the proletariat is busy working extremely long hours at the factory, he has no free time to study or learn a trade. Furthermore, since he makes barely enough money to support himself and his family, he has no extra savings with which he could set up his own business. How would the worker become independent and free? "Everywhere," says Keller, "large shops and large factories devour the small ones.…vast cultivation (of fields) with machines likewise

---

[54] Ibid., 282.

[55] Ibid., 253.

[56] Ibid., 254.

[57] Ibid., 254-255.

suppresses small cultivation, this sacred nursery of independent men."[58] Owners of large industries, who promoted free trade and universal competition, certainly do not help the worker. In order to compete with their foreign rivals, they lower the prices of their goods which, in turn, forces them to lower their workers salaries. In the end, this competition with foreigners, or "free-trade" is at the expense of the worker.[59]

Should the poor wish to borrow money, they would end up paying a high interest rate which would further enslave them to their debtors. The rich, on the other hand, could get a low interest loan.[60] Consequently, the people who really needed loans would have to pay more dearly for the use of them than the wealthy. Again, Keller argues that economic liberalism aggravates the separation of society into two classes.

According to Keller, if the worker wishes to associate and strike, will this not restore equilibrium between the workers and the owner? On the contrary, Keller observes that the worker needs a substantial amount of savings to take time off from work and strike.[61] Keller maintains, "If each worker has nothing, gathered together, they will not be wealthier, and consequently, not more free."[62]

---

[58] Ibid., 256.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., 258.

[61] Ibid., 264.

[62] Ibid., 264-265.

More and more technological advancements serve as "engines of domination[63] in the hands of the financial barons who have a monopoly over them." Both capital and work undergo a transformation as they become more centralized with "large fortunes dominating and absorbing middling ones, likewise, great poverties dominating and absorbing the little ones,…"[64] As Keller points out, this situation deteriorates and the abyss between the rich and the poor grows wider.

Regarding the true liberty of work, Keller has a twofold solution. The workers must be assured of either an individual or collective patrimony. In addition, they must be taught the virtue of moderation so as not to disturb the peace when they associate.[65] Keller notes that the former is an economic difficulty and the latter is a moral difficulty, both of which the Church has resolved, but which "unlimited liberty" has failed to answer.[66]

Keller also claims that political liberty for the worker is also a sham. He states that no man can exercise his rights as a citizen when he is not sure of putting bread on his table. In the cities he is the victim of disinformation spread by the small clique of opinion-formers who control the journals; in the country, the workers are at the mercy of the manufacturer who oversees them as they vote. Therefore, Keller claims the worker is

---

[63] Ibid., 260.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid., 265.

[66] Ibid., 265-266.

not really represented.[67]

In addition, Keller argues that the worker's freedom of conscience is not respected. The worker is denied Sunday rest—the law makes no provision for it. He needs respite to raise up and enlarge his soul. Some of the workers who are extremely poor or exceedingly grasping are willing to work a seventh day. As a result, capital, which determines the salaries of the workers by their strict needs, requires all to work for seven days in order to provide for their bare necessities.[68] Sunday work, therefore, becomes commonplace. Consequently, Keller observes that the worker is degraded and becomes a beast of burden without repose.[69] Instruction given by the State to the young ignores religion. Rather than confirming and nourishing the faith of the young, secular schools in effect undermine it.[70] Eventually, this adversely affects the young, leading to a corruption of morals as well as incredulity, neither of which help to stabilize the State.

When a worker has no patrimony, family life collapses as well. The indissolubility of marriage soon falls by the wayside. The temptation is at first to contracept and, eventually, not marry at all.[71] The state, in order to combat contraception and concubinage, concocts the impotent formula of civil marriage, which readily ends in

---

[67] Ibid., 266.

[68] Ibid., 268.

[69] Ibid., 267.

[70] Ibid., 268-269.

[71] Ibid., 270-271.

divorce, followed by a loss of morals and loss of respect for women. Keller points out that this is "inept from the economic point of view as it is culpable from a moral point of view," for population is the "first wealth of a society."[72]

5. Social Truth: Principle of Social Liberty

In Chapter XVII of *L'Encyclique*, Keller proposes a remedy to address the wounds in the social order. He begins by discussing the importance of both capital and labor in the production of wealth.[73] Keller maintains that private capital cannot be seized forcibly or it will be lost. It appears that he is here talking about socialism. Socialists claim that if "capital" is owned by the State rather than by private individuals, the enormous inequalities in the social order will be cured. Keller disagrees. Rather, capital needs to be given to interested possessors who will guard and conserve it.[74] At the same time, in order to avoid interested possessors from being pillaged, capital must be distributed widely among large numbers of proprietors.[75] Commenting on Keller's point, Georges Jarlot states:

> Equilibrium would be able to be reestablished in two ways. Either by suppressing the power of wealth by the abolition of the property right: equality into nothingness, this is the socialist doctrine. Or accession, as large and generalized as possible, of proletariats in the possession of goods: it is no longer a question of suppressing property, but of universalizing it: this is the teaching of

---

[72] Ibid., 271.

[73] Ibid., 279-280.

[74] Ibid., 280.

[75] Ibid.

> Keller.…But, the remedy does not consist in enfettering the masters by depriving them of their goods, but by freeing the slaves by facilitating for them the acquisition of property, which is handed over. [76]

Keller, like the twentieth-century English distributists,[77] believed that wealth must be universalized or distributed widely among people of all classes. Unlike Le Play and Périn, he believed that the existing regime of economic liberalism was unjust because it naturally led to a concentrated accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few.

At the same time Keller recognizes that workers, as well as the rich, must both rise up to their respective moral challenges. He mentions that the abuses, injustices, and inequalities in society will be more glaring as the moral level of society declines.[78] The worker must not view work as a "hateful yoke," but rather as a "duty full of grandeur and dignity." Daily he must courageously practice virtue. In particular, he should exercise moderation and thrift by saving a portion of his wages in order to eventually secure his independence.[79]

Keller also challenges the rich not to abuse their superiority, but rather render gratuitous services to their country in proportion to their income. Among other things, he suggests that they must recognize that their fortune is not just for their personal

---

[76] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 34.

[77] Among others, this group included G.K. Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, Eric Gill, and Fr. Vincent McNabb.

[78] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 281.

[79] Ibid.

enjoyment, but rather a "public office" created for society and in the interest of all.[80] Keller proposes that the rich should not charge interest on loans to those who have nothing and that they should help the miserable poor reconstitute a patrimony. In addition, they should consider themselves patrons or protectors of the poor, making sure that the poor can raise their families honestly and receive days of rest, which they need for the good of their soul.[81]

On account of original sin, Keller maintains that it is not enough for the moral power to penetrate men's consciences and thereby influence the customs and laws of the people. More is needed. He claims that only the example of an organized voluntary poor will stem the tide of man's selfishness. These poor will be a "sign of contradiction" to the prevailing Spirit of the Age. Voluntarily giving up their own riches, they "will preach economy to the little and humanity to the great." They will pursue not their rights, but the rights of others.[82] In contrast to the "sacred property" and "unlimited liberty" canonized by the Revolution, Keller asserts that there truly is a "sacred property" and an "unlimited liberty" which need to be grasped by the modern world. He exhorts:

> Most certainly, if there is a *sacred property*[83] among all, it is that which is thus

---

[80] Ibid., 282. This idea is similar to the thought of Mgr. Ketteler as well. See p. 120 of this dissertation.

[81] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 282-283.

[82] Ibid., 283-284.

[83] Prior to the Revolution, some of the property of the French church was set aside for the benefit of the poor. See: Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, vol. 1, 8-10. After the confiscation of church property by the National Assembly on November 2, 1789, the poor no longer could turn to the resources of the Church. See: Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, vol. 1, 47.

> renounced in order to become the property of the poor, in order to assure the gratuitous service of children, the sick, and the elderly. If there is a *liberty* which is able and ought to remain *unlimited*, it is truly that of dedicating oneself to others, of joining together and associating oneself in order to serve them under the protection of a common rule.[84]

It appears here that Keller is referring to religious orders dedicated to the poor when he talks of unlimited liberty. After all, he speaks of these men joining together under a common rule. The sacred property to which Keller refers may be referring to wealth given over to the care of the Church for the sake of the poor. It is not entirely clear from the context.

Next, Keller challenges the upper classes to rise up to chivalrous ideals. In fact, he paints a picture of the true "man of the people." According to Keller, such a man sacrifices his fortune and his person for the sake of the common good and especially for those who suffer. Well being and comfort are despised by men who are called to heroic actions for the common good.[85] It is very likely that the young soldiers, René de La Tour du Pin and Albert de Mun, were deeply affected by this passage as they read it.

Reiterating that truth alone is the source of liberty, Keller maintains that "it is the true religion and the true political system, which, in place of exploiting him, render him his dignity and independence."[86] Analyzing the three prevalent schools of thought, viz. the schismatic/autocratic, Protestant/financial feudal, and the Revolutionary schools, he draws out the social consequences, following from such false belief systems. The

---

[84] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 284.

[85] Ibid., 286-287.

[86] Ibid., 286.

absolutist centralizers of the schismatic school,[87] though not denying original sin, believed that their dogma, raw power, can remedy its consequences. Regulation, rather than freedom, is their watchword. The dogma of the Protestant School[88] is the free expansion of individual forces wherein capital dominates. The worker is exploited and usury and speculation hold the sway. For them freedom or liberty will solve all social problems. More logical than either of these is the Revolutionary School,[89] which completely denies the Fall of Man altogether. The adepts of the Revolutionary School regard the autocratic and feudal schools as useless in solving the social problems of the age. They claim that "popular reason" alone is infallible and all powerful and, therefore, it should be "absolute mistress of public and private fortunes."[90]

Whereas the *ancien régime* represents the autocratic or mercantilist school in its reliance on power and regulation to bring prosperity to the State, the bourgeois liberals

---

[87] This might be understood as the "School of Hobbes." It is referred to as the "schismatic school" because Keller has the "Orthodox" Czarist regime of Russia in mind. Given the highly centralized power of the sovereign in Russia, the regime was also viewed as extremely autocratic, thus in line with Hobbes' view of the absolutist sovereign in his work *Leviathan.*

[88] This might be understood as the "School of Locke." It is referred to as the Protestant school because Keller has the Protestant Anglican regime of England in mind. Given the oligarchical, political power within Parliament of the wealthy elites such as bankers and merchants, he refers to this as financial feudal. This is in line with constitutional monarchy and legislative (Parliamentary) supremacy promoted by Locke in his *Second Treatise of Government.*

[89] This might be understood as the "School of Rousseau." It is referred to as the Revolutionary school because Keller has the earlier revolutionary republican regime of France in mind. As it denies the Fall of Man and the infallibility of "popular reason," it is in line with the infallibility of the general will as articulated in the direct democracy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, exemplified in his work *On the Social Contract.*

[90] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 288.

represent the financial feudal (economic liberal or laissez-faire) school which maintains that the free expansion of individual forces[91] will bring about order and prosperity in society. Finally, the social revolutionaries denied the efficacy of both the mercantilist and economic liberal systems to remedy the injustices of the social order. Denying original sin, they believed popular reason, i.e., the general will of the people, would infallibly bring about social progress, if left to its own devices. Keller points out that it leads to "Caesarism, the worst of tyrannies."[92] Such anarchy brought both Napoleon I and Napoleon III to power. The logical consequences of the Revolution, says Keller, will eventually lead us to Catholicism, which alone will both protect society from the grave perils that will envelop it and which will also give flesh to the common people's hopes.[93]

To those who believe that Catholicism will usher in a counter-despotism over the affairs of the world, similar to that of the Revolution, Keller retorts, "No!" It would no longer be the truth if it used force as its offensive arm. The Church neither advocates

---

[91] In his magnum opus, *The Wealth of Nations*, Adam Smith, one of the leading lights of the Scottish Enlightenment, denies the obvious consequences of original sin. He believes that those who pursue their own selfish interests enhance the social order, whereas those who pursue the common good have a baneful influence on society. In Book IV, Chapter 2 of his work, he remarks: "…Every individual necessarily labors to render the annual revenue of the society as great as he can. He generally indeed neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it.…He intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an *invisible hand* to promote an end which was no part of his intention.…By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good." Adam Smith. *The Wealth of Nations* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc, 1998), 513. We find here a cynical view about human nature which is totally counterintuitive.

[92] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 288.

[93] Ibid., 289.

absolute regulation nor unlimited liberty, both impotent to resolve the social problems of the world. Whereas the Church uses force only as a secondary and purely defensive arm against evil, her offensive arm is

> only persuasion, the free adhesion of man to the truth and virtue: to the truth, in order to accept the social necessity and in order to create stability; to virtue, in order to render these necessities less harsh and create progress.[94]

Keller advocates reasonably moderate regulations which are accepted by the public conscience and will redress the most glaring injustices.[95]

Through the expansion of Catholic institutions and their influence on both workers and capitalists, Keller claims that the two classes will be reconciled. The Church will teach the workers thrift and association, and at the same time, will influence the wealthy to be generous with their reserves of wealth. As a result, the patrimony of the proletariat will be reconstituted.[96] Although encouraging savings banks and mutual help is required, more is needed. Keller proclaims:

> Its power will be increased tenfold by organizing *corps de métiers*,[97] and by permitting corporations to have a collective and alienable reserve to supply the needs of their members.[98]

Although supporting Le Play and Périn's moral reforms, Keller goes one step further. He mentions that these corporations, unlike the over-regulated corporations

---

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Ibid., 290.

[97] This can also be translated as professional bodies or corporate bodies.

[98] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 290.

under the *ancien régime,* should have a religious bond and as a result be permitted to have schools, churches, hospitals and to celebrate their own feast days. Further, these corporations should have both models to imitate and supports to assist them. Keller makes the case for "religious orders, especially consecrated to the workers' needs, which employ, in order to resolve the problems of industry and of the organization of work, the perseverance that the children of St. Benedict had employed to break up our "wildernesses."[99] Keller completes his picture of social renewal by advocating gratuitous loans to workers, dowries to poor women and aid to widows on a Christian rather than a philanthropic basis.[100]

Then Keller then lists appropriate means by which the State, in harmony with the public conscience, might use to protect individual liberty in the social order. First of all, it can protect the poor from the rapaciousness of capital by maintaining a legal rate of interest and forbidding certain types of speculation by the force of law.[101] Second, it can diminish the disorder in families and the relaxation of morals in society by upholding the indissolubility of marriage.[102] Third, it can provide for religious training at all levels of education to prevent the young from slipping into unbelief.[103] Lastly, although it should

---

[99] Ibid., 291.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Ibid., 292.

[102] Ibid., 293-295.

[103] Ibid., 295.

not force people to go to church, it should prevent anyone from being deprived of Sunday rest, which is the basis of the intellectual and moral life.[104] This demonstrates Keller's reliance on state intervention to remedy certain glaring social problems.

6. Political Truth: Principle of Political Liberty

According to Keller, the attempt to supply the same political blueprint for all peoples and countries is senseless. Besides being an ill-concocted dream of the revolutionary disciples of Rousseau, it is not grounded in political truth. Political truth takes into account the whole of the customs, traditions, and interests of each country—these ultimately determine its form of government.[105]

To bring about true political liberty, Keller remarks, "it is necessary that the entire people participate and that in place of being the exploitation of the country by a caste, the government represents and protects the interests of all."[106] Although Keller recognizes the natural superiorities in certain men who will hold power, he maintains that men must exercise their power on behalf of everyone.[107] He advocates a "representative regime" in which all interests are represented to the central power.[108] Further, the people have a

---

[104] Ibid., 298.

[105] Ibid., 305.

[106] Ibid., 306.

[107] Ibid., 310.

[108] Keller, being a monarchist, is here referring to a king when he uses the term "central power."

consultative office by which they enlighten the sovereign on their own proper affairs. According to Keller, this allows the nation a realizable share in sovereignty; and only Catholicism is equipped to bring this about for all, rather than just the privileged few.[109] This idea of a "representative regime" would strongly influence La Tour du Pin.

Whereas the Revolution leads to servitude, Keller maintains that the Church is capable of slowly bringing about a pacific and progressive liberty for all.[110] Rather than depoliticizing the clergy, he adds that the ministers of religion must once again reclaim their seats in political assemblies. Keller argues that the clergy would help point out legislation contrary to morals and opposed to religious liberty. In addition, they would support the interests of the poor and the weak.[111] As witnesses of God to the solemn commitment between the sovereign and the nation, they would give political oaths a religious value. As a result, in extreme cases where a prince is unfaithful to his pact, they could exercise toward him a legitimate defense, not by ordaining revolutions, but by limiting or preventing them.[112] They would be representatives of the poor and weak as well as a shield against the excesses of a tyrant. Keller also argues on behalf of an independent spiritual sovereignty that can resist the violences and seductions of a central

---

[109] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 310-311.

[110] Ibid., 311.

[111] Ibid., 312.

[112] Ibid., 312-313.

power gone bad.[113] Like Joseph de Maistre in his work, *Du Pape,*[114] Keller sees the papacy as a check and balance on the temporal power of worldly sovereigns. Outside of Catholicism, Keller states that all religions are to varying degrees subjugated to the State; the result is the destruction of liberty.[115]

Keller continues by maintaining that the "Liberties of 1789" have not led to a general emancipation of humanity, but to a further centralization of power following the lead of the *ancien régime*.[116] He relates:

> Far from correcting the abuses of schism [authority] and heresy [liberty], the Revolution has singularly exaggerated them, by denying all established power, all natural superiority, and by affirming the sovereignty of the people, that is to say, political truth, *no longer recognized, but created by the will of the men.*[117]

Such abuses and deceptions pave the way for Catholic truth, according to Keller. Catholic doctrine gives us "the true notion of authority, founded on respect for justice" and "the true notion of liberty, founded on respect for power."[118] Consequently, there must be a delicate balance between authority and liberty. As Aristotle formerly maintained, "Virtue is a kind of mean."[119] A preponderance of unmoderated authority

---

[113] Ibid., 307.

[114] See: Joseph de Maistre, *Du Pape*, 25e éd. (Lyon: H. Pélegaud, 1878), especially « Livre 2: Du pape dans son rapport avec les souverainetés temporelles » of this work.

[115] Ibid., 308.

[116] Ibid., 309.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Aristotle, "Nicomachean Ethics," in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New

leads to the autocratic absolutism of either the *ancien régime* or the Caesarean tyranny of the Revolutionary regime. On the other hand, the preponderance of unregulated liberty results in the "survival of the fittest" of the Darwinian economic liberal (feudal) school or the anarchy of the Revolutionary School. In the nineteenth century, the Revolutionary School fluctuated between the extremes of unlimited liberty and centralized authority as liberalism ultimately led to socialism.

Keller affirms, "the more a country respects its government, the less it needs to be governed."[120] The people need a certain amount of self-control to bring such a situation of stability about in the country. The Revolution teaches men to be impatient and resolve injustices immediately, eventually leading to greater injustices. On the contrary, the Church teaches men to bring about change slowly and perseveringly. When there is a level of stability in the government of a country, great men of "genius", such as Napoleon I or Napoleon III, are not required. Rather, honest, sensible men with a firmness of character will suffice. Such a people will be highly suited to monarchical, not imperial tendencies.[121]

A prince and a people that are profoundly Christian will exercise internal controls over their appetites through the aid of the Church. As a result, the country will be more acclimated to a decentralization of power and true liberty will blossom. This will provide

---

York: Random House, 1941), 1106[b]28, 958.

[120] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 310.

[121] Ibid.

a moral unity which respects diversity and the principle[122] of subsidiarity.[123] Intellectual and material progress will thrive as families, communes, and corporations are free to make decisions within their proper spheres of influence.

On the other hand, if peoples and princes do not become politically Christian again, centralization will be the natural consequence. Order needs to be maintained in society. If people will not control themselves, they will be controlled by a combination of raw force and a State teeming with laws, both of which ultimately undermine liberty. These exterior restraints bring about a material unity of a people, "a unity of the sword," which attempts to put men "in a common mold."[124] Uniformity and the destruction of all differences among men are the watchwords of such centralizers. Keller, relating the disastrous consequences of centralization in the spheres of politics, economics, and thought, claims:

> Thus are centralized nations formed, which are a perpetual menace for neighboring nations; centralized industries, which are the death sentence for small fortunes; finally, centralized sects, journals, secret societies, which impose a yoke of iron on vulgar intelligences.[125]

Keller then demonstrates that material progress[126] (regular armies, printing, journals,

---

[122] Keller did not use the term "principle of subsidiarity." This was of later provenance. He used the term "decentralization." Nevertheless, this term "principle of subsidiarity" adequately expresses what he had in mind and demonstrates that he was ahead of his time in his thinking.

[123] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 316-321.

[124] Ibid., 318.

[125] Ibid., 319.

[126] Donoso Cortés also speaks about this connection between material progress and centralization in his "Speech on Dictatorship." See: Bela Menczer, *Catholic Political Thought, 1789-1848* (South Bend,

steam, electricity, railways, telegraphs) has accentuated the problem of centralization, leading to a complete destruction of local forces and culminating in an all-encompassing bureaucratic administration.[127]

Keller exhorts Catholics to be above party factionalism and put their trust and confidence in the "bark of St. Peter, true plank of safety and sole place of the reconciliation of souls."[128] He likens Catholics to "conservatives" in that they respect laws and institutions; rather than overthrowing laws, they wish to improve them. At the same time, he likens Catholics to "revolutionaries" because they are not satisfied with the present order, but wish to better their country as well as humanity.[129] The Catholic is neither a disciple of the *ancien régime*, nor of the Revolution, but of Christ.

Keller ends Chapter XVIII by indicting those who advocate the principle of non-intervention. He points out that the Christian peoples are brothers who ought to come to one another's aid. While advocating solidarity among nations, Keller maintains that those who tolerate crimes are ultimately responsible for them also.[130] His main target is Napoleon III, who by evacuating his troops from Rome, became a willing accomplice in the Piedmontese takeover of the remainder of the Papal States.

IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962), 160-176. See especially pages 170-173.

[127] Keller, *L'Encyclique*, 320-321.

[128] Ibid., 326.

[129] Ibid., 323-326.

[130] Ibid., 329.

Earlier in Chapter XVIII, Keller challenges the great men of the upper classes. He states:

> In order that their [great men's] power not degenerate into feudal exclusivity, it is necessary that capable and intelligent men voluntarily renounce honor, fortune and the legislative preponderance to which they were called in order to become the champions of justice and the representatives of the weak.[131]

Keller practiced what he preached. He also galvanized other men of the upper classes to devote themselves, like the chivalrous knights of old, to the poor and the weak. While prisoners of war in Aachen, both Albert du Mun and René de La Tour du Pin read Keller's *L'Encyclique.* It was the first step in finding their vocations. De Mun, more of a man of action, championed workers as a deputy in the Assembly with Keller. La Tour du Pin, more of a thinker, placed his mind and pen in the service of restoring a Christian social order. Together, both men founded clubs which patronized workers.

Keller's book planted seeds in La Tour du Pin's mind which were later brought to fruition. Among other things, La Tour du Pin, like Keller, was both anti-individualist and anti-liberal. He had no time for the liberal anti-individualist aspects of Le Play and Périn's thought. For La Tour du Pin as for Keller, reform must not only be moral (as it was for Le Play and Périn), but also economic. Keller laid the ground work for La Tour du Pin by advocating the restoration of the *corps de métiers* (corporate bodies or corporations). This would increase workers' power by allowing these men to associate with one another and establish an inalienable corporative patrimony. The corporative

---

[131] Ibid., 307.

patrimony was a prerequisite for the liberty of the worker; for liberty presupposed the ownership of some type of property. At the same time the owners' and the workers' interests could be reconciled within the corporation, thereby avoiding the prevalent class warfare. Although Keller did not provide a complete plan for the restoration of the social order, he laid down principles and indicated certain paths[132] which La Tour du Pin would further develop.

Lastly, La Tour du Pin also further developed Keller's ideas of a representative regime. Keller maintained that a true political system must allow some participation by all the citizens as well as promote the common good, not the particular good of the most strong, intelligent, and wealthy. La Tour du Pin would further develop this idea into what he would call the "representative regime" or in other terms an "organic democracy." This type of democracy would respect local forces such as provinces, communes, corporations, and the family; unlike modern mechanistic democracy, it would not be prone to centralization.

After having examined Keller's social ideas, it is now fitting to consider the social ideas of Wilhelm von Ketteler, another key influence on La Tour du Pin. Unlike Keller, who produced just one great work, Ketteler was more prolific, penning a number of important social, political, and economic works. Attention will be focused on the works of Ketteler which most clearly affected the thought of La Tour du Pin.

---

[132] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 36.

B. Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler

1. Introduction

In the mid 1830's the German *Zollverein* or customs union brought about almost unlimited freedom of trade within German lands. This, combined with protective tariffs, stamped out foreign competition and encouraged the foundations for industrial growth.[133] Unlike England, France, and Belgium, Germany's industrial growth began much later, mainly after 1850.[134] Famines brought peasants into industrial centers to find work; journeymen, who had difficulties finding artisan work, also began to do factory work. In addition, the population grew during this period and added to the growing labor force. With the large increase in the number of laborers, wages fell to a low in the late 1840's.[135] Most factory workers were paid subsistence wages and were, therefore, barely capable of providing the food, clothing, and shelter requisite for family necessities.

Prior to examining the thought of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, it is helpful to survey four German social reformers who preceded him. Adam Müller (1779-1829) was one of the first great critics of Adam Smith and his economic system of laissez-faire. He was a romantic who was heavily influenced by Chateaubriand's glorious view of the

---

[133] Helga Grebing, *The History of the German Labor Movement* (London: Oswald Wolff, 1969), 33.

[134] Ibid., 34.

[135] John F. Cronin, S.S., and Harry W. Flannery, *The Church and the Workingman* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1965), 99.

Middle Ages. He wanted to reform society by hearkening back to the organic, corporate arrangement of the medieval period—he strongly opposed the contemporary, artificial, individualistic order of things in the early nineteenth century.[136]

Franz von Baader (1765-1841) was also a pioneer German social reformer in the early 19th century. Though a physician, he worked as a mining engineer in England for a time. In this capacity he saw the plight of many worker-families. He referred to Adam Smith's principle of laissez-faire as "loose-talk."[137] Baader was a good friend of the Abbé Felicité de Lamennais and together they "agreed that the mediating services of a socially minded priesthood were needed.…Baader conceived of the role of the priest as 'an advocate and aid in the plight of the propertyless among the people, and as an arbiter between them and the property owners.'"[138]

Franz-Joseph von Buss (1803-1878) championed the workers through social reform bills in the *Landtag* (State-parliament) of Baden. Among other things, he proposed a fourteen-hour workday limit, Sunday rest, sickness insurance funds, financed in part by the State. In addition, he supported technical training for workers and employee-owned factories.[139]

---

[136] William Edward Hogan, *The Development of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler's Interpretation of the Social Problem* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), 3.

[137] Cronin, *The Church and the Workingman*, 97.

[138] Ibid., 98.

[139] Ibid., 99.

Lastly, Adolph Kolping (1813-1865) must be mentioned. He was the founder of the *Katholische Gesellenvereine* (Catholic Journeymens' Associations). Kolping was a former journeyman cobbler before he became a priest. He wanted to provide some type of stable family life for his fellow journeymen in order to draw them away from the emotional appeal of revolutionary ideas.[140] These clubs were overseen by priests and multiplied quickly. They had

> courses in reading, writing and arithmetic (few journeymen had the excellent elementary education that Kolping had received) and continuing education in the trades, business, religion, and civics, but also, room and board for the traveling journeyman who had just arrived in town and had not yet found work. The clubhouses where the local members came to study or socialize also served as a sort of clearinghouse on job information for those who needed work.[141]

All four of these men anticipated the work of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler in their distinct fashions. Müller preceded Ketteler with the idea of replacing an individualistic, mechanical conception of society with a corporate, organic one. Baader stressed the role of the priest in the workers plight. Buss prefigured Ketteler by his reliance on state intervention in solving the workers' problems. Finally, Kolping prescribed associations for craftsmen and tradesmen which encouraged mutual social help. Although Ketteler, unlike Kolping, would concentrate on the industrial working class, he too would endorse such associations.

Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler (1811-1877)[142] was born on Christmas day[143] at

---

[140] T. Brauer, *The Catholic Social Movement in Germany* (Oxford: The Catholic Social Guild, 1932), 21-23.

[141] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe,* 98.

[142] For a survey of Ketteler's life and main ideas in English, see: Edward C. Bock, *Wilhelm von*

Münster in Westphalia. His family was a member of the lower nobility. As a boy he studied under the Jesuits in Brig, Switzerland, and later he entered the University of Göttingen to study physics, law and history. There he was involved in a duel in which he lost the tip of his nose, and while recovering from his wound, decided to study at the University of Berlin. He also studied at the Universities of Heidelberg and Munich before returning to Berlin to receive his law degree in 1833. Afterwards, he took a position as a legal consultant with the Prussian bureaucracy.[144]

In 1839 Ketteler resigned from his civil service job in protest over the arrest of the Archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August von Droste zu Vischering. This was known as

---

Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz: His Life, Times and Ideas (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1977). For a recent work in English which focuses on the beginnings of Ketteler's vocation to social Catholicism, see: Martin O'Malley, *Wilhelm Ketteler and the Birth of Modern Social Thought: A Catholic Manifesto in Revolutionary 1848* (München, Herbert Utz Verlag, 2008). For the definitive scholarly compilation of the complete works and letters of Ketteler, see: Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*, ed. Erwin Iserloh, 11 vols. (Mainz: von Hase und Koehler, 1977-2001). For an English translation of the most significant social teachings of Ketteler, see: Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981). Although it is an older work, Otto Pfülf's historical portrait of Bishop von Ketteler is very good. See: Otto Pfülf, *Bischof von Ketteler, 1811-1877,* 3 vols. (Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kircheim, 1899). For more recent works on Ketteler, see: Karl Brehmer, *Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler (1811-1877): Arbeiterbischof und Sozialethiker: auf den Spuren einer zeitlosen Modernität* (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2009); Joseph Höffner, *Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler und die katholische Sozialbewegung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1962). For a brief treatment in English of the accomplishments of German Catholicism, see: Alexander Dru, *The Contribution of German Catholicism* (New York: Hawthorn, 1963). For an excellent older work on the Catholic Church in Germany during the nineteenth century, see: Georges Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse: Le Catholicisme (1800-1870),* 4 vols. (Paris: Perrin, 1905-1909).

[143] Hence the middle name of Emmanuel. See: Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), v.

[144] Edward C. Bock, *Wilhelm von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz: His Life, Times and Ideas* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1977), 1-7.

the "Cologne Affair."[145] The archbishop had courageously defended the Catholic position on the issue of mixed marriages in the Prussian dominated Rhineland. Following the "Cologne Affair," Wilhelm decided to become a priest and returned to Munich for his studies.[146] In 1844 he was ordained a priest and began his service in the Westphalian towns of Beckau and Hopsten. Four years later, he was elected by his people to sit in the Frankfort Assembly of 1848.

2. Great Social Questions of the Present Time

As a newly appointed deputy to the Frankfort Assembly in late 1848, Ketteler gave the famous oration over the graves of two murdered assemblymen, Prince Lichnowsky and General von Auerswald. This oration brought his name into high relief throughout the nation. The great Bishop stated:

> I hear cries for help from among our poor, suffering brethren; yet who, that is not purblind, cannot see how they languish in their need, and who, that is not heartless, is not in full sympathy with this cry for help? I see greed and miserliness on the increase; I see the pursuit of pleasure taking over. I see men, who call themselves national leaders do nothing to prevent the growing need. Instead they make matters worse by undermining people's will to work by instigating envy of what someone else possesses. It never occurs to them to open their own pocketbooks to help the poor. Instead they work to destroy the Christian teaching which requires that a man begin by opening his own heart to share with his fellow man what he has in superabundance. 'Do you wish to be perfect, then go sell

---

[145] For a description of the events surrounding the "Cologne Affair," see: Roger Aubert et al., *The Church between Revolution and Restoration,* vol. 7 of *History of the Church*, trans. Peter Becker, ed. Hubert Jedin and John Dolan (London: Burns & Oates, 1981), 331-334; Owen Chadwick, *A History of the Popes, 1830-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 37-40. The treatment of Droste zu Vischering by Chadwick is particularly severe. For a view more sympathetic to Droste zu Vischering, see: Karl Bihlmeyer and Hermann Tüchle, *Modern and Recent Times,* vol. 3 of *Church History,* trans. Victor E. Mills, O.F.M. and Francis J. Mueller, O.F.M. (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1966), 326-329.

[146] Among his professors were Johann Joseph von Görres and the great church historian Ignaz Döllinger. During this time Ketteler also read Johann Adam Möhler's *Symbolik*, and was deeply influenced by it. See: Bock, *Wilhelm von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz*, 10-13.

> what you have and give it to the poor. [147]

During Advent 1848, Ketteler was asked to deliver six sermons in Mainz, the very year in which Marx and Engels issued their *Communist Manifesto.* These six sermons were published as *The Great Social Issues of the Present.*[148] Edgar Alexander notes:

> In these sermons reflecting the social awakening of the Church, worthy of the sermons of the great Ambrose of Milan, who also might be regarded as a social revolutionary, German Catholicism probably made its most positive contribution to the Year of Revolution, 1848. All the later achievements of Ketteler in social criticism and church programs, significant though they were, must rank second in their historical consequences and importance to these veritable "social sermons on the mount" of Advent 1848.…he [Karl Marx] could not regain his calm with respect to these sermons and their consequences, even in 1869: "Whenever they think fit these dogs (for instance, Bishop Ketteler in Mainz, the clerics at the Duesseldorf Congress, etc.) flirt with the labor question. As it turns out, in 1848 we have toiled for them, only they enjoyed the fruit of the Revolution in the time of reaction."[149]

The first sermon on "The Christian Concept of the Private Property Right"[150] was delivered in St. Peter's Church. The other five sermons were preached in the cathedral because of the large crowds.[151] All six of the sermons provided the foundation for his later social thought. I will only treat of his first sermon on private property because

---

[147] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 109-110.

[148] The German original was titled *Die Grossen socialen Fragen der Gegenwart.*

[149] Edgar Alexander, "Church and Society in Germany," in *Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements, 1789-1950,* ed. by Joseph N. Moody (New York: Arts, Inc., 1953), 414-415.

[150] The German original of this first sermon was titled *Die christliche Idee vom Rechte des Eignethums.*

[151] Rupert Ederer, translator's note to "The Great Social Issues of the Present," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* 3. The other five sermons included "The Obligation of Christian Charity," "The Christian Concept of Human Freedom," "The Christian Concept of Human Destiny," "The Christian Concept of Marriage and the Family," and "On the Authority of the Catholic Church."

Ketteler's understanding of the social function of property was similar to that of La Tour du Pin's.

Concerning private property rights, Ketteler describes two misconceptions, one which sees private property as an absolute and inviolable right and the other which wants private property abolished altogether.[152] Ketteler turned to the teaching of St. Thomas[153] to shed light on the truth concerning property rights. In particular, he examined Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae,* II, II q. 66 arts. 1-2. According to St. Thomas, Ketteler argued that God alone is absolute owner of all things; man, on the other hand, is merely a restricted owner and can be said to have a "right to use;" therefore, he must only use goods for the reasons which God has ordained.[154] Ketteler next points out that true property rights can only exist when there is a living faith in God. For once man has separated himself from God, men, usurping the place of God, arrogate the right of absolute ownership to

---

[152] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "The Great Social Issues of the Present," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981),10.

[153] In his book, *Nineteenth Century Scholasticism,* Gerard McCool describes how Bishop Joseph Ludwig Colmar invited his friend Bruno Lieberman to head up the seminary at Mainz along Tridentine lines. Lieberman made Mainz into a stronghold of scholasticism and he founded the review, *Der Katholik* which, with *Civililtà Cattolica,* became one of the most influential organs of neo-Thomism. See: Gerard McCool, *Nineteenth Century Scholasticism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989), 31. Nonetheless, in *Social Catholicism in Europe,* Paul Misner states, "Some have taken his use of Thomas Aquinas as evidence that Ketteler, like Pope Leo XIII, regarded Thomist thought as the God-given instrument by which the Roman Catholic Church would prove its worth to the nineteenth century. Actually, Ketteler, who was not of a scholarly cast of mind, who had not been trained in Thomism (the neo-Thomist revival in Germany had started in Mainz earlier in the century, but Ketteler had studied theology mostly in Munich), merely regarded Aquinas as a particularly representative and clear spokesman for the common Catholic tradition on the relations of the propertied and the property-less." Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe,* 94-95.

[154] Ketteler, "The Great Social Issues of the Present," 11.

themselves. Goods are seen to satisfy man's greed and lust for pleasure under such circumstances. This egoism causes man to ignore the plight of his less fortunate brethren and, as a result, a huge gap dividing the rich and the poor develops.[155]

Ketteler makes use of Aquinas' distinction between the care and administration of property on the one hand, and the enjoyment of the benefits of property on the other. Concerning the care and preparation of the goods of this earth, Aquinas claims that men have the right of private ownership for three reasons.[156] First of all, only when property is privately owned will people take good care of it. If property is held in common, most people will ignore it and "let someone else take care of it."[157] Secondly, private property ensures that order will be maintained so that the goods of this world are effectively exploited. Diversity of labor is requisite to effectively care for the needs of men. If there were no private ownership of goods, then the division of labor would be chaotic.[158] Finally, private property maintains peace among men. If everyone owned everything, all kinds of disputes would break out over how to use the property.[159] Regarding the enjoyment of the benefits of property, Aquinas states that man ought to regard property as the common property of all. A man has duties to his fellow man and must be prepared

---

[155] Ibid., 12-13.

[156] Ibid., 14.

[157] Ibid.

[158] Ibid., 14-15.

[159] Ibid., 15.

to share with those who are in want.[160]

Ketteler concludes his sermon on private property by telling his hearers that goods are unevenly distributed amongst people so that they can be god-like by sharing with their fellow man. For it is by Christian charity that God allows us to imitate him by exercising our free will and self-determination. He closes by exhorting the congregation to works of charity.[161]

3. Freedom, Authority, and the Church

In 1862, Ketteler published *Freedom, Authority, and the Church.*[162] It was translated into French that very same year.[163] This work chiefly concerns the political order. It is, first of all, a clarion call for Catholics to bestir themselves and man the Catholic press in order to clarify the issues of freedom and authority, which were improperly understood by many people. He treats of the fine balance between liberty and authority which a state must maintain in order to avoid the extremes of revolution and absolutism. Later in this work he discusses the nature of religious freedom, freedom of the Church, the unity and indissolubility of marriage, freedom of education, and freemasonry. The latter part of the book is an indictment against the liberal secularist

---

[160] Ibid.

[161] Ibid., 17-18.

[162] The German original was titled *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche.*

[163] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 60.

regime of the time and its absolutist tendencies. Although this work contains many subjects for reflection, I will examine only those ideas which appear to have influenced La Tour du Pin. Among them will be included Ketteler's ideas on liberty, authority, absolutist centralization, modern liberalism as absolutism in the guise of liberty, and the constitutional and corporate political structures. Rupert Ederer, a translator of many of Ketteler's works, noting certain parallels between Ketteler's *Freedom, Authority, and the Church* and Pius IX's *Syllabus errorum,* claims that Ketteler's work quite probably influenced the pope's work.[164]

Like Émile Keller, Ketteler emphasizes the disastrous consequences of original sin which "damaged his [man's] ability to recognize truth and choose what is good."[165] At the same time, Ketteler underscores Christ's Redemption in overcoming these effects of original sin. Hence, Christianity does not obscure men's minds and deny them what is truly good as certain modern men believed. Rather, it aids man's ability to recognize truth and choose the good, and as such, makes men truly free and brings about true progress.[166]

Afterwards, Ketteler treats of freedom in general. Whereas God's freedom is unconditional and unlimited, Ketteler states:

---

[164] Ederer, translator's note to "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* 103.

[165] Ketteler, "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," 112.

[166] Ibid., 113.

> The freedom of man can only be a conditional freedom. It is restricted by obligation—the obligation to submit itself freely to the Divine Will.[167]

Ketteler understands that human freedom is regulated and conditional. It is limited by duties and obligations; it is not a license or a "freedom to do as one wishes" as "liberty" is defined in article four of the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen.* This document declares, "Liberty consists of the power to do whatever is not injurious to others." [168]

At the same time Ketteler points out that the ruler of a state does not have unlimited and unconditional power. While maintaining that all authority originates from God, he claims that the employment of that authority does not. The abuse of authority is what leads to absolutism, for a king is also required to exercise his power "in obedience to God's will."[169] Ketteler considers the "Divine Right of Kings" as "nothing more than a destructive idolatry."[170]

Ketteler then examines two basic tendencies of societies. He declares, "The one serves to cement the social body and hold it together; the other is the one whereby the members of society stress their own individuality and their differences and thereby make

---

[167] Ibid., 118.

[168] "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 114.

[169] Ketteler, "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," 146.

[170] Ibid., 145.

their own specific contributions."[171] The one stresses unity, the other diversity. While observing that both of these tendencies are necessary for the development of a society, he claims that there must be a delicate balance between them. This balance is between authority and freedom. Selfishness, however, leads to a perversion of authority and freedom. If authority tips the scales of the balance, the citizens are degraded and the result is a tyrannical absolutism. On the other hand, if freedom predominates, then the unity of the State is broken and the outcome is revolution.[172]

"The essence of liberty," says Ketteler, "whatever the context, lies in free self-determination stemming from inner conviction rather than from external force.[173] Hence, the greater latitude that a man has to organize and manage his affairs in the personal, social, and political spheres, without infringing on the rights of others, the more that man is said to be free.[174]

Ketteler next demonstrates how Christian-inspired morality is interconnected with political liberty and self-government, while revolution destroys all freedom and sooner or later leads to absolutism. He comments:

> The more moral a man is and the more free he is of selfishness and domination by unruly passions, the more free he is in the true sense of the word. Whoever learns self-control does not require that any external bonds be placed upon him. A truly Christian nation could operate with a maximum of self-government. On the other hand, revolution and the spirit of revolt are the enemies of all

---

[171] Ibid., 131.

[172] Ibid., 131-132.

[173] Ibid., 135.

[174] Ibid.

> freedom. The brutal person,[175] referred to in Sacred Scripture, abuses all freedom and brings on absolutism! [176]

Conversely, one might glean from Ketteler's comments that, insofar as a people is immoral and lacks self-control, the less likely they will participate in self-government. If they lack self-control in their daily lives, i.e., the little matters, then they will lack control in their political life, i.e., great matters. Furthermore, they will be degraded by an absolutist centralized state that rules over every aspect of their life.

This brings us to Ketteler's appraisal of the health of a state. He maintains that it is fallacious to think that a state is stronger to the degree that it wields greater power. He claims, "It is like judging the health of the human body by the size of its waistline."[177] He attests that there must be a delicate balance between authority and freedom and testifies to the worth of what later would be called the "principle of subsidiarity." He designates the different social bodies (families, corporations, communes, provinces, etc.) in which men organize themselves as moral persons. Although the State has the function of unifying all the lower social bodies, it does not have the right of taking over tasks within the inferior bodies' proper spheres of influence; if it does, it will neglect its own proper duties and all will suffer because of it.[178]

---

[175] It is not entirely clear as to which passage of Sacred Scripture Kettler is referring. Perhaps, he is making reference to Matt. 20:25.

[176] Ketteler, "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," 137.

[177] Ibid., 139-140.

[178] Ibid., 140.

Ketteler recognizes three principal areas in which the State's competence is justified. First of all, the State must safeguard justice. Secondly, it should offer support—beneficent intervention—so that the citizens can attain their temporal well-being. Lastly, it should represent the nation in its dealings with other nations.[179]

Ketteler then compares the effects of absolutism and revolution on civil society. He relates:

> Absolutism is self-seeking gone wild on the part of those who hold the reins of state power, just as revolution is self-seeking gone wild on the part of the members of society. Both lead to the dissolution of society; the former in that it destroys the freedom and individuality of the separate members of society, the latter in that it severs the bond of unity required for any society. One obliterates differences, the other, unity. [180]

He continues on to criticize the following principles: *"cuius regio, eius religio,"* of the Protestant princes; *"L'État c'est moi"* of Louis XIV; "Liberty is the despotism of reason" of Robespierre; and finally, "Liberty is the despotism of law" of Casimir Périer.[181] All of these expressions are examples of absolutism as exemplified in different types of government.[182]

The baneful effects of absolutism and centralization are next examined by Ketteler. He lists five harmful results. "First of all," he states, "absolutist centralization deprives the vast majority of citizens of any real grasp of the public affairs that affect

---

[179] Ibid., 140-143.

[180] Ibid., 159.

[181] Casimir Pierre Périer was the Prime Minister of Louis Philippe from 1831-1832.

[182] Ketteler, "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," 162-163.

their everyday lives."[183] These citizens have no opportunity to learn the duties and responsibilities which come with self-government. The people do not "participate" in the political process. Hence, irresponsible opinions hold sway in society at large.[184]

Second, he maintains that civil virtues, especially the willingness to sacrifice, are suppressed. Unpaid volunteers who are concerned with the good of the country are the backbone of a self-governed state. On the other hand, salaried officials, who care more for their paycheck than the good of the country, proliferate in a centralized state.[185]

Third, remarking on the disservice which centralized government does to those who are drawn to materialism, Ketteler remarks that it

> …robs those classes which depend upon material gain of every opportunity to get involved in any more ennobling activities, and it serves to make them venal and concerned exclusively with pleasure and money. [186]

Ketteler also notes that, next to religion, participation in public affairs is a great way to elevate men's interests above the material level.[187]

Fourth, Ketteler points out that centralization rends apart the fabric of society by destroying the different social bodies in which men gather to attain certain common ends. In the end this destruction of solidarity among men leads to an atomization of society or a

---

[183] Ibid., 175.

[184] Ibid.

[185] Ibid., 175-176.

[186] Ibid., 176.

[187] Ibid.

social isolation. There is no leadership, nor is there any social cohesion. Society is similar to a pile of dust, blown in the wind.[188]

Lastly, this centralization leads to revolution. For, among other things, the State takes on responsibilities which it cannot possibly execute, but at the same time prevents others from carrying out responsibilities in their proper spheres of influence. As a result, since the State claims to have all these responsibilities, when it fails to succeed in carrying them out, the citizens, who have no awareness of responsibilities, become frustrated and blame the State for any harm they receive. This imbalance of exaggerated responsibilities on the part of the leaders, together with the lack of responsibilities for the members of society, becomes a seedbed from which revolutions originate.[189]

After this, Ketteler assails modern liberalism which he claims is really "absolutism in the guise of liberty."[190] He claims that modern day liberals inconsistently support the absolutist centralized state and are quite truly the heirs of the bureaucratic machinery of the *ancien régime.* He asserts, "…modern liberalism represents intolerant, relentless centralization and the omnipotent state as opposed to individual and corporate autonomy."[191] Later he adds, "the lash that was wielded by the absolute monarch is now in the hands of the absolute representative, so-called of the people; and he is, if anything,

---

[188] Ibid., 176-177.

[189] Ibid., 177-178.

[190] Ibid., 183.

[191] Ibid.

even more determined."[192] Although this grasping, self-seeking, "phony liberalism" is responsible for the ultimate debasement and enslavement of the people, it claims that it alone is the guardian of liberty.[193]

Although modern liberty also talks continuously of "the people," in reality it "exploits the basest passions of the people as a means to subjugate them."[194] All political outcomes are said to be the "will of the people" even though the people are only allowed to vote occasionally.[195] Finally, modern liberalism is godless; it has a great contempt for anything truly Christian, and especially Catholic. Although the people are still basically Christian, the parliament, filled with the people's representatives (liberals), scorn Christianity, demonstrating that the parliament it is not truly representative.[196]

Ketteler then makes a comparison and appraisal of the constitutional and corporate orders as the two basic forms according to which the State can be structured. He regards the constitutional structure as mechanical and the corporate structure as organic.[197] Although Ketteler rejects a constitutional order which supplants the "will of God" by the "will of the people" with the latter as the source of all authority and all

---

[192] Ibid.

[193] Ibid., 183-184.

[194] Ibid., 185.

[195] Ibid.

[196] Ibid., 187.

[197] Ibid., 195.

rights, he does admit that the constitutional structure itself is not opposed to Christian principles. Nevertheless, he favors the corporate order.[198]

In analyzing the constitutional structure, Ketteler points out that its unifying force is external, and therefore, mechanical. It brings people together in a thoroughly utilitarian manner. The people or electors are merely united together on account of geographical proximity or in "equality in what they possess (wealth)," which are very general bonds. There is no real bond between the constituents and the representatives. The representatives represent one party and the electors represent an unlimited number of parties. The people are even more out of touch with the representative if the latter does not pander to their baser instincts, engage in demagoguery, or bribe them.[199] According to Ketteler, this type of electioneering does not lead to the representation of the people, but to an exploitation of the people.

Ketteler then examines the corporate order. He observes that the unifying force is internal and organic, similar to a living organism; on account of this, it is on a higher plane of existence than a mere political structure based on mechanical unity.[200] Concerning the nature of the corporate structure, he relates:

> Parts that are thus organically united link up with other higher organisms up to the highest organic form which then binds all of the parts into one overriding *individuum*. Thus everything in it is alive and operates according to an inner vital principle. Everything about it is marked by a free self-

---

[198] Ibid.

[199] Ibid., 195-196.

[200] Ibid., 196.

> determination and a free self-government whereby the individual members serve the whole organism. The activity of the individual member is limited[201] only at that point where, for its fulfillment, it requires the intervention of the higher organism. [202]

These reflections demonstrate Ketteler's commitment to solidarity among people and the later-broached "principle of subsidiarity." Ketteler ends by noting that corporate structures dovetail better with self-government and true representation. Whereas the constitutional structure represents only partisan or personal interests, the corporate structure truly represents "…common interests, i.e., a representation of the actual, general interests of the people;…"[203] There is much more realistic participation by the people and "true representation of interests" in such a structure. He concludes by remarking:

> How much better the crafts, the merchant class, the academicians, the nobility, the religious, the public officials could be represented than they are now, if they were organized as corporate bodies which represent their own interest, where every elected representative has to be all things to all people![204]

As both Karl von Vogelsang and René La Tour du Pin studied the works of Bishop von Kettler, it is extremely plausible that Ketteler's discussion of the mechanistic and organic structures of the State played a great role in shaping the thought of both men.

---

[201] Ketteler's description of the corporate structure is very similar to that found in Pius XI's encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno*, nos. 79 & 80.

[202] Ketteler, "Freedom, Authority, and the Church," 196-197.

[203] Ibid., 197.

[204] Ibid.

4. The Labor Problem and Christianity

In 1864 Ketteler wrote *The Labor Problem and Christianity*[205] which discusses issues of the economic order. This book was translated into French in 1869.[206] This book is divided into four main parts. The first part concerns the conditions of the laboring classes. The rest of the book addresses the solutions to the Labor Problem proposed by the liberals, socialists, and Ketteler himself.

At the outset, Ketteler claims that the "political problems" of the day are far less important than the Labor Problem, for the latter pertains to the worker's basic necessities, viz. food, clothing and shelter. In addition, it also concerns the greater part of mankind.[207] He reproaches the parliamentary deputies for posing as "friends of the people," but in reality doing nothing but engaging in empty talk.[208] He states:

> All one needs is the gift of gab in parliament and a certain willingness to publish long opinionated columns in the papers; then the counterfeit title can be won. The *real* friend of the people once said, "By your deeds you shall know them." All that has changed. Now you will know the friend of the people by his words and by his slogans. [209]

While recalling that unemployable people have always existed throughout history, Ketteler observes that the Church has been the chief source of aid for these people

---

[205] The German original was titled *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christenthum.*

[206] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 60.

[207] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "The Labor Problem and Christianity," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 313.

[208] Ibid.

[209] Ibid., 314.

through its hospitals, poor houses, and institutions for the aged and infirm.[210] Christianity, he claims, provides superior service to the poor because work is done voluntarily out of charity and not for the paycheck.[211]

Concurring with the socialist leader, Ferdinand Lassalle, Ketteler notes that the wages of workers are at the subsistence level.[212] Human labor was seen as a commodity which was subjected to the laws of supply and demand. If there was an oversupply of labor, workers would compete amongst each other and underbid each other for lower-than-subsistence wages. Given this state of affairs, the workers theoretically would not be able to provide for themselves or their families.[213] Ketteler said , "that is the slave market of our liberal Europe fashioned according to the blueprint of our humanist, enlightened, anti-Christian liberalism and Freemasonry!"[214]

Ketteler maintained that such conditions existed for two reasons, unrestrained competition and dominance of capital. Unrestrained competition brings prices down to the cost of production. If one sees human beings as any other commodity, then unrestrained competition will bring wages to subsistence level, because that is the

---

[210] Ibid., 317.

[211] Ibid.

[212] Lassalle referred to the subsistence wage theory of David Ricardo as the "iron law of wages."

[213] Ketteler, "The Labor Problem and Christianity," 321-323.

[214] Ibid., 323.

minimum wage needed to keep the worker alive and producing.[215]

The dominance of capital had two repercussions. First of all, it had reduced the number of self-employed workers and increased the number of those dependent on a wage. For example, large organizations would begin to encroach on all kinds of work and, on account of economies of scale, would do it more cheaply than someone who is self-employed. These people would not be able to compete with the large outfits, and therefore, would have to become day-laborers.[216] Secondly, prices are further reduced when capital is invested in machinery. Human beings cannot compete with machines, for unlike machines, they need to be fed and need to sleep.[217]

Ketteler here bemoans the loss of the guilds. He realizes that they could sometimes be abusive by overcharging for shoddy goods. Nonetheless, he believes that they could have been updated and reformed.[218] He describes how the guild restrictions which were caused by an exaggerated authority (absolutism within the guild itself) brought about the reaction of an excessive freedom which led to unrestrained competition. He would like to see a balance between authority and freedom.[219] Hence,

---

[215] Ibid., 325-326.

[216] Ibid., 330-331.

[217] Ibid., 331.

[218] Ibid., 329.

[219] Ibid., 328.

he thinks politicians should have taken some of the guild restrictions[220] and combined them with legitimate freedom.[221]

Ketteler is not impressed by the proposals of the liberals. He takes to task their ideas of social self-help and their reforms for bettering the material condition of the working classes. First he states that social self-help is not new, this was the idea behind the guilds. In fact, liberals have no business touting self-help at all, because according to their own principles, the individual is self-sufficient and outside help offered to a person offends his dignity.[222]

Secondly, Ketteler claims that the liberals' "reforms" do not truly improve the material condition of the lower classes as M. Lassalle has already shown. Among these reforms are various types of cooperative associations which include loan associations, raw material procurement associations and consumer cooperatives. First of all, loan associations are useful only to those who have their own businesses; this excludes wage-earners. Secondly, raw material procurement associations are useless because wage-earners do not work with their own materials. Finally, consumer cooperatives do benefit the wage-earner somewhat insofar as he can get better goods for a lower price.

---

[220] Some of the beneficial guild restrictions of times past were limited working hours, Sunday rest, minimum wages, and restrictions on women and children working. Because the guilds no longer existed, both Ketteler and Leo XIII (in *Rerum novarum)* would claim that the state would have the right to establish such restrictions for the benefit of the workers.

[221] Ketteler, "The Labor Problem and Christianity," 331.

[222] Ibid., 347.

Nevertheless, they have their limits; for as consumer cooperatives multiply, more independent businesses will fail and the number of wage-earning laborers will increase, thereby reducing wages, which will cause wages to buy even less.[223]

The radicals' proposals do seem to truly address the material welfare of the worker, but Ketteler questions their legitimacy. Since workers put their "flesh and blood" into their work, it would seem that they should be remunerated over and above a subsistence wage. Lassalle and the radicals want the workers to be co-owners in enterprises such as the productive associations in England and France. These associations cannot effectively take root on their own, because the workers do not have enough capital to found them. Hence, the radicals declare that the State should provide assistance by either lending or giving them the needed capital. Since the propertied classes now control parliament, they will not permit this. Therefore, the working classes should agitate for direct representation in parliament. Once they have their deputies in parliament, a simple majority will endow them with the needed capital for productive associations. On account of this, the good things of the earth would then belong to the workers.[224]

Ketteler mentions that if there is no personal God and the property right is based on the will of the people, then the State can forcibly dispossess people.[225] However, he

---

[223] Ibid., 350-352.

[224] Ibid., 356-359.

[225] Ibid., 364.

claims that Christians, who believe that laws ought to be just, cannot be forced to help their fellows in need. There still is a moral duty to help one's neighbor, but not a legal duty.[226]

Although he has misgivings about state subsidies for the workers,[227] he agrees with the Socialists in ushering in direct elections. He is aware of the problems of demagoguery, but he believes that direct elections are better than the prevailing corrupt liberal system.[228] Hence, like La Tour du Pin after him, he feels that the prevailing liberal system is not truly representative and argues in favor of a system that will truly represent all rights and interests.

Ketteler then proposes Christianity's' solutions to the workers' problems. He maintains, "Before Christianity, any notion of a common origin of all men, of a common high destiny and unique value of every human person had all but vanished from the earth."[229] Christianity recognized the immortal soul in the slaves of ancient times[230] and the spirit of Christianity permeated society so that slave owners eventually freed their slaves out of charity.[231] The workers' plight calls for the same solution. He states:

---

[226] Ibid., 365-367.

[227] Ibid., 373.

[228] Ibid., 378.

[229] Ibid., 383.

[230] Ibid., 383-384.

[231] Ibid., 386.

> The cure for this can and will come only from within. To the degree that eternal truth once again enlightens men's spirits, we will once more discern the principles and their proper application in the economic scheme of things as well as in the political sphere that is so closely related to it. [232]

Ketteler then mentions five different means by which the Church can ameliorate the hardships of the worker. First of all, Christianity produces institutions for unemployable workers, such as hospitals, poor houses, and insane asylums, which are sponsored by people acting out of supernatural love.[233] Consequently, these unemployed workers had a place to go if they cannot get a job.

Second, there are three advantages which Christianity produces in families based on solid Christian marriages. They are the following: a) the indissolubility of the sacrament of marriage contributes to the stability of the family; b) chaste morals keep the worker from falling into an enervated physical condition; and c) the workers' wage is increased by the thrift of the prudent Christian wife and by a good Christian man who avoids squandering his money at the tavern.[234]

Third, the truths of Christianity offer the possibility of an authentic personal development for members of the working class. Christianity teaches one to develop one's capacities to the utmost, which leads one to avoid sloth. It also teaches one not to trust in earthly goods for most men will be denied these. In fact, Christianity reminds us that the Son of God shared man's earthly existence as a fellow laborer who had few

---

[232] Ibid.

[233] Ibid., 387-389.

[234] Ibid., 391-396.

earthly goods. In addition, it points out that one's daily work does have a spiritual value.[235]

Fourth, the social forces of Christianity provide principles for the foundation of healthy, organic associations, not mechanical associations which have only external bonds and utilitarian motives. Christian associations, relying on the principle of love of God as a check on love of self, will provide for love of one's neighbor. Associations based on such a Christian spirit will have strong internal bonds and higher spiritual motives. According to Ketteler, certain associations deserve the name corporations. He states:

> It is appropriate to refer to certain associations as corporate bodies. The body is the ultimate union of its members, which are bound together by the highest life-giving principle, the soul. We, therefore refer rightly to certain associations as corporations, since they, in a certain real sense, contain a soul which truly unites the members of the organization. That is the specific peculiarity of the Christian principle of association. Even though the immediate purpose of an association is a completely mundane one, dedicated to the needs of everyday-living, it nevertheless is possessed of a higher consistency and binding force when it is based on Christian principles.[236]

Kettler's view of corporations here is very different from the typical understanding of a corporation.[237] According to his understanding, a trade union could be a corporation as long as the spirit uniting and binding all of the workers together is based on Christian principles. That is definitively what transforms a mere association into a corporation. Such associations could be formed for social or scholarly purposes or for improving

---

[235] Ibid., 397-404.

[236] Ibid., 407.

[237] In the standard understanding of a "corporation," all workers and owners in the same trade are united together in one social body.

material welfare. Two such organizations would be trade unions and the *Gesellenvereine* of Fr. Kolping.[238]

Ketteler's fifth suggestion included the producer cooperatives of Lassalle, but under the auspices of Christianity. Rather than advocating state-help like Lassalle,[239] he is hopeful that voluntary contributions from Christians will be forthcoming as during other times in the history of the Church in order to implement the producer-cooperatives.[240] He later asserts:

> If only it is more possible by the practice of Christian charity to scrape together the necessary men for setting up an enterprise and then to invite workers to work in such an enterprise with the understanding that whatever profits are not needed for maintaining the enterprise, and whatever must not be put into a reserve fund will flow to them as an expression of Christian love. The effect will be tremendous, and the accursed influence of a godless industrial system on the working class would perhaps be broken once and for all. [241]

5. Later Works of Ketteler

When *The Labor Problem and Christianity* was written, Ketteler was still mistrustful of using state intervention on behalf of the worker; he was still relying on moral regeneration and the Church's own role in solving the problems of the working class. By 1869, however, he was following a different tack. He had now decided that

---

[238] Ketteler, "The Labor Problem and Christianity," 405-411.

[239] At one point Ketteler wrote an anonymous letter (to avoid scandal) to Lassalle asking him how to implement producer cooperatives. Even though Lassalle was an atheist, Ketteler still had a high regard for him and some of his ideas. Lassalle himself paid tribute to Ketteler's own interest in the solution of the Labor Problem as well. See: Alec Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism, 1820-1920*, 107-108.

[240] Ketteler, "The Labor Problem and Christianity," 414-415.

[241] Ibid., 418.

state intervention was imperative on account of the influence of socialism as well as the influence of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* (1867) over the workers.[242]

On 25 July 1869, Ketteler gave an "Address to Workers" near Offenbach. Later it was published as *The Labor Movement and Its Goals in Terms of Religion and Morality*.[243] He addressed the question of how a Catholic can be involved in the Labor Movement without falling into moral or religious danger. He says:

> In the course of my presentation, it will become clear to you that whatever is good and legitimate in the labor movement of our time can only be realized to the extent that it remains tied firmly to religion and morality. Without religion and morality, all efforts to improve the lot of the working class will be futile. It is of the utmost importance that we grasp this truth. [244]

Ketteler then singles out certain demands of the Labor Movement, recognizing that they are good if they are tied to religion and morality. The six demands are the following:

> The first demand for the working class is for an increase in wages that reflects the true value of a man's labor….
>
> The second demand of the working class is for a reduction of the hours of work….
>
> The third demand of the working class is the provision of days of rest….
>
> The fourth demand of the labor movement is the ban on child labor in factories, while children are of mandatory school age….
>
> The fifth demand of the working class is to prohibit female labor, especially the employment of mothers, in factories….
>
> The sixth demand which is often pressed among spokesman for the working class, one which is

---

[242] Bock, *Wilhelm von Ketteler*, 28.

[243] The German original was titled *Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältniss zu Religion und Sittlichkeit.*

[244] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "The Labor Movement and Its Goals in Terms of Religion and Morality," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 440.

> closely related to the previous one, is that young ladies are to be excluded from work in the factories.[245]

On the day following (26 July 1869) his address to the workers, Ketteler gave an "Address to the Bishops" at the Fulda Conference. This address was later published as *The Charitable Concern of the Church for the Working Class*.[246] In this address Ketteler first points out to the bishops that the social problem of the working class is a reality in Germany. He then provides reasons why the Church should get involved. Among the most important reasons which Ketteler underscores is that the Labor Problem touches on the "deposit of faith." This is an unmistakably new tune to which the assembled bishops are listening. He states:

> …the social problem touches on the deposit of faith. Even if it is not immediately apparent, the leading principle of modern economics which has been aptly characterized as, "The war of all against all," stands in direct opposition to our Faith; and it merits foursquare condemnation on dogmatic grounds. Why? Because it contradicts the basic natural law, not to mention the Christian teachings of love for one's fellowman. If this is not sufficient proof, witness the results in nations where the economic system based on that principle has reached a significant state of development, so that there has been bred a factory population of physical, spiritual, and moral cripples who are beyond the reach of Christianity's saving graces. It also stands in flagrant opposition to basic humanity, let alone Christian dignity, just as it stands opposed to the destiny of material goods, as intended by God, to serve the needs of all mankind. It plays havoc with family life which was intended by God for the propagation of the race of men, including their proper nourishment and upbringing. Above all, this abominable principle flies in the face of mandates of Christian charity, which is intended to govern not only the dealings among individuals, but also to serve as the guideline for the organization of society and social relationships in general. [247]

He then explained the remedies to the Labor Problem as well as the role of the

---

[245] Ibid., 444, 448-449, 452-453, 456.

[246] The German original was titled *Sozialkaritative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft.*

[247] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "The Charitable Work of the Church for the Working Class," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 475-476.

Church in overcoming it. As mentioned earlier, Ketteler evolved from a position of solving the Labor Problem by moral regeneration with the aid of the Church, to a position which required state intervention. It is at the Fulda Conference that he circumscribes the measures to be to be enacted by government legislation. They are as follows:

> 1) Abandon the practice of employing young children in factories.
>
> 2) Strict limitation on the hours that young people are allowed to work, in the interest of their proper physical and mental development.
>
> 3) Segregation of the sexes in the workshops.
>
> 4) Closing shops which pose a health hazard.
>
> 5) Limitation of the hours of labor generally.
>
> 6) Sunday rest.
>
> 7) Compensation to be paid to the workers who, through no fault of their own are disabled while on the job, whether temporarily or permanently.
>
> 8) Legislative encouragement and support of worker organizations that are in the common interest of workers such as the law of the North German League protecting the legal status of industrial and commercial associations, passed on July 4, 1868.
>
> 9) State enforcement of labor regulations by the appointment of official factory inspectors.[248]

After this, Ketteler gives the bishops some advice on how to propagate worker associations and implement protective measures on a wide scale.[249] Among other things, the Church should encourage and support the workers' associations and should awaken an interest in its clergy to the workers' plight.[250] One idea of Ketteler is extremely avant-garde for his time. He declares:

> The problem of the working classes must therefore no longer be omitted from the philosophical and pastoral training of the clergy. It would be advisable, in fact, to pick certain clergymen who show a

---

[248] Ibid., 485.

[249] Ibid., 486.

[250] Ibid.

> disposition for such things and train them in economics. [251]

Priests should also be trained who have a special apostolate to the workers, and he added that priests who are assigned to industrial areas should have proper pastoral sensitivity to the workers' needs.[252] Finally, the Catholic press should develop an interest in the Labor Question as well.[253]

In 1873, Ketteler wrote *Liberalism, Socialism and Christianity.*[254] This work described how the post-1848 liberals abandoned their original principles to become anti-liberal and absolutist. Ketteler claimed that socialism was the true offspring of liberalism and took the principles of liberalism to their logical conclusion. Both groups were wrong, he claimed, in that they pandered to man's material interests and neglected his spiritual interests. He states:

> In a Christian society it is impossible to speak of the will of the people in a fine and meaningful sense. A nation without God, such as liberalism and socialism propose, a nation that has fallen prey to the Hegelian madness and believes itself to be the immanent God, such a nation has no unifying principle whereby it can be reconciled into a basic unity. Instead, it is bedeviled by that sinister force which all too easily comes to dominate the human spirit, egotism. Egotism is divisive. A nation of egotists cannot establish an authority that will represent it in a truly communitarian manner. That is precisely why all of the deified states that are erected on this lie, of necessity fall prey to the same dominant party which exploits the state for its narrow partisan purpose. All talk of the popular will is fraudulent since only the unity of varying party interests is possible under such

---

[251] Ibid.

[252] Ibid., 487-489.

[253] Ibid., 489.

[254] The German original was titled *Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christenthum.* On account of modern stylistic changes in the German language, the German title is now given as *Liberalismus, Sozialismus und Christenthum.* See: Rupert Ederer, translator's note to "Liberalism, Socialism, and Christianity" in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* 497.

conditions.[255]

Although early on Ketteler was more lenient with the socialists, especially Lassalle,[256] when Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel formed the German Socialist Workers Party in 1875 at Gotha, Ketteler became increasingly aware of socialism's ill-effects. In his incomplete work, *Christianity and Social Democracy*,[257] he lashes out against the utopian fantasy of revolutionary socialism.

He also refined his idea of the purpose of the workers' associations. Originally, in *The Labor Problem and Christianity* he described associations of workers primarily as religious associations or confraternities of workmen. In *Christianity and Social Democracy*, however, he stresses more clearly the economic and professional role of these associations and their autonomy within civil society. In order to restore to the working class its natural bonds of association, Ketteler lays out five fundamental principles which are indispensable. They are the following:

1. The desired organizations have to be natural and spontaneous….
2. The hoped for associations must once again be associations designed for genuine economic

---

[255] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "Liberalism, Socialism and Christianity," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877*, trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 513-514.

[256] Lassalle, unlike Marx, was a nationalist and he believed that the proletariat could share political power with the other classes. Therefore, he did not believe in the abolition of political power for the other classes and therefore, he can be regarded more as a reformer than as a revolutionary. Nonetheless, he did share with Marx the idea of common ownership, although he was willing to sacrifice some of his principles for political expediency. It should be mentioned that Marx himself despised Lassalle because Lassalle was the "idol of the people" and had a much more sanguine temperament than did Marx. See: Bock, *Wilhelm von Ketteler*, 87-91.

[257] The German original was titled *Christenthum und Sozialdemokratie.*

> purposes and not for mere political intrigues and utopian schemes….
>
> 3. Such associations must be established on a firm moral basis which includes a keen awareness of the dignity of one's station in life, a sense of obligation, and a code of ethics….
>
> 4. An association must embrace all who follow the same calling….
>
> 5. Finally, the association must have a proper measure of autonomous self-government and self-regulation.[258]

In fact, in his earlier work, *The Charitable Concern of the Church for the Working Class,* Ketteler argues, "It is not the proper role of the Church to set up associations and to enact such measures directly. That it beyond her official competence."[259] It certainly goes against the grain to hear a nineteenth century bishop advocating such an idea. His idea of removing workingmen's associations from ecclesiastical control also appears to have inspired La Tour du Pin. Ketteler, unlike La Tour du Pin, is more flexible in his understanding of workingmen's associations. His view could include both trade unions and corporations.[260] Unlike La Tour du Pin, he does not seem to be worried that trade unions will exacerbate the class struggle.

Although Ketteler himself did not play an active role in the creation of the German Center Party, [261] his influence certainly permeated it.[262] Soon after the formation

---

[258] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, "Christianity and Social Democracy," in *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, 1811-1877,* trans. Rupert Ederer (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 592-595.

[259] Ketteler, "The Charitable Concern of the Church for the Working Class," 486.

[260] That is, corporations in the standard sense of the word.

[261] The goals of the Center Party primarily included advocating federalism within the German Empire, protecting the rights of religious groups, promoting religious freedom, and augmenting the moral and material welfare of all classes. For the definitive English work on the Center Party, see: Ellen Lovell

of the German Empire, the German chancellor Otto von Bismarck launched the *Kulturkampf* or "Struggle for Civilization" against German Catholics.[263] Bismarck had begun to suspect that Prussian Catholics might not be loyal citizens of the German Empire.[264] He overlooked their past loyalty and tried to bring the Roman Catholic Church under the Erastian control of the State. The atheistic liberals and socialists were happily allied with Bismarck as they tried to bring Catholicism to ruin. Ketteler himself manned the front lines of the battle and energetically attacked the persecutors with his pamphlets.[265] After celebrating Pius IX's Golden Jubilee as a priest in 1877, Ketteler, returning home, fell extremely ill and died in Bavaria. In one of his travel bags, there was found a copy of *Das Kapital*.[266]

Evans, *The German Center Party, 1870-1933: A Study in Political Catholicism* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981). For studies of the earlier period of the Center Party, see: Ronald J. Ross, *Beleaguered Tower: The Dilemma of Political Catholicism in Wilhelmine Germany* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1976); John K. Zeender, *The German Center Party, 1890-1906* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1976). For the origins of the Center Party, see: George Windell, *The Catholics and German Unity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), 276-295. For brief treatments of the Center Party, see: Bock, *Wilhelm von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz,* 194; Michael Burleigh, *Earthly Powers: The Clash of Religion and Politics in Europe from the French Revolution to the Great War* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2005), 321-322.

[262] George Windell, *The Catholics and German Unity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), 284.

[263] For the most recent and extensive treatment of the *Kulturkampf* in English, see: Ronald J. Ross, *The Failure of Bismarck's Kulturkampf: Catholicism and State Power in Imperial Germany, 1871-1887* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1998). A shorter discussion of the nature of the *Kulturkampf* is provided by Michael Burleigh in *Earthly Powers.* See: Burleigh, *Earthly Powers,* 320-336.

[264] Windell, *The Catholics and German Unity,* 239.

[265] George Metlake, *Christian Social Reform* (Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press, 1912), 217.

[266] John Cort, *Christian Socialism: An Informal History* (Marynoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988), 197.

6. The Influence of Ketteler

Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler's social writings constitute the foundation stone on which Catholic social thought was built. His ideas were not particularly original, for he borrowed from Aquinas, Suarez, Fénelon, and even Ferdinand Lassalle, an atheistic socialist. He was also influenced by the restrictions of the ancient craftsmen's guilds. Nonetheless, he put together these ideas into a coherent system which responded to the pressing needs of his own time. His work influenced social thinkers in many countries and in different ways. Some of his disciples like Franz Hitze accepted capitalism with reservations, but others like Karl von Vogelsang and René de La Tour du Pin rejected capitalism outright. Ketteler never rejected capitalism as such—he wished to soften its harsh effects.

The most salient characteristics of Ketteler's thought that influenced social Catholics such as René de La Tour du Pin and Albert de Mun included the distinction between the mechanistic and organic structures of society and the role of workermen's associations as intermediate bodies. Ketteler's idea of workermen's associations evolved from understanding them primarily as confessional bodies to viewing them principally as professional bodies. La Tour du Pin's idea of corporations would also undergo a similar development. Furthermore, the positive role of state intervention in the Worker Question also greatly influenced La Tour du Pin in 1882 and caused him to change the direction of the *Conseil d'Études* from a reliance on Catholic economic liberals such as Le Play and Périn to the truly social Catholic view of Ketteler.

Ketteler advocated workingmen's associations, but this was a very vague term. He not only advocated "corporations," but he also supported trade unions.[267] This latter idea of Ketteler was not favored by La Tour du Pin. Ketteler's German disciples like Franz Hitze did support trade unions, but his Austrian disciple, Karl von Vogelsang and his French disciple, La Tour du Pin, only supported corporations. Finally, Ketteler even hints at the possibility of a socio-political system based on the organization of professional bodies. No doubt this had an influence on Vogelsang's corporatism and this obviously influenced La Tour du Pin as well.

Ketteler also influenced the thought of Leo XIII in his groundbreaking encyclical *Rerum Novarum.* What are some of the similarities between Ketteler's writings and *Rerum Novarum?*[268] Among many other things, both men stress the role of the Church in solving the social problem. They also thoroughly lay out the basis for private property ownership, and on account of this, both condemn socialism. In addition, both advocate the protection of the working class by state intervention and both promote associations for workers, especially trade unions. Finally, both advocate a just wage, limited working hours, Sunday rest, and restrictions on women and children working in the factory setting. Ketteler's direct influence over *Rerum Novarum* was much more obvious than

---

[267] This is his contention in *The Labor Problem and Christianity*. See: Ketteler, "The Labor Problem and Christianity," 410.

[268] See: Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, especially nos. 4-6, 16, 27-30, 36-37, 41-45, 48-51, and 62-63.

the influence of La Tour du Pin and the Fribourg Union over it.[269]

Concerning Ketteler, Leo XIII was noted to have said, "He was my great predecessor."[270] He also stated, "Ketteler was a great bishop. He was the first to openly state the responsibility and duty of capital and the State to the working men of our times."[271] Did Leo XIII himself read any of Ketteler's works? Dr. Franz Mueller claims, "According to his biographer Count Edoardo Soderini, Leo, as Archbishop Pecci of Perugia, included in his studies the writings of Bishop E. von Ketteler."[272] On the other hand, Paul Misner states, "…Ketteler's personal utterances anticipated much of the history of the Catholic social teaching for the next half a century. His influence on Leo XIII remains to be researched in detail."[273]

---

[269] Paul Misner, "The Predecessors of *Rerum Novarum* within Catholicism," *Review of Social Economy* 49 (winter 1991): 447.

[270] Metlake, *Christian Social Reform*, 5. Leo XIII made this comment to the Swiss Catholic sociologist Gaspard Decurtins.

[271] Cronin, *The Church and the Workingman*, 103. This remark was given by Leo XIII to Bishop Ketteler's last secretary in a private audience on August 30, 1896.

[272] Franz H. Mueller, *The Church and the Social Question* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1984), 73.

[273] Misner, "The Predecessors of *Rerum Novarum* within Catholicism," 462.

CHAPTER 4.

THE LIFE OF RENÉ DE LA TOUR DU PIN

A. Portrait of the Man

Later social Catholicism[1] owes much to Charles-Humbert-René, Comte de La Tour du Pin[2] Chambly, Marquis de la Charce (1834-1924). He was born from a noble

---

[1] The standard works of later social Catholicism are the following: Paul Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War* (New York: Crossroad, 1991); Rollet, *L'Action sociale des catholiques en France, 1871-1914,* 2 vols. (Bruges, Belgique: Desclée de Brouwer, 1947-1958); Georges Hoog, *Histoire du catholicisme social en France, 1871-1931* (Paris: Dumat, 1946). Two older works which are extremely valuable for an understanding of the growth of the social Catholic movement are the following: Parker Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France: A Study in the History of Social Politics* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921); Francesco S. Nitti, *Catholic Socialism,* trans. Mary MacIntosh (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1895). Nitti's book was written during the halcyon period of the social Catholic movement and, therefore, includes contemporary insights by a noted Italian political economist.

[2] The best and most detailed biography of René de La Tour du Pin has been written by his sometime secretary Élisabeth Bossan de Garagnol. See: Élisabeth Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin d'après lui-même* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1934). For another useful biography of René de La Tour du Pin, see: Charles Baussan, *La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Flammarion, 1931). For the most recent biography in which La Tour du Pin's life and intellectual and moral influence are discussed in some detail, see: Antoine Murat, *La Tour du Pin en son temps* (Versailles: Via Romana, 2008). For a brief overview of La Tour du Pin's life and accomplishments, as well as an introduction to his thought, see: Robert Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1964). For significant interpretations of La Tour du Pin's thought, see: Robert Talmy, *Aux sources du catholicisme social: L'École de La Tour du Pin* (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée, 1963)*;* Roger Semichon, *Les idées sociales et politiques de La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936); Jean Rivain, *Une programme de restauration sociale: L'École de La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Le Livre, 1926); Antoine Murat, *Le Catholicisme social en France: justice et charité* (Bordeaux: Éditions Ulysse, 1980); Jacques Bassot, *Travail et proprieté: Actualité révolutionnaire de La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Éditions de l'institut d'études corporatives et sociales, 1943). For modern studies of corporatist theory, see: Philippe C. Schmitter, "Still a Century of Corporatism," *Review of Politics,* 36, 1 (January 1974): 85-131; Peter J. Williamson, *Varieties of Corporatism: A Conceptual Discussion* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Peter J. Williamson, *Corporatism in Perspective: An Introductory Guide to Corporatist Theory* (London; Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1989). For a comprehensive study of French corporation theory, see: Matthew H. Elbow, *French Corporative Theory, 1789-1940* (New York: Octagon Books, Inc, 1966). For a study of the corporative system in Catholic thought, see: Georges Jarlot, S.J., *Le régime corporatif et les catholiques sociaux: Histoire d'une doctrine* (Paris: Flammarion,

line of Dauphiné. His secretary, Élisabeth Bossan de Garagnol, daughter of one of his closest friends of his military years, his chief biographer and a great admirer, painted a very reverent portrait of the man in his later years in her biography of La Tour du Pin, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin d'après lui-même*.

René de La Tour du Pin was of medium stature. His manners were free and easy and his bearing was dignified. He inspired respect without asserting himself. With both a brisk step and the lively movements of a youth, he was a man of great energy even into his later years. He lived to the age of ninety-four. Bearing his head high and slightly tilted to the right, he cut the figure of a thinker. Fairly balding, his thinning hair was groomed in the military fashion[3] of the Second Empire. Coupled with an aquiline nose and a light gray beard, this yielded him with a very distinguished profile and noble visage. Together with a serene brow and a mild sad gaze, his benevolent smile exuded kindness. Any form of carelessness or vulgarity was utterly foreign to him, as was any sort of foolishness or malicious gossip.[4]

Possessing an engaging low-pitched voice, he knew how to convince as well as to

---

1938). Finally, for an explanation of an economic "third way," inspired by the social doctrine of the Church and corporatist thought, see: Marcel Clément, *La Corporation professionelle* (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1958). This work was later translated into English under the auspices of Hamish Fraser, the late editor of the *Approaches*, a periodical devoted to the dissemination and explanation of the social doctrine of the Church. See: Marcel Clément, *The Social Programme of the Church*, 4 vols., trans. Frank Macmillan (Saltcoats, Scotland: Approaches, 1984).

[3] It was brushed down and forward towards the face in the manner of Julius Caesar.

[4] Élisabeth Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin d'après lui lui-même* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1934), 2-3.

command.[5] Above all, he was a man of order and discipline. He had a great capacity for intellectual work, thus steeling his will by means of unremitting exertions. Blended with a robust and bright intelligence, he had the capacity for good judgment as well as the unusual facility for synthesis. Moreover, he was grounded in a firm faith which provided him with certainties throughout the dark wood of life.[6] Bossan de Garagnol noted, "The mastery of oneself alone makes true leaders and La-Tour-du-Pin was a leader."[7]

Eschewing trite formalities, his handshake was firm, cordial, and sincere. His speech was warm and courteous, yet at the same time, he weighed his words carefully. Although he was a man of elevated ideas and opinions, his way of living, his manners, and his language were free from affectation, and thus filled with a wholesome simplicity.[8] Whereas many intellectuals enjoyed bestowing something "original" to humanity, La Tour du Pin, in his self-effacing manner, declared, "'I am only one ring of a traditional chain.'"[9] Like a true conservative, he attempted to organically mold the future only by what had been learned from the past. Bossan relates:

> The knowledge and the love of the past—an informed sense of present realities, a clear vision of applications for the future, had the Colonel de La-Tour-du-Pin dubbed a reactionary by some, an innovator or prophet by others….[his doctrine] was born from history and from its lessons, from life

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 4.

[7] Ibid., 3.

[8] Ibid., 2-3.

[9] Ibid., 4.

> and from its experiences.[10]

For his disciples, he was "the incarnation of the soldier, the gentleman, and the Christian."[11] The triadic wellsprings of all his thoughts and actions were tradition, duty, and service. From his earliest childhood to his life as a military officer, from his conversion to social Catholicism to his death, these were the motive forces that defined the man. His biographer captures it thus:

> The passion to serve, the sense of responsibility that he had in the highest degree, the full conception of the duty of state came to him from the traditions of his House: the devotion to the public good had been the reason to exist and the law of his own people.[12]

His followers called him "My Colonel," but he refused the title of "Master."[13] His doctrine of a Christian social order won over an extraordinary loyalty from his adherents, and for them, his thought alone[14] sufficed.[15]

B. The Education of a Young Nobleman

On 1 April 1834, Charles-Humbert-René, the elder of two sons, was born to Charlotte-Alexandrine (neé Maussion) and René-Henri-Gabriel-Humbert de La Tour du

---

[10] Ibid., 3-4.

[11] Ibid., 1.

[12] Ibid., 5.

[13] Ibid., 4.

[14] They did not place his own teaching above that of the Church, but rather over that of all other social theorists.

[15] Bossan de Garignol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin,* 1.

Pin-Chambly in the village of Arrancy-en-Laonnais within the department of the Aisne.[16] Although his family's estates were quite vast, at an early age René came to appreciate property not only as a right, but also as a social function. His father took scrupulous care of the interests of the farmers working on the familial domains.[17] The young René felt very strong ties to the soil and its inhabitants from his earliest days. His father was a nobleman in the truest sense and his father's example resonated with him for the rest of his days. He recalls the advice which his father gave him in 1848, as they were both surveying the family domain from a prominence. The elder La Tour du Pin said, "Always remember that you will only be the administrator of this land for its inhabitants."[18] The "social question," then, was already percolating in the mind of René, while still a youth.

As would seem obvious for a young man from a distinguished noble family, tradition played an extremely important role in his thought from his youth on upwards. The chateau of Arrancy (Aisne) in which he was raised was situated in the Laonnais and it was surrounded with tradition. This structure was built in 1615 by the bishop of Laon, Valentin Douglas. The Douglas family had emigrated from Scotland to Brittany, and finally to Laonnais. An ancestor of the bishop was the renowned James Douglas, the

---

[16] Charles Baussan, *La Tour du Pin* (Paris: E. Flammarion, 1931), 6, 8.

[17] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 7.

[18] Charles Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 5.

foremost retainer of Robert the Bruce, king of Scotland, and his leading knight in the war against the English. Bruce, on his deathbed, asked Douglas to carry his heart on pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem in order to fulfill his own vow to go on crusade. As it turned out, Douglas was distracted from his pilgrimage by an opportunity to fight the Moors in the Iberian Peninsula to the south. After throwing the box which contained the heart of his sovereign into the midst of his enemies, he followed his lord into battle and was killed. The Douglas coat-of-arms thereafter was composed of a red heart crowned with a golden royal crown; the young René was well-acquainted with this, living in the chateau of Arrancy.[19]

After the last female of the Douglas line, Julie, was guillotined during the French Revolution, the chateau passed to her niece, Eulalie Bertou. This lady married a bourgeois gentleman, a M. de Maussion, whose daughter, Charlotte-Alexandrine, married René-Henri-Gabriel-Humbert de La Tour du Pin-Chambly. They were the parents of René.[20]

His father's lineage was filled with a rich tradition as well. The La Tour du Pin, an old noble family, originated from a collateral branch of the dauphin of the Capetian line. An ancestor of La Tour du Pin's, René de la Tour, intermarried with the de la Charce family, and a descendant of theirs married the heir of the Chambly line. One of his ancestors, the squire Pierre de Chambly, saved his lord Philip Augustus at the Battle

---

[19] Ibid., 6-7.

[20] Ibid., 8.

of Bouvines, after the king was unhorsed. The famous Huguenot leader René de La-Tour-du-Pin Gouvernet was another ancestor. Cardinal Pierre de Berulle was a distant ancestral uncle.[21] In fact, the young René was also a descendant of Thomas Corneille, a literary figure in his own right, but certainly overshadowed by his more talented and famous brother Pierre, the great Corneille.[22] He had other relatives guillotined during the Terror as well. Among them was Jean Frédéric de La Tour du Pin Gouvernet, first constitutional minister of war and reorganizer of the royal army. During the trial of Marie Antoinette, he spoke of the queen with such respect during his deposition that it cost him his own life.[23] The young La Tour du Pin, therefore, was thoroughly aware of his pedigree, whether it involved the distant origins of the French monarchy, various strains of noble descent, great literary and religious figures, or even that of a more commonplace bourgeois provenance.[24]

His biographer, Charles Baussan, sums up the importance of René's lineage thus, "La Tour du Pin had always had the opinion of this ancestry, less as a dignity, than as a responsibility, a duty."[25] He understood the essence of the true, but often forgotten noble

---

[21] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 5-6.

[22] Ibid., 6. La Tour du Pin was also proud to refer to Charlotte Corday, the assassin of Jean Paul Marat, as "my cousin" since she herself was a descendant of Pierre Corneille. He also found it interesting that, while he was a descendant of Thomas Corneille, his good friend Albert de Mun was a descendant of Claude Adrien Helvétius, the Enlightenment philosopher.

[23] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 25.

[24] Ibid., 8-9.

[25] Ibid., 9.

vision; his goal was not to prodigally exhaust the family resources and milk the inhabitants under his charge so he could live a life of repose and luxury; rather, his aim was to serve those beneath him, to treat them with dignity, and to raise them up as much as was in his power.

Possessing a deep-seated piety, especially towards his deceased ancestors, the young René daily visited the cemetery of the estate. There was nothing morbid or sad in this visit; he knew that one day he would sleep with them as well.[26] Meditating near these tombs, he reflected on the privileges which he owed to his forbearers. In a very concrete way, he saw his own formation as guided by those who preceded him.[27] He had a firm grasp of the meaning of tradition. His biographer notes that this daily ritual made the communion of saints very tangible to him.[28]

On account of his grandfather Maussion's death in 1839 and his grandmother's infirm condition, René's parents took over the administration of the estate of Arrancy.[29] Both father and mother were deeply devoted to the education of the young boy and his brother Aymar, who was five years his junior. In modern parlance we might say that they were homeschooled by both of their parents. The marquis and marquise were urged on this route by the Abbé Blat, curé of Corbeny, who would be the young René's religious

---

[26] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 14.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., 23.

instructor. His father was his instructor in classics and mathematics, his mother in geography, history, and mental arithmetic. Having received a military education himself, his father forced himself to learn Greek as a middle-aged man so that he could personally teach his son the classics on his own.[30] René claimed that he owed his understanding of the thread of history to his mother, who was herself taught by her own father.[31] With the exception of the aforementioned priest and some of the chateaus' Westphalian staff[32] by whom he learned the rudiments of the German tongue, his whole elementary and secondary education was laid out and conducted by his parents alone.

At the age of eleven, the young boy made his First Communion.[33] Noting the good religious examples during his youth, he recalled, "I was only surrounded with examples of piety from my infancy."[34] He especially regards the good religious example of his own father, as an important source for the conservation of Christianity among the bulk of the local population; he even claimed that no evil habits made headway among them for this reason.[35] The example of his father, the local notable, was inculcated into his mind and would play a crucial role in the young man's understanding of the role of the

---

[30] Ibid., 23-24.

[31] Ibid., 24.

[32] Ibid., 22.

[33] Ibid., 24.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

noble class in the modern world. This was far from the seventeenth and eighteenth century aristocratic aspirations to dwell at Versailles, where nobles squandered their material and temporal resources in feasts, play, amusements, and gossip. This understanding was the all-but-forgotten traditional reason. The nobility were to be exemplars; they were to serve, and at the same time to elevate, the other classes of society. This idea, of course, would later find its realization in the *Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers.*

René claimed that his education at the chateau provided him with a great love of the countryside and its people; this he stated contributed in no small way to his moral and physical health. He and his younger brother Aymar got regular outdoor exercise by running freely through the woods of the vast family estate—in excess of three hundred hectares.[36] An old master-of-arms, a member of the chateau's staff, taught him gymnastics and swordsmanship. His own father coached him in horsemanship.[37] By the example of his parents, he learned the lesson of respect and during his childhood he was habituated to a well regimented daily routine.[38]

The family was also well acquainted with the local prelate who was both Bishop of Soissons and Laon. In René's youth Mgr. de Simony,[39] a retired army officer of the

---

[36] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 7.

[37] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 26-27.

[38] Ibid., 27.

[39] Bishop Jules-François de Simony was Bishop of Soissons and Laon from 1825-1847.

dragoons and his successor, Mgr. de Garsignies,[40] who was a very close friend of René's father, would spend time at the chateau during their episcopal visitations. The latter bishop greatly impressed the young René. He cut a good figure as a bishop of the long-past *ancien régime,* although he was also somewhat prodigal in exhausting his fortune on good works; nevertheless, they were truly charitable works.[41]

During the Revolution of 1848, the country was in uproar and armed bands of unemployed workers, infested with socialism, rampaged in varied locales. René witnessed his father's courage and coolness in defusing the escalating situation, ultimately saving his own chateau. A band of workers from Arrancy and the neighboring village of St. Croix approached the family chateau with menacing intent. His father, pistol in hand, received the representatives of the band on the front steps of the chateau.[42] The marquis, who was of short stature, said:

> You wish equality. You wish to beat down my chateau because it is higher than your houses. But you, you are taller than me. Is it now necessary that I have your heads cut off so that, you and me, we are all at the same level?[43]

His father's quick thinking defused the situation; the band of men laughed a bit and went away. The Marquis Humbert had a commanding tone of voice and he loved being

---

[40] Bishop Paul-Armand-Ignace-Anaclet Cardon de Garsignies was Bishop of Soissons and Laon from 1848 to 1860.

[41] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 37. Garsignies spent great sums in reconstructing a number of buildings, e.g., the Abbey of Prémontré, which he converted into an orphanage. See: Joseph Ledouble, *L'État religieux ancien et moderne des pays qui forment aujourd'hui le diocèse de Soissons* (Chez l'auteur: Soissons, 1880), 120.

[42] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 29.

[43] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 12.

obeyed, but he also had a virtue which was less common to those of this class, he understood the social duties of property.[44] He used his own resources for relieving the wants of the local population by furnishing them with work—building a road on his estate.[45]

At this time many conservatives rallied to the plebiscitary regime of Louis Napoleon. René mentions that his father never aspired to political office on the wings of the mandate of the people. Humbert's interests were elsewhere. Small farms were rapidly disappearing. He was closely attached to matters of public interest, especially the farming way of life; hence, the "flight from agriculture" seriously concerned him. He was elected president of the *comice agricole*[46] of Laon and was devoted to this work for thirty years.[47] As Mlle. Bossan de Garagnol states it, he wished to

> …serve the people in his own manner, [rather] than to represent them in their manner. His profession of monarchical faith was clear.[48]

These were very important early social lessons for the young René, who learned firsthand from his father the social duties of those who would be social leaders. Much of his later social and political thinking was being formed now under the gentle, but careful tutelage

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 30.

[46] This is an assembly of farmers or cultivators of a particular region which is formed to improve the methods of cultivation and breeding.

[47] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 34-35.

[48] Ibid., 35.

of his father. The seeds were sown now; they would bear fruit later.

On account of his noble heritage and upbringing, René had an instinctive reverence for the past and its traditions, this at a time in French history when political, social, economic, and religious innovations were on the rise. His secretary sums up his profound respect for the past thus:

> Without cease he will come back to the social sense of the "first commandment which has a promise," for it is to the races and the peoples respectful of their past that the future belongs.[49]

This sociological principle was well imbibed during his early years at home.

C. A Soldier's Life During the Second Empire

At the age of eighteen, René entered the French military academy of Saint-Cyr. At that time one of the few careers open to young nobles with monarchist leanings was the military. After all, they were members of the *noblesse d'epée.* Since they would be serving their country by force of arms, as the nobility had always done in the past, the military was considered a suitable profession. Being a soldier was not just a matter of choice for him, it was much more than that; he was "obeying" the family tradition and continuing the family profession.[50] This again was a living recognition that he was in a very tangible sense in continuity and communion with his forbearers. La Tour du Pin saw service in the Crimea, Northern Italy, Algeria, Mexico, and finally France itself

---

[49] Ibid., 41.

[50] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 28.

during the Franco-Prussian War.[51] He would serve in the army for a total of thirty years.

At the tender age of four René knew that he was destined to life in the military.[52] It would be some years, however, before his dream would be realized. After passing an entrance examination, he entered the military school of St. Cyr in 1852. His father, uncles, and many country neighbors had taken their careers in the army of the Restoration, but the Revolution of July[53] closed off any further advancement to them. On account of the Revolution of February,[54] however, military career possibilities opened up for René and other like-minded young men of his generation.[55] He noted that "The gate of St. Cyr appeared as the portico of public life…."[56]

It was at St. Cyr that La Tour du Pin made the acquaintance of some of his closest friends in the army. They included Saint-Balmont, Guioth, d'Harcourt, Reille, d'Hendecourt, and especially Bossan de Garagnol,[57] probably his best friend in the

---

[51] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin,* 8-9.

[52] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 28.

[53] This refers to the Revolution of 1830 which overthrew the Bourbon Restoration Monarchy and installed the Orleanist constitutional monarchy.

[54] This refers to the Revolution of 1848 which overthrew the Orleanist regime and set up a republican form of government.

[55] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 25-26.

[56] Ibid., 26.

[57] Bossan de Garagnol was the father of Élisabeth, who would later become La Tour du Pin's secretary and biographer. She is the authoress of *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin d'après lui-même.*

military.[58] At the same time, he made some critical comments about life at the great military school. The regimen was very strict, and being brought up in the country, he found life between the walls of the academy very stifling.[59] Much to his distress too, he noted that out of six hundred students at the school, only six, to his knowledge, made their Easter duty.[60] The St. Cyr of his own day was not full of fervent Catholics. On the contrary, when he returned to the school as an examiner twenty years later, he saw a very different picture.[61] Mlle. Bossan de Garagnol relates:

> He had the surprise of seeing, the 15th of April, two-thirds of the students take communion in the chapel. He attributed this change, in twenty years, to the liberty of teaching, and also to the movement of ideas, provoked by the disasters of 1870.[62]

From St. Cyr, La Tour du Pin, like his father, passed into the school of the *État-Major*[63] of the Army. It was at this time (1856) that war broke out in the Crimea; his regiment was there without him, and he longed to join it.[64]

On his way to the Crimea, René passed by the coasts of Corsica, Sardinia, and Italy, had a port of call at Messina, and spent time at the Acropolis and Parthenon in

---

[58] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 45.

[59] Ibid., 44-45.

[60] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 27.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Ibid.

[63] In English, this is best rendered as the "General Staff." This refers to a group of officers, usually in a division, which help their commander to plan, coordinate, and supervise operations.

[64] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 27-28.

Athens. Later, he passed by the plains of Troy, entered the Golden Horn, spending eight days in Constantinople. From there, he rejoined his regiment of light infantry.[65] Accustoming himself to the privations of camp life, his body acquired stamina.[66]

In 1859, La Tour du Pin was made a captain in the general staff of the army that freed the Alps. Although he was not a fervent supporter of the Italian cause, on account of its democratic stench, he was eager to go into battle on its own account.[67] He was present at the battle of Palestro, where he was engaged on a reconnaissance mission, as well as the battles of Magenta and Solferino.[68]

As just mentioned, La Tour du Pin was disgusted with what he considered the untraditional democratic urges of Italian nationalism. He loved Italy and he thoroughly appreciated the Italian people and their patriotic spirit; in fact, he wanted to see the Italians achieve their independence, but he thought that the romantics and the lawyers had hijacked the movement and poisoned it with their alien democratic spirit.[69] Noting that members of the old nobility are not wanting to sacrifice themselves for independence,[70] he asks:

---

[65] Ibid., 29-30.

[66] Ibid., 32.

[67] Ibid., 33.

[68] Ibid., 35-36.

[69] René de La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire sous le Second Empire, 1855-1870* (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1911), 82-83.

[70] Ibid., 83.

> Why is it necessary that this beautiful and just cause has been perverted by the Revolution, whereas it was born of tradition?[71]

At any rate, he makes a distinction between the legitimate aspirations of the Italian people for independence from foreign domination on the one hand, and what he considers to be the illegitimate democratic desires of popular rule led by the bourgeois on the other. It was by no means easy for La Tour du Pin to reconcile "fidelity to the principle of order,…and sympathy for the sacred cause of irredentism…."[72] There was something of a struggle going on in his soul.[73]

An incident following the French occupation of Cremona demonstrates another facet of La Tour du Pin's character, a noteworthy zeal for the defense of the pope's honor. A number of French officers, La Tour du Pin among them, gathered together at the local theater in the loggia of some of the local aristocracy. The general staff was placed in the position of honor. Among other things, the Italian players put on a political piece in which Pope Pius IX was ridiculed and lampooned. General Bourbaki, La Tour du Pin's superior, who was present, did not budge. However, the young captain's blood boiled. As a result, La Tour du Pin straddled the loggia, jumped down to the players' level, rushed the stage with two or three friends, and threw the actors out into the street. The actors fled away bewildered.[74] The Italian governor, of course, complained to the French

---

[71] Ibid.

[72] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 92.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid.

commander. The commander said he would like to punish them, but that they were hot heads and he would not answer for them in such a case.[75] Still the zealous young captain had to confront General Bourbaki the following morning. Courtesies were exchanged, but nothing concerning last night's episode was broached.[76] There seemed to be an understanding that it would be best to forget what transpired since the French authorities "had neither the right of allowing it to begin, nor of tolerating it."[77]

After the peace was signed with the Austrians, La Tour du Pin thought that he would enjoy the beautiful country a bit. A few days afterward, in the same theatre, he was "fêted" by the orchestra with a hymn to Garibaldi. He "applauded" with a very insincere bow and was immediately greeted with menacing glances by the assembled youths. A storm almost broke out.[78] Next morning he was greeted with something more ominous; "*Morte al Tedesco*"[79] was written on his door.[80] He was told by the *syndic* of the city that he had to leave in the interest of his own security and those of his fellow countrymen. Reflecting on this situation, La Tour du Pin thought he might receive more

---

[75] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 38.

[76] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 93-94.

[77] Ibid., 94.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Literally translated, this means "Death to the German." Even though La Tour du Pin had recently fought on the side of the Italians against the Austrians, the inhabitants of Cremona, from recent actions, concluded that he showed greater sympathy with the "reactionary and conservative" ideas of the Austrians than with their own "progressive and liberal" beliefs. In this assessment, they were correct.

[80] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 94.

hospitality in Venice, then under Austrian control.[81]

Later, La Tour du Pin was stationed in Algeria. He passed through Constantine on his way to Algiers.[82] While stationed there, La Tour du Pin was surprised by totally unexpected news. He heard that they were to head across the Atlantic to Mexico.[83] One of Napoleon III's imperial ambitions was to found a Mexican Empire, propped up by France, to counterbalance the ever-increasing domination of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Although the Mexican expedition would involve certain difficulties, La Tour du Pin realized that this adventure into unknown territory would prove to be very interesting. He himself had no great love for the sea and this would be a far longer and more difficult voyage than any within the Mediterranean he had undertaken.[84] In addition, word had come back from troops stationed there that trials awaited the soldiers. He mentions that "the army had suffered from vomiting, hot earth, rains, cruelties of the enemy, serpents, scorpions…"[85] He was himself involved in a successful engagement with the enemy near Sancta Catharina, the headquarters of the enemy, after taking his platoon through a cornfield.[86]

---

[81] Ibid.

[82] La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 93.

[83] Ibid., 111.

[84] Ibid., 112.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Ibid., 133-136.

While in the city of Porfias, he heard about the tough justice meted out to a deserter from the regiment. The man's clothing was cut up by the doctor; covered only by the coat of an officer, he was shot. La Tour du Pin witnessed the naked and bloody body stretched out in the street and expressed his pity for the man.[87] He stated, "…a stern example was given, the chastisement was just, but it was terrible."[88] Not much later, he also observed the execution of Mexican prisoners. He stated that they were obviously bandits; nevertheless, they claimed to be legitimate soldiers and he commented on their brave death. They had been prisoners for two years now and suddenly they were abruptly executed.[89] La Tour du Pin, reflecting on the proper means of administering justice, notes, "… I have never been a supporter of summary executions."[90] Furthermore, he is quite forthright in judging his commander's character and comments on it with evident displeasure; he found it weak and vacillating.[91] He exemplifies this further with the following illustration. During this same tour in the New World, La Tour du Pin witnessed that booty captured by the French Army that had originally been requisitioned by the Mexican enemy from a fellow Frenchman, a colonist, was not returned to him. Rather, the commander had placed the property on sale, thus ruining his fellow

---

[87] Ibid., 139-140.

[88] Ibid., 140.

[89] Ibid., 140-141.

[90] Ibid., 140.

[91] Ibid., 141.

countryman, and this, out of fear of displeasing his troops.[92] La Tour du Pin here already displayed his love of justice and compassion which he would more fully demonstrate during the repressive measures later taken against Communards in 1871 and in its aftermath.

La Tour du Pin also saw time in Algeria. Eventually he served in the Franco-Prussian War[93] under General Ladmirault whom he greatly admired. He served[94] on the General Staff and was involved in communications between Ladmirault and Marshal Bazaine. In the end, he was one of the many French prisoners who were taken at Metz.

In his work *Feuillets de la vie militaire sous le Second Empire, 1855-1870,* published in 1911, just prior to World War I, La Tour du Pin shared his reflections on military life and the campaigns in which he was personally involved during the Second Empire. In the last chapter of the book, "Au Drapeau," he delivers his critique of the French army of the first decade of the twentieth century. First of all, he analyzes the

---

[92] Ibid.

[93] Michael Howard, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Invasion of France* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962), 120-182, 257-283. This is the standard work in English on the Franco-Prussian War. "Chapter IV: The Army of the Rhine" and "Chapter VII: Metz and Strasbourg" give detailed accounts of both the individual battles and the siege of Metz in which La Tour du Pin had participated. More recently, Geoffrey Wawro has written a gripping account of the Franco-Prussian War which complements Howard's work. See: Geoffrey Wawro, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[94] La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 147-173. This section of La Tour du Pin's book concentrates particularly on his own involvement in the Franco-Prussian War. Although he protests that he respects his unfortunate military leaders, he also points out that he is both concerned with the truth being told and a lesson being learned. He, therefore, introduces his discussion of the campaign of the Army of the Rhine thus: "How the [war] effort of three battles is lost, and next how an army is ruined, that is what we are going to register here." La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 148.

disaster of the Franco-Prussian War. Having accused the empowered parliament of the Second Empire of serious blunders; he emphatically states:

> The Empire no longer existed except in name, and it was parliament—thus in the last resort opinion—which disposed of the command and of the movement of armies. It is the Opposition which had checked the military reorganization prepared by Marshal Niel. [95]

He also notes a critical weakness that was and is still creeping into the military. Laying blame for the Franco-Prussian fiasco not just at the door of military negligence, he highlights another problem which was less prevalent in the 1860-1870s, but had then become systemic in the army.[96] Ultimately, it is a moral problem. He notes the difference in the foundational formation of the two representative types of men that are currently in the military. Both have military skill, but the comparison stops there. The one type, personified by Marshal Bazaine,[97] is really a soldier of fortune or a man of ambition; in the last resort, he is a climber who ultimately understands honor as "success." The other, personified by Marshal MacMahon,[98] is from a family deeply

---

[95] La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 186.

[96] Ibid., 182, 186.

[97] Maréchal François Bazaine (1811-1888) surrendered the fortress of Metz to the German Army in October of 1870. He was later brought before a military court (1873) and found guilty of treason, viz. negotiating and capitulating with the enemy. Nevertheless, he was treated with clemency and his sentence was commuted. He died in exile. As leader of the Army of the Rhine, he was La Tour du Pin's commander-in-chief during the Franco-Prussian War. La Tour du Pin, like many French men of his day, somewhat understandably, but ultimately unjustifiably, saw Bazaine as nothing short of a traitor. See: Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 9.

[98] Maréchal Patrice MacMahon (1808-1893) surrendered to the German army after the defeat at Sedan in September of 1870. He was a legitimist and later became head of state and the president (1873-1879) of the Third Republic. Ultimately, he saw himself serving as a transitional figure until the monarchy could be reestablished under the Comte de Chambord.

rooted in the military profession and tradition.[99] According to La Tour du Pin,[100] the latter, through the influence of the family,[101] tradition, and the profession of arms, realizes that he achieves his honor only through "sacrifice."[102] He subsequently remarks that most of the officers in the higher ranks of the army no longer are drawn from professional military families.[103] The new leaders in the army are political functionaries or climbers, but not men of honor.[104]

Following up on this tack further, La Tour du Pin observed that many men, who were entering the French military during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, were ambitious and concerned primarily with their own personal good and success. They were *arrivistes*.[105] La Tour du Pin admits that many of them were talented, but they were wanting in the moral formation so necessary for the integrity of an institution such as the army. Undoubtedly, he saw the post-Revolutionary proliferation of individualism finally

---

[99] La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 186-187.

[100] It should come as no surprise that La Tour du Pin's sympathies lie with a man such as MacMahon; both men arose from the same social milieu and traditions of the nobility.

[101] As noted earlier, La Tour du Pin himself, born out of noble family which was imbued with the military tradition, never really considered any other profession than that of army officer.

[102] La Tour du Pin concretely illustrates MacMahon's character in the Marshal's reply to the emperor when the latter desired to make MacMahon supreme commander of both French armies during the Franco-Prussian War. MacMahon said, "Give it rather to Bazaine: 'He would not obey me for himself, but I will obey him for myself.'" La Tour du Pin himself commented, "He was only too faithful." La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 187.

[103] La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 187.

[104] Ibid., 188.

[105] Ibid., 188-189. An *arriviste* is best translated as "one who is ruthlessly ambitious."

making serious inroads into what was, up till now, a most formidable bastion, the army.

He will have similar things to say about the role of lawyers in parliament within his social catholic works. He saw that many of them were only concerned with their own personal success and refused to make any personal sacrifice for the common good. This is why he was so opposed to the social caste of lawyers being in control of the parliament. They were usually from the higher middle classes and they understood the legal jargon; consequently, they steered parliament down paths which were beneficial to their particular interests. For that reason, they were not good representatives of the nation as a whole.

It may seem a diversion to spend so much time on La Tour du Pin's military career and his thoughts on the military. Nevertheless, he came from a background that recognized a hierarchy of social occupations, and these he saw in bold relief. It was his opinion that the military profession[106] was the highest state in life with the exception of the priesthood.[107] For La Tour du Pin, a warrior-aristocrat, the profession of arms was the chief means of serving and preserving the State after that of prayer. It required men who were truly willing to sacrifice their lives in order to serve the common good. For him, this type of behavior and mindset would best originate from the tradition being

---

[106] It should be pointed out that when La Tour du Pin is discussing the profession of arms, he is really referring to the officer corps or military leaders with a commission rather than private soldiers.

[107] La Tour du Pin, *Feuillets de la vie militaire*, 187. He undoubtedly derives this from the differentiation of the three estates of pre-Revolutionary society, the first estate being those who prayed (priests), the second being those who fought (nobles), and the third being those who worked (everyone else).

organically handed on down through the family from father to son. The reason for this is clear. If something was handed down and entrusted to someone by their forebears, they were less likely to see it as their own personal property to be disposed of as they might wish. It was to be regarded as a sort of communal property or deposit which existed throughout time.[108] Such men would be more aware of the attendant responsibilities and duties connected with the privilege which had been handed down. Hence, there was solidarity (true social bonds) between that person, his ancestors, and his potential descendants. The inheritors of privileges should regard themselves more as stewards, using their privileges for service of others, rather than as absolute owners, disposing of them as they wished.

Again, as earlier mentioned, La Tour du Pin himself saw "ancestry, less as a dignity, than as a responsibility, a duty."[109] It was also a matter of honor. He once stated, "I am everywhere where my name is and my name is everywhere where I am."[110] He also saw his own formation guided first of all by that of his ancestors.[111] Most of these ideas which filtered through La Tour du Pin's mind as a child or as an army officer would

---

[108] A helpful way to understand this is by the following example. In the past, religious orders, priests, bishops, and even the pope did not see the immovable and movable property within their monasteries, convents, churches, dioceses, and even the Papal States as something that they could readily alienate or sell off for their own wishes and whims. They had received them from their predecessors and they understood that they must hand them down to their successors, with increase, for the common good of the Church. Hence, they saw themselves as mere stewards of this property.

[109] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 9.

[110] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 5, note 1.

[111] Ibid., 14.

resurface later in the formulation of his social thought.

D. The Awakening of a Social Vocation

La Tour du Pin's social vocation began as a result of being a prisoner-of-war at Aix-La-Chapelle during the Franco-Prussian War. While interned there, La Tour du Pin met another French officer who would prove to be his comrade in arms in the cause of social Catholicism. The name of his collaborator was Albert de Mun[112] (1841-1914), a young nobleman from the Seine and Marne department in the region of the Île-de-France. During the time that they were held as prisoners, a Jesuit, Fr. Gustav Eck, gave them *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'état et la liberté* by Émile Keller. Concerning this book, de Mun remarks:

> It is a clear, simple and energetic statement of Catholic truth and of revolutionary error, the principles of Christian society and the false dogmas of modern society. Its reading filled us with the liveliest emotion. It seemed to us that, in the obscurity of our anguish, a light inundated our spirits.[113]

Together with Keller's book, the achievements of Bishop Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler and other German social Catholics also made a deep impression on the two

---

[112] For Albert de Mun's autobiography of the seminal years of his social vocation, see: Albert de Mun, *Ma vocation sociale: Souvenirs de la fondation de l'Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers, 1871-1875.* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1908). Containing previously unpublished documents, the first two decades of de Mun's social Catholic work is set forth in Charles Molette, *Albert de Mun, 1872-1890: Exigence doctrinale et préoccupations sociales chez un laïc catholique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1970). The most recent work devoted to the first fifty years of de Mun's life, containing newly discovered archives, is Philippe Levillain, *Albert de Mun: Catholicisme français et catholicisme romain du Syllabus au Ralliement* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1983). For a portrayal of de Mun's entire life; see: Benjamin Martin, *Count Albert de Mun: Paladin of the Third Republic* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978).

[113] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale,* 21.

young officers. A certain Dr. Joseph Lingens introduced them to the German social Catholic movement. Georges Jarlot argues that La Tour du Pin and de Mun undoubtedly also read Ketteler's works, *Freedom, Authority, and the Church* and *The Labor Question and Christianity*, while in captivity. He adds that these two books were translated into French in 1862 and 1869 respectively.[114] La Tour du Pin and de Mun's close study of Keller and Ketteler's works demonstrates the great influence which both authors wielded over the minds of the two young officers. Both men found their social vocation at this time and decided to serve both their country and their church by devoting themselves to the "people." As a result, they hoped to regenerate France, which had been led astray by the Revolution.[115]

In the spring of 1871 the bloody reprisals against the communards by Adolphe Thiers gave the two officers a sense of urgency in serving the worker. On this occasion de Mun recorded, "between the rebels, and the legitimate society of which we were the defenders, an abyss became visible to us."[116] La Tour du Pin also wondered why matters had come to such a pass. This led him to read the works of Frédéric Le Play whom he considered his "master." He did not restrain himself, however, from criticizing his "master" on one point. La Tour du Pin comments:

> …Le Play has only conducted [us] as far as the Decalogue, he fails in his observation to take

---

[114] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 60.

[115] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 22.

[116] Ibid., 29.

> account of the arrival in the world of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of everything which proceeded from it. This, however, is also a fact and the rapprochement of Christian doctrine and of the life of peoples is also a condition of the prosperity of nations.[117]

Albert de Mun also testifies that La Tour du Pin had a "more clearly Catholic orientation" then Le Play.[118] La Tour du Pin held that the Decalogue, in itself, is incapable of remedying the morally depraved society of the nineteenth century, but rather puts his faith in the Church of Christ to overcome this deplorable situation. Apart from reading Le Play's books, La Tour du Pin was also known to frequent the house of the sociologist in the Place Saint-Sulpice.

In late December 1871, through the inspiration of Maurice Maignen, a lay brother of St. Vincent de Paul, the *Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*[119] was founded. Earlier Maignen had asked both La Tour du Pin and Albert de Mun for their help with his club of young workers at boulevard Montparnasse. He told La Tour du Pin that he wanted "not his money, but the gift of himself."[120] Maignen gave a rousing talk to Albert de Mun in which he stated that it was the rich and not the people who were responsible for the conflagration of the Commune. He added that the rich never showed any concern

---

[117] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 89. Although he does not say so directly, La Tour du Pin appears to have in mind the New Law promulgated by Christ during the Sermon on the Mount and its practical application through the centuries, especially in the social teaching of the Church. Furthermore, he probably has in mind that grace, which comes through Jesus Christ, helps bring about a real transformation in human nature, which the Decalogue, on its own, is incapable of doing.

[118] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 115.

[119] Literally translated, this means the "Work of Catholic workingmen's clubs." It is better understood as "Association of Catholic workingmen's clubs." Henceforward, this will be abbreviated as the OCCO.

[120] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 156.

for the poor, and were blind to their needs and sufferings. Briefly, they had no contact with them at all. He ended by pointing out that the poor did not hate the upper classes and urged, "Go to them with your heart open, your hands extended and you will see that they do understand you."[121] Because of Maignen's influence, both men were drawn deeper into the service of the workers and hoped to close the abyss between the rich and the poor by setting up workers' clubs as Maignen had done. They were joined by de Mun's older brother Robert. This nucleus of three men rapidly recruited others, and nine men[122] were present for the founding of the OCCO on 23 December 1871. The men all agreed to adhere without qualification to the principles of the encyclical *Quanta Cura* and to the condemnation of the errors found in the *Syllabus*. They sent this address to the Holy Father[123] succinctly defining the nature of their enterprise thus:

> The work of the Catholic clubs of workers has for its purpose the devotion of the ruling class to the working class, for principles, the definitions of the church in its relations with civil society, and for form, the Catholic club of workers.[124]

The founding members of the OCCO, like Keller himself, felt that the only way to stem the flagrant abuses found in modern society was to adhere closely to the teaching of the

---

[121] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 63.

[122] The nine men included Maurice Maignen, Albert de Mun, Robert de Mun, René La Tour du Pin, the deputy Émile Keller, Léon Gautier (professor at the École des Chartres), the deputy Léonce de Guiraud, the lawyer Armand Ravelet (also the director of the journal *Le Monde)*, and Paul Vrignault (bureau chief at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

[123] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 71.

[124] Henri Rollet, *L'action sociale des catholiques en France 1871-1914*, vol. 1 (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1947-1958), 15.

Catholic Church and concretely realize it.

An "Appeal to Men of Good Will" was drafted by Paul Vrignault in order to both raise money and move public opinion favorably for the OCCO.[125] The "Appeal" was reproduced in many French Catholic journals and opened with the following:

> The worker question, at the present time, is no longer a question to discuss. It comes down before us as a menace, as a permanent peril. It is necessary to resolve it.…[126]

The nucleus of the OCCO was formed by the two de Muns and La Tour du Pin. Robert de Mun was in charge of finances; Albert was in charge of founding new clubs; and La Tour du Pin was in charge of propaganda as well as head of the executive committee. The clubs contained rooms for concerts, billiards, schooling for the unlettered, and a bank as well.[127] The clubs of the workingmen were very similar to Fr. Kolping's *Gesellenvereine*. The main difference was that where the *Gesellenvereine* was created for traveling journeymen, the *cercles* were founded for industrial workingmen. Each club also contained a chapel where de Mun imposed simple religious requirements on members. They had to wear a medal of the Immaculate Conception, recite certain prayers, attend Mass annually on the feast of St. Joseph, and offer up one annual communion for the safety of the workers.[128] The OCCO expanded vigorously over the

---

[125] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 70.

[126] Ibid., 72.

[127] Benjamin Martin, *Count Albert de Mun: Paladin of the Third Republic* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 17.

[128] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 92.

first decade and a half. By 1884 it included 400 committees and 50,000 members.[129] Nevertheless, it was never really successful in attracting large numbers of industrial working men. Parker Moon remarks, "They [the workers] were unwilling to be patronized by benevolent aristocrats."[130]

Unlike de Mun, who was primarily a man of action, La Tour du Pin was given to study. In order to base the OCCO on solid principles, he encouraged the creation of *Conseil d'Études*[131] in the spring of 1872. The *Conseil d'Études* was composed of theologians and sociologists who drew up plans for ushering in a Christian society.[132] The *Conseil d'Études* was original in that it afforded devoted and intelligent women the opportunity to collaborate in the *Oeuvre* by holding salons under the influence of La Tour du Pin. De Mun points out that the role of these women was similar to those of the eighteenth century who were won over to the ideas of the *philosophes*.[133] For many years La Tour du Pin was the inspiration behind this part of the OCCO. Eventually, he also labored to found a monthly bulletin devoted to social Catholic thought. The first number was issued in 1876; it was called *Association catholique*.[134] Throughout the 1870's, the

---

[129] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 85.

[130] Ibid.

[131] This is best translated as Research Council.

[132] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 115.

[133] Ibid., 117.

[134] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 10-11.

OCCO was supportive of the social thought of Le Play and Périn, both of whom frowned on government intervention. This, however, would change after La Tour du Pin's diplomatic assignment in Austria, where he imbibed many of the more progressive German and Austrian social Catholic ideas.

E. Léon Harmel and the Experiment at Val-des-Bois

The third member of the triumvirate who aided the social Catholic initiative in France was Léon Harmel[135] (1825-1915). Harmel's family owned the cotton spinning mill of Val-des-Bois in the Champagne. Both Harmel and his father, the founder of the mill, were imbued with a profoundly religious spirit; on account of their zeal for proselytizing, they wished to convert their laborers to Christianity and thereby save them from wallowing in the dregs of immorality like so many workers elsewhere. Harmel hit upon a novel plan. He established a "Christian corporation" at Val-des-Bois in order to satisfy both the moral and material needs of his workers.

Léon's father, Jacques-Joseph, offered the same apostolic advice to his son that his own father had given to him. Léon's grandfather had urged his father to win over the workers by living a life of simplicity and dwelling in an unostentatious home. He pointed

---

[135] For the definitive biography of Léon Harmel, see: Georges Guitton, *Léon Harmel, 1825-1915*, 2 vols. (Paris: Spes, 1927). Guitton also wrote other works on Harmel as well. For instance, see: Georges Guitton, *La Vie ardente et féconde de Léon Harmel* (Paris: Action-Populaire, 1929). For Harmel's description of his Christian corporation, see: Léon Harmel, *Manuel de la corporation chrétienne* (Liége: L. Grandmont-Donders, 1876). Joan Coffey, utilizing recent scholarship, has written the first major study on Harmel in English. See: Joan L. Coffey, *Léon Harmel: Entrepreneur as Catholic Social Reformer* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

out that luxury both annoys and irritates the workers who see themselves as primarily responsible for providing it. He exhorted him to act, outside of work, as a friend rather than as a patron; furthermore, he told him to act as an associate rather than as a master in matters regarding work.[136]

Val-des Bois was a multi-faceted and complex industrial body. The Harmels' persuaded their workers to form various associations in which the workers themselves held management positions under the surveillance of the owners. Workers were also elected to a guild board which had a consultative function in factory decisions. Hence, the "Christian corporation" at Val-des-Bois was mixed, i.e., composed of both workers and employers. The Harmels' corporation demonstrated a blend of associationism, democracy, and paternalism united in a spirit of Christianity.[137] Workers had great opportunities to employ collective action; for example, they formed consumer cooperatives. Because of a "social insurance fund" workers were insured against sickness, accidents, and death. Harmel built small, beautiful cottages with gardens, which he would rent at reasonable rates to his employees. Children under twelve were not employed; they were required to attend primary education. Vocational training was also made available through the corporation and workers were given the opportunity to

---

[136] Georges Guitton, *La Vie ardente et féconde de Léon Harmel* (Paris: Action-Populaire, 1929), 27.

[137] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 114.

rise to higher and more responsible positions in the factory.[138] Healthy diversions were also made available such as music clubs, theater, and billiards, etc. As important as the material advantages were, the moral advantages were significant as well. Parker Moon continues:

> The working man who was secure in his employment, protected against accident or sickness, participated in the management of guild affairs, was no longer a "wage slave," a cog in the machine, but a self-respecting human being. He felt a pride in his trade and in his home. [139]

Lastly, it should be noted that the Harmels always had the religious interests of the workers at heart. Therefore, they encouraged their employees to form and join sodalities and confraternities under the auspices of a chaplain.[140]

Contact between Harmel and the OCCO began in 1873 during a pilgrimage of workmen. Harmel had concretely realized what de Mun and La Tour du Pin were theorizing about—a Christian corporation. They now had a practical, organic and living example of a corporation adapted to the exigencies of the modern world. La Tour du Pin was extremely enthusiastic about Harmel's ideas and suggested that Harmel write a manual on the principles underlying the corporation and its mode of operation.[141] Harmel took this exhortation in hand and he produced his *Manuel de la corporation chrétienne* in

---

[138] Ibid., 115-116.

[139] Ibid., 116-117.

[140] Ibid., 117.

[141] Ibid., 118.

1876. With the notable exception of La Tour du Pin,[142] Harmel's ideas on free and voluntary corporations[143] won the suspicion rather than the admiration of many of the OCCO's leaders. Maignen and de Mun were both strong advocates of closed corporations. La Tour du Pin came to realize that Maignen's closed corporation was geared toward unmarried tradesmen similar to Kolping's *Gesellenvereine*—most of these men's lives were unstable. The rigid structure of his closed corporations with a predominating religious spirit would give them stability in their lives. On the other hand, Harmel's free and voluntary corporations were better suited to factory workers who were married and whose lives were more rooted. La Tour du Pin now urged the OCCO to address questions which dealt with factory workers' families and even women.[144] The principles underpinning Harmel's corporation at Val-des-Bois and its functioning were a distinctive influence over the evolving corporative thought of La Tour du Pin. Despite the fact that Harmel was a bourgeois who became more and more enchanted with democracy and worker self-help, the paternalistic and monarchist noble, La Tour du Pin,

---

[142] Levillain, *Albert de Mun*, 419.

[143] Harmel, unlike Maignen, felt that workers in a particular trade should be able to choose whether they wanted to join a corporation or not. In addition, he wanted any worker in a particular trade, whether he was a Catholic, Christian, or unbeliever, to have the opportunity of joining the corporation. Maignen advocated closed corporations which limited workers to Catholics over whom the clergy could exercise a preponderant influence. His corporations, more or less, resembled confraternities where the religious spirit was primary and the commonality of the trade was secondary. Furthermore, he was resolutely opposed to free, voluntary corporations, because he felt they savored too much of the "false liberty" or liberalism of '89 which was responsible for many of the ailments in the current society. See: Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 161-162.

[144] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 158-159.

would regard him as a good friend throughout his long life.

Eventually, Harmel led a pilgrimage of one hundred patrons to Rome in 1885. Later, he led pilgrimages of workingmen to Rome in 1887, 1889, and 1891. The 1889 pilgrimage included ten thousand working men. During the 1887 pilgrimage he asked the pope to speak on behalf of the workers.[145] Commenting on these pilgrimages of working men, Lillian Parker Wallace says, "They were nineteenth-century substitutes for Canterbury pilgrimages or Crusades." [146]

F. Military Attaché in Austria: The Influence of the Comte de Chambord and Baron von Vogelsang

1. The Comte de Chambord

In early 1877, La Tour du Pin was sent to Vienna as a military attaché. In this capacity he was allowed to visit the Comte de Chambord[147] (1820-1880) by frequenting

---

[145] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 159.

[146] Lillian Parker Wallace, *Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1966), 190.

[147] Henri, Comte de Chambord, was the son of the Duc de Berry, Charles X's second son. Since the Duc de Berry was assassinated in early 1820 and Charles X's eldest son, the Duc de Angoulême, was childless, the Comte de Chambord would become second in line for the throne. This boy who was born seven months after his father's assassination was called the "Child of the Miracle." Since both his grandfather and uncle abdicated their rights to the throne in 1830, from then on, he was the pretender to the throne. See: Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines*, 166. For a brief life of the Comte de Chambord, see: Marvin Brown, *The Comte de Chambord: The Third Republic's Uncompromising King* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1967). Chambord's chief writings have been collected and organized with those of the Orleanist pretenders in a single work. See: Comte de Chambord, Comte de Paris, and Duc D'Orléans, *La Monarchie française: lettres et documents politiques, 1844-1907* (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1907).

Schloss Frohsdorf,[148] the home of the legitimist pretender to the throne. The Comte de Chambord or "Henry V" as his supporters were want to call him, was a "socially conscious king." Chambord was not an adherent to the divine right of kings or to arbitrary absolutism in any shape or form. He laid his claim to the throne on the "sacred deposit of the tradition" which intimately linked the house of Capet with the nation of France.[149] Epitomizing Chambord's thought, Charlotte Muret remarks, "Caesarism and anarchy result from seeking salvation in persons, rather than in fundamental principles."[150] This was the most noticeable difference between legitimists and the Bonapartists. In the tradition of de Bonald and de Maistre, he was opposed to a parliamentary monarchy in which the Chambers vis-à-vis the king were supreme. Nevertheless, he was opposed to both the monarchy of the *ancien régime* and that of the Restoration. He felt that the monarchy of the *ancien régime* did not respect the prerogatives and liberties of the intermediate bodies within the State. Regarding parliamentary monarchy, he felt it was an exercise in futility, for the king reigned, but did not govern.[151] This division or confusion of powers led to a "political ataxia." He

---

[148] Schloss Frohsdorf was the French-style chateau occupied by the Comte de Chambord in the village of Lanzenkirchen in Lower Austria. The Comte would dwell there for almost forty years during the months from May to November. He enjoyed hunting, reading books from his enormous library of 15,000 volumes, and receiving royalists who were visiting from France. See: Marvin Brown, *The Comte de Chambord*, 47-48.

[149] Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines*, 168-169.

[150] Ibid., 169.

[151] By this distinction the Comte de Chambord understands that "to reign" means "to hold office as

wanted to take up the reform of the monarchy where it left off in 1789.

Chambord issued a number of circular letters in the 1860's. Two of his most important letters were his "Letter on Decentralization" of 14 November 1862 and his "Letter on the Condition of Working Men" of 20 April 1865. In the latter letter he denounced capitalistic individualism and promoted the corporate organization of working men as in the eighteenth century.[152] He castigated the laws which prevented working men from associating. In addition, he pointed out that associations would always exist, hence it was better to recognize some of these associations that were wisely regulated or men would join secret associations that were subversive.[153] Lastly, he mentioned that voluntary corporations supervised by the State would act as a considerable bulwark of order and harmony throughout the State.[154]

In his "Letter on Decentralization," Chambord censured the administrative centralization which had taken root in France, especially under the Napoleonic regime. Earlier, in his "Letter to Saint-Priest" of 22 June 1848 he called for reforms which would enable towns, cities, provinces, and other associations to regain their local liberties and

---

head of State, but exercise minimal or no authority in executing policy." On the other hand, he understands that "to govern" means "to exercise full authority in executing policy."

[152] Brown, *The Comte de Chambord: The Third Republic's Uncompromising King* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1967), 73.

[153] Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines*, 171. This is similar to Leo XIII's advice in *Humanum genus*.

[154] Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines*, 172.

rights, and thereby make decisions within their proper spheres of influence.[155] Nevertheless, his 1862 letter was the most thoroughly developed plan for decentralization. He called for tact and prudence in progressively decentralizing France. He noted that the main problem in France during the nineteenth century was that of balancing authority with liberty. As France was now organized to "be administered, not governed," the representative system had failed. The country would become conscious of its real needs and interests only by undergoing decentralization and this would lead to true representation.[156]

Lastly, Chambord also promised that he would insist on religious education being given to the people. He would recognize all the Church's rights and liberties. He also demonstrated that he was an intrepid defender of the temporal power of the Holy See.[157]

It cannot be stressed enough how much La Tour du Pin and the Comte de Chambord saw eye to eye on social and political matters. At one of his visits to Frohsdorf, La Tour du Pin placed a memoir containing his ideas on social politics before the prince. At the bottom of the memoir Chambord wrote, "All his thoughts are mine, his views, my views, his sentiments, my sentiments."[158] La Tour du Pin even thought of leaving his military position to attach himself to Chambord's service and represent him in

---

[155] Brown, *The Comte de Chambord*, 72-73.

[156] Muret, *French Royalist Doctrines*, 172.

[157] Ibid., 173.

[158] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 75.

the department of the Aisne.[159]

2. Baron Karl von Vogelsang

The other person who had a great influence over La Tour du Pin's mind while he lived in Vienna was Baron Karl von Vogelsang[160] (1818-1890). Vogelsang was a member of the lower Prussian nobility from Mecklenburg in Silesia. He had studied law at Berlin, Bonn, and Rostock and entered into the Prussian civil service. After the Revolution of 1848, he was disgusted with Fredrick IV's handling of the situation and resigned from the civil service. He eventually became interested in Catholicism and converted in 1850 at Innsbruck after instruction by the Jesuits there. He had made his conversion under the guidance of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, whose social theories he also warmly imbibed.

After twenty years of itinerant work, he finally became the editor of the Viennese newspaper *Vaterland*.[161] According to John Boyer, "*Vaterland* represented the Catholic,

---

[159] Ibid.

[160] For the most significant treatment of Vogelsang's life and work, see: Wiard Klopp, *Leben und Wirken des Sozialpolitikers Karl Freiherrn von Vogelsang* (Vienna: Typographische Anstalt, 1930); *Die sozialen Lehren des Freiherrn Karl von Vogelsang* (Vienna-Leipzig: Reinhold Verlag, 1938). For more recent treatments of Vogelsang, see: Johann Christoph Allmayer-Beck, *Vogelsang: vom Feudalismus zur Volksbewegung* (Vienna: Herold, 1952); Erwin Bader, *Karl von Vogelsang: die geistige Grundlegung der christlichen Sozialreform* (Vienna: Herder, 1990). The essays of Vogelsang were collected together in 1886. See: Karl von Vogelsang, *Gesammelte Aufsätze über socialpolitische und verwandte Themata* (Augsburg: M. Huttler, 1886). For a brief, but informative treatment of Vogelsang and his ideas in English, see: John W. Boyer, *Political Radicals in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1981), 166-180.

[161] John W. Boyer, *Political Radicals in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social*

federalist-orientated nobility in the struggle against both administrative centralization and political liberalism.[162] Eventually Vogelsang made *Vaterland* his mouthpiece on the social question. In 1879 he founded the *Österreichische Monatsschrift für christliche Sozialreform.*[163]

One of the most notable features of Vogelsang and his disciples was their strict condemnation of usury, i.e., prohibition of interest altogether.[164] Vogelsang also held extreme views on capitalism; he rejected and condemned it as immoral *in se*.[165] Offering some insight into his severe judgment on capitalism, Edgar Alexander notes:

> To him, capitalism was not a predominantly social problem which had arisen in the course of Western industrial development and as such could be dealt with through reform. To him, capitalism is fundamentally a moral problem, the defection from the Christian order as established in the Middle Ages. Thus, capitalism is the "fall of man" that began with the Reformation and now needs to be eliminated. [166]

Vogelsang was opposed to socialism as much as he was opposed to liberalism. Consequently, he spoke out furiously against land nationalization.[167] Nevertheless,

---

Movement, 1848-1897 (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1981), 167-168; Edgar Alexander, "Church and Society in Germany," in *Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements, 1789-1950*, ed. by Joseph N. Moody (New York: Arts, Inc., 1953), 417-418.

[162] Boyer, *Political Radicals,* 169.

[163] In 1879 this journal was called *Monatsschrift für christliche Sozialwissenschaft*, but in 1883 the name was changed to the *Österreichische Monatsschrift für christliche Sozialreform.* See: Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe,* 170.

[164] Boyer, *Political Radicals,* 176-177

[165] Normand J. Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals of the Fribourg Union" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1983), 36.

[166] Alexander, "Church and Society in Germany," 420.

[167] Nitti, *Catholic Socialism,* 222.

describing the Church as impotent to solve the social question alone, he advocated an "energetic intervention" by the State.[168] In order to combat economic liberalism he insisted that the corporations should be resuscitated. Then they should be given legal personal rights and juridical authority over their members and be allowed to form autonomous bodies under the surveillance of the State. Like his master Ketteler, as well as Keller, Vogelsang saw the social question as both a moral and economic question.[169] He and the rest of the Catholic party played an important part in the legal restoration of the corporations[170] in Austria (1883) and in Hungary (1884).[171]

One of Vogelsang's original contributions to social Catholic thought is his corporatist reorganization[172] of society. He was opposed to the horizontal divisions into classes and wished to substitute vertical divisions of society into three economic *Berufstände* (professional associations), viz. large industry, small craft trades and shops, and agriculture. Owners and workers would be bound together in each of the professional associations. As a result, they could express their common interests to those

---

[168] Ibid.

[169] Ibid., 222-223.

[170] The corporations were abolished in Austria in 1859; nevertheless, they had not been completely suppressed as they were in France.

[171] Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*, 224.

[172] The Austrian Chancellor, Engelbert Dollfuss, who instituted the "Christian Corporate State" of 1934, was a disciple of Vogelsang and concretely realized his corporatist theories. See: Alexander, "Church and Society in Germany," 422; Gordon Brook-Shepherd, *Dollfuss* (London, MacMillan, 1961), 169.

outside the profession and settle their differences internally within the corporation.[173] The *Berufstände* would also have a political function by "being represented in the ruling branches of the State."[174] As a result, the *Berufstände* would act as a bulwark against excessive individualism from below and oppressive socialism or statism from above.[175] Remarking that Vogelsang's plan would kill three problems with one solution, Paul Misner notes:

> This would *eliminate the proletariat* by integrating or absorbing its components into the three main economic Stände or "estates." It would also *eliminate or restrain usury and bureaucracy* by the workings of self-management. Finally it would largely *replace the "artificial" modern institutions* of the liberal, constitutional state. A monarchical head with defense forces and courts remaining under the royal sovereignty seemed self-evident to round out this scheme. [176]

How would this be brought about? Vogelsang advocated strong state intervention to realize his corporative society.[177]

La Tour du Pin frequently visited Vogelsang, studied his thought, and even translated some of his works into French.[178] The Comte de Chambord also admired Vogelsang and subscribed to *Vaterland*. Often he would discuss its articles with La Tour du Pin.[179] Both Vogelsang and La Tour du Pin had great hope for a "social king" to arise

---

[173] Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals of the Fribourg Union," 36.

[174] Ibid., 37.

[175] Ibid.

[176] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 171.

[177] Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals of the Fribourg Union," 37.

[178] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 98.

[179] Ibid., 74.

and believed it could be concretely realized in "Henri V." La Tour du Pin always remembered Vogelsang's description of this "worker king" as follows:

> At the time of the old Christian and national order, there was a social king, a king who remained at the summit of society, among which all parties were jointly and severally bound to one other. In him, who accomplished the highest national work, work was truly king.[180]

While in Austria, La Tour du Pin met many other social Catholics, most of them being Vogelsang's disciples. Among them were Comte de Blôme, Prince Löwenstein, and Fr. Augustin Lehmkuhl. They would later form the nucleus of the Union of Fribourg with La Tour du Pin. All in all, La Tour du Pin's four-year sojourn in Austria was quite productive. For, as Charles Baussan says, "…[It] was a decisive step in the journey of his social ideas and a deepening of his doctrine."[181] The ideas of Vogelsang contributed to La Tour du Pin's harsh critique of capitalism and usury. More important yet, however, La Tour du Pin's program for a reorganization of society owes much to Vogelsang's organization of society into three economic *Berufstände*.

G. De Mun: Defender of the Social Catholic Cause in Parliament

De Mun resigned his commission from the army in 1875 and ran for parliament as deputy for Morbihan (Brittany) in 1875. Although he won the election in 1876, anticlerical politicians were successful in invalidating[182] it. Later in the year, he finally

---

[180] Ibid., 98.

[181] Ibid., 96.

[182] His opponents invalidated his election on grounds of clerical interference, which was falsely attributed to de Mun.

took his seat on the far right of the assembly after he won his seat a second time. De Mun's ideas had evolved and he planned to work for the social Catholic cause in the legislative arena, which would be many times more effective than working on its behalf as a private citizen.[183]

On 8 September 1878, de Mun gave a rousing speech to the *cercles* of Paris at Chartres on the occasion of a workers' pilgrimage and workers' congress. He wished to distance himself from both the liberals and the socialists whom he saw as co-heirs of the revolution. At the end of his speech he declaimed, "Socialism is the logical revolution, and we are the irreconcilable counter-Revolution."[184] The term "counter-Revolution" was a loaded term, which hinted at a return to the *ancien régime*. Even members of the right, such as Comte Alfred de Falloux, condemned the term as ill-chosen and pointed out that it could lead to considerable misunderstanding.[185] Émile Keller himself wrote a letter to de Mun demonstrating his displeasure with the term as well. He wished to be sure that "counter-Revolution" was not synonymous with the *ancien régime*. Continuing, Keller wrote:

> Because the revolution has been prepared, fashioned in all its pieces by the legists, counselors of the monarchy, enemies of the Church, of the Jesuits and of the workers' corporations. I call your attention to this point because I have certainly understood some fears and apprehensions excited by you affirmation. *Neither the* ancien régime *nor the revolution, but a Christian society, there is the*

---

[183] Martin, *Count Albert de Mun*, 24-30.

[184] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 179.

[185] Martin, *Count Albert de Mun*, 36-37.

true motto. [186]

This letter hit home with de Mun. Within a short time he realized that royalism was not the *sine qua non* for which to strive. Following the pope's direction at many points in his career, he began to advocate Catholic interests before royalist interests.

At Chartres, de Mun also fueled the fires of another opponent as well, Charles Périn. Périn gave a speech in which he rendered justice to de Mun's intentions, and evidenced agreement with de Mun's portrayal of the social malaise that proceeded from the Revolution, but he attacked de Mun's "corporative conceptions."[187] This was the beginning of a long drawn-out battle between the two factions[188] of Catholics who wished to address to the Social Question.

Throughout his parliamentary career de Mun did great work on behalf of the Church and the working classes. Many of the ideas which he promoted within the chamber were discussed beforehand with other members of the OCCO.[189] Even socialists such as Jean Jaurès respected de Mun on account of his defense of the workers' rights. Unlike La Tour du Pin, he was inclined to incrementally adjust the currently unjust society to a just one by means of social legislation.

De Mun argued in the Chamber on behalf of mixed syndicates (corporations)

---

[186] Molette, *Albert de Mun*, 182. The italicized emphasis is my own.

[187] De Mun, *Ma vocation sociale*, 180.

[188] This refers to Catholic economic liberals and social Catholics.

[189] Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism*, 122.

before the Law of 1884 on trade unionism was passed. Like La Tour du Pin he thought that it would build solidarity between owners and workers rather than exacerbate the class struggle between them.

Since 1880, a law on syndicates had been under discussion and in 1883 it came before the Chamber of Deputies. De Mun and a few of his friends[190] tried to endow this individualist law with a corporative spirit;[191] most of the members of the chamber were unfamiliar with corporative thought and refused to follow his lead.

De Mun and other social Catholic deputies saw some serious deficiencies in this law and approached it with mixed feelings.[192] First of all, article four of the Law of 1884 forbade associations to receive gifts except under very onerous titles. The Law's sponsors wished to prevent mortmains from being set up, which would become extremely powerful vis-à-vis the State. Also, since mortmains were not subject to inheritance laws, they would not contribute to the public treasury. Second, the State refused to recognize the associations in public law as juridical persons, but considered them as associations of private law, resulting from individual wills. This struck the social Catholic deputies as very individualistic in nature, for the associations would not be able to act as intermediate bodies between the individual and the State. No true progress to combat individualism and statism would have been made. De Mun and his friends wanted these associations to

---

[190] Among them were Charles Geoffroy Le Cour de Grandmaison and Édouard de la Bassetière.

[191] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 96.

[192] Ibid.

possess officially recognized powers and privileges; they believed that these associations should have autonomy to govern their members, make laws in their respective professions, and settle disputes within the association. Third, these separate syndicates of employers and workers would exacerbate the class struggle. For workers would form solidarity among themselves, but not between themselves and their employers. Thus there would be no reconciliation of interests between owners and employers and, in addition, the professions would not be organized.[193]

On the other hand, the social Catholics were happy that the hated Chapelier Law of 1791, which outlawed associations of workers, was formally abrogated.[194] De Mun and the others eventually decided not to oppose the Law of 1884, thus accepting separate syndicates as they were proposed; nevertheless, he hoped to gain preferential treatment for mixed syndicates with an amendment. Among other things, de Mun and his colleagues wanted mixed syndicates to be endowed with the capacity to receive gifts, legacies, and to acquire landed property to be used for workers' lodgings, homes for infants and the aged, and hospitals for the sick.[195]

Unfortunately, for the social Catholic cause, the amendment was rejected by the Chamber and mixed syndicates received no special privilege.[196] Workers were naturally

---

[193] Ibid., 97-98.

[194] Ibid., 96-97.

[195] Ibid., 98.

[196] Ibid., 101-102.

inclined to join separate workers' syndicates. Nevertheless, de Mun had hoped to attract them away from trade unions by giving the corporations special privileges which the workers themselves would enjoy. As a result of de Mun's preferential treatment for mixed syndicates, he hoped the separate syndicates would founder and mixed syndicates would blossom. In fact, just the reverse happened.

De Mun championed the workers' cause in other areas of legislation as well. He spoke in favor of councils of arbitrage within the corporation to reconcile conflicts between workers and employers. He promoted different types of social insurance, e.g., accident insurance and retirement funds for workers. At the same time he wanted syndicates rather than the bureaucratic government to administer these funds.[197] He also wished to limit the hours of work for women and children in industrial conditions.[198] In many cases de Mun and the social Catholics would join the socialists in the Chamber to promote the workers' interests. De Mun was not always successful with his proposals, but even his enemies respected his dedication to the "working class." Summing up de Mun's views on work, Alec Vidler remarks, "He insisted that industry was made for man, not man for industry." [199]

De Mun was elated when Pope Leo XIII issued *Humanum genus*, his encyclical

---

[197] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 90-91

[198] Georges Hoog, *Histoire du catholicisme social en France, 1871-1931* (Paris: Dumat, 1946), 27-28.

[199] Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism*, 122.

on freemasonry. Commenting on the utility of the guilds of the past, the pope states:

> …there is a matter wisely instituted by our forefathers, but in course of time laid aside, which may now be used as a pattern and form of something similar. We mean the associations or guilds of workmen, for the protection, under the guidance of religion, both of their temporal interests and of their morality. If our ancestors, by long use and experience, felt the benefit of these guilds, our age perhaps will feel it the more by reason of the opportunity which they will give of crushing the power of the sects [freemasonry]. Those who support themselves by the labor of their hands, besides being, by their very condition, most worthy above all others of charity and consolation, are also especially exposed to the allurements of men whose ways lie in fraud and deceit. Therefore, they ought to be helped with the greatest possible kindness, and to be invited to join associations that are good, lest they be drawn away to others that are evil. [200]

The pope appeared to be giving his outward support to corporations and indirectly lent his favor to the social Catholic cause promoted by La Tour du Pin and de Mun. Concerning *Humanum genus*, de Mun wrote to his friend Félix de Roquefeuil the following:

> Without doubt, it is not a total and exclusive approbation: but it is an absolute approbation, on the one hand, of the idea of corporations, so clearly combated by Périn, after Chartres, and since, by Claudio Jannet, —and, on the other hand, of all our practical work so much discussed by the ecclesiastical authorities.[201]

H. Proceeding to *Rerum Novarum*

In 1881, La Tour du Pin resigned his commission as colonel in the military. He returned to France and to the OCCO. By 1882 he was president of the *Conseil d'Études* and began leading his social Catholic friends on a different tack. In his writings, he also began to distinguish between the OCCO's official position by using "We" and his own personal opinion in which he used "I." As one might imagine, the "I" predominated in

---

[200] Leo XIII, "Humanum genus," no. 35, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903,* vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 100.

[201] Molette, *Albert de Mun*, 201.

his writings thereafter, and "he took a doctrinal position."[202] At that time the OCCO was filled with disciples of Le Play and Périn, but he argued that the social Catholics need not be adherents to either one. Rather, he remarked:

> We have found ourselves thus, by the resolution of our point of departure and the logic of our inclinations, pushed into the open path by the great bishop of Mainz, Mgr. Ketteler, and followed by the Catholic conservatives of the Rhine and the Danubian valleys.[203]

Hence, in 1882 Ketteler's thought once again took hold of La Tour du Pin's mind. In 1869 Ketteler himself acknowledged that moderate state intervention was necessary to remedy the injustices against the working class population.[204] La Tour du Pin would now also be converted to the necessity of moderate state intervention into the economy. He also spoke of completing Harmel's "Christian corporation" by a corporative regime in a Christian state.[205] Ketteler appears to have influenced La Tour du Pin both directly and indirectly. In *Freedom, Authority, and the Church,* Ketteler discusses the advantages of the corporate (organic) structure of society over the constitutional, mechanistic structure. Ketteler also displays hope that the various professions in society will be organized as corporate bodies and truly be more representative than in the current system.[206] La Tour

---

[202] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif,* 89.

[203] Ibid.

[204] Ketteler, "The Charitable Work of the Church for the Working Class," 485; Bock, *Wilhelm von Ketteler*, 28.

[205] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif,* 91.

[206] See pp. 128-130 of this paper where Ketteler's comparison of organic and the mechanistic structures of society are discussed.

du Pin was also influenced by the ideas of Vogelsang[207] who midwifed Ketteler's ideas into Austria with his own personal adaptations. Vogelsang, with his idea of the *Berufstände,* was the first theorist of a corporative system. La Tour du Pin would later fill in his theory and complete it, giving it his own personal touch as well.

Already in 1879 state intervention into the economy was becoming a source of dissension within Catholic ranks. The thinkers behind the *Conseil d'Études* of the OCCO saw the role of the State as the "guardian of the common good."[208] The state should not only protect the poor and the feeble, but also "encourage" professional associations and corporative patrimonies. Furthermore, the State should act as both an interior and exterior defense. With regard to the former, it should control new businesses, demanding caution if they had not yet formed a corporative patrimony. With regard to the latter, the State should look after the good of the national economy by enforcing protectionism against free-exchange.[209] Economic liberals like Charles Périn and Claudio Jannet who thought state intervention should be limited to abuses in society were extremely disturbed by these new developments of the social Catholics.[210]

Later, La Tour du Pin, becoming more precise in his terminology, stated that the Catholic industrial association at Val-des-Bois was not really a true corporation, because

---

[207] Vogelsang's corporative ideas are discussed on pp. 185-186 of this dissertation.

[208] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 85.

[209] Ibid.

[210] Ibid.

it possessed neither a corporative patrimony nor a corporative bond.[211] Here he is articulating more clearly the essential attributes of a true corporation. In fact, he clarified precisely what he meant by the term *régime corporatif* (corporative system). He comments:

> I understand by *régime corporatif*, the economic and political system where the "Christian corporation of Val-des-Bois" will be recognized as a constituted body; not only as civil person, but moreover as a political unity, and will have suffrage (direct or in several degrees) in all questions posed in legislation relative to the regulation of work, of property, of commerce.[212]

La Tour du Pin continues on by claiming that the corporative regime is all encompassing in that it is economic, political, and social.[213] It is an organic system in which all these spheres of life are interdependent and integrated.

Within a short time, La Tour du Pin, in firm control of the *Conseil d'Études*, won over the directors of workers' associations to his way of thinking. After the Congresses at Reims and Bordeaux in 1882 the directors of the workers' associations declared themselves "unanimously convinced that the corporative regime is the sole means of remedying the evils engendered by the anarchical state in which we live."[214] Demonstrating his distaste for the revolutionary notion of the innate opposition between authority and liberty, he maintained that Christian liberty would only blossom under a Christian authority and that a social Christian order is only possible by means of a

---

[211] Ibid., 91.

[212] Ibid.

[213] Ibid.

[214] Ibid., 92.

Christian political authority.[215]

Over the course of the years 1882-1891, La Tour du Pin developed a firm social doctrine on which to base his corporative regime and the restoration of a Christian social order. During the time under his leadership, the *Conseil d'Études* contributed studies on the contract of work, the just wage, the social function of property, the nature of corporations, the intervention of the State, and the corporative regime.[216]

Through the 1880's some tension arose between La Tour du Pin and de Mun. Although de Mun had great respect for La Tour du Pin, he claimed that La Tour du Pin's defects included boldly basing his conceptions solely on intuition as well as his repugnance to accept the control of a dogmatic authority.[217] He also thought that La Tour du Pin put too much emphasis on the *Conseil d'Études* to the detriment of the *cercles* themselves. After stating "we are dying from theory…," he separated *Association catholique* from the *cercles.*[218]

La Tour du Pin felt that no true lasting social renovation would come about if it was not based on a solid doctrinal foundation. He was not so totally wrapped up in theory, as de Mun would have us believe. With his friends Louis Milcent and Hyacinthe

---

[215] Ibid., 93.

[216] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 17-27.

[217] Molette, *Albert de Mun*, 203.

[218] Martin, *Count Albert de Mun*, 92.

de Gailhard-Bancel he helped realize agricultural syndicates in the Jura and Dauphiné.[219] He also attempted to realize the corporative regime in practice in the late 1880's and the early 1890's through the *Assemblée de Romans* and the *Contre-centenaire de la Revolution*. He was not interested in parliamentary meddling as was de Mun. The final rupture between he and de Mun occurred during the *Ralliement* (1892) in which de Mun, following the pope's advice, rallied to the Third Republic. La Tour du Pin, on the other hand, a firm monarchist, felt that the pope had overstepped the limits of his authority, and he refused to rally to and support the anti-clerical and anti-Christian Third Republic which had already caused grave damage to "Christian France."

La Tour du Pin eventually became more involved with the royalist *Action Française.* De Mun, the leader of the parliamentary constitution Catholics, isolated from his former friends, spent his time on the *Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française* (ACJF) and also set up the political party *Action Libérale Populaire* (ALP) with Jacques Piou. Léon Harmel eventually became one of the leading lights of the Christian democratic movement with some notable republican priests. Not a paternalist like La Tour du Pin and de Mun, he supported workers' trade unions because he felt that the workers should learn how to manage their own affairs.

During the 1880's the battle lines were drawn up between the two schools of Catholic social thought. Charles Périn vigorously argued against state intervention in the

---

[219] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 114-117.

economy. He alluded to the inefficiency and incompetence of the State when it involved itself in matters which are the proper sphere of the Church.[220] Moreover, he maintained that not much true help could be expected from the modern state, because the State itself was in the hands of those who hated Christianity.[221] La Tour du Pin angrily retorted that the workers can't turn down all help "until it comes *exclusively* from the spiritual resources of the Church."[222] Later, Mgr. Freppel,[223] Bishop of Angers, challenged La Tour du Pin to discuss the intervention of the State at a Catholic Congress of Jurists at Angers. La Tour du Pin replied, "we refrain from carrying the struggle into this Assembly,…one does not fire on ambulances."[224] The liberal economic school promoted liberty of work, minimum state intervention for abuses, and wished to "baptize" capitalism with charity; on account of Freppel's influential role, it was called the School of Angers. In 1890 the social Catholics had a Congress in Liège under the auspices of Bishop Doutreloux (of Liège), where they acknowledged that the State has a right to undertake labor legislation; hence, this social Catholic school became known as the

---

[220] He was referring primarily to the roles of the Church in education and charity in the past.

[221] Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 167.

[222] Molette, *Albert de Mun*, 82.

[223] Mgr. Freppel was influenced by the liberal economic ideas of the economist Charles Périn. Claudio Jannet, another prominent thinker involved in the Social Question, was more influenced by the liberal economic ideas of Le Play. Both Freppel and Jannet were Catholic liberals in their economic thought. They were very much opposed to the state intervention advocated by La Tour du Pin and his followers. See: Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*, 263-268; Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 153-155; Roger Aubert et al., *The Church in the Industrial Age*, vol. 9 of *History of the Church*, trans. Margit Resch, ed. Hubert Jedin and John Dolan (London: Burns & Oates, 1981), 107-108.

[224] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 27.

School of Liège. Over the years leading up to and after *Rerum novarum,* the School of Liège and the School of Angers would fight it out in the arena of Catholic social thought.

Lastly, it is important to see where the pope himself stood on this issue in the mid-1880s. In 1885 the *Conseil d'Études* saw itself accused of socialism by Périn and others of the liberal school. In response, they sent La Tour du Pin to the Holy Father as an ambassador.[225] After the pope had been informed that the men behind the *Conseil d'Études* were accused of socialism, Leo XIII cried out, "But my sons! This is not socialism! It is Christianity."[226] After this interview the social Catholics put aside any fear that they would be condemned by this pope. In addition, it hinted to the direction where Leo XIII's sympathies lay.

I. Retirement, Exile, and Death

In 1892, at age 58, La Tour du Pin married his cousin Marie de La Tour du Pin-Montauban.[227] She was a widow. Marie brought great happiness to the home at Arrancy for their brief marriage—she died twelve years later in 1904.[228]

After the death of his wife, La Tour du Pin retreated more and more from

---

[225] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 248.

[226] Ibid., 250.

[227] Ibid., 269.

[228] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 143-144.

society.[229] His daily rhythm was uncluttered. He arose early, attended mass at 7:00 A.M., and spent the remainder of his day attending to the people of Arrancy, seeing guests who came to visit him, and attending to his correspondence.[230] La Tour du Pin kept up with current books, read works of history and sociology, and made special time for his preferred authors, Bossuet, Burke, Le Play, and Vogelsang.[231]

Not long after the death of his wife, Élisabeth de Bossan de Garagnol, the daughter of his dear old friend from the St. Cyr days and various campaigns, began to dwell at Arrancy and served him as his secretary.[232] She collaborated with La Tour du Pin in translating the works of Karl von Vogelsang into French. Furthermore, she worked with him to collect his significant writings into the book *Vers un ordre social chrétien.*[233]

At the age of 78, La Tour du Pin sought to be reintegrated into the ranks of the army as World War I began. Even with the help of his friend Albert de Mun, he was unsuccessful in this matter.[234] The village of Arrancy was occupied by the Germans on 2 September 1914. Nevertheless, for three years during the war, La Tour du Pin did what

---

[229] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 52.

[230] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 146.

[231] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 287.

[232] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 166.

[233] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 52.

[234] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 299.

he could to stem the demands of the occupying Germans and he endeavored to protect the local families with whatever authority he still had.[235] During the war, René's nephew and heir, François de La Tour du Pin,[236] fell on the field of battle.

In early March 1917 La Tour du Pin was ordered to leave Arrancy.[237] He was eventually taken to Germany to the city of Karlsruhe where he was interned in a concentration camp for about six weeks.[238] While detained in the camp, La Tour du Pin, now at 83 years of age, had no resources. The dowager Grand-Duchess of Baden, an acquaintance of Élisabeth de Bossan de Garagnol's grandmother, heard of the plight of La Tour du Pin, and sent him eggs and wine during his internment.[239]

Finally, La Tour du Pin was liberated and received authorization to pass from Germany into Switzerland.[240] He passed through Constance, then Fribourg, eventually settling down in Lausanne.[241] In later years, he did make three sojourns to his homeland, the Aisne, to contemplate the devastation and the ruins after the war.[242] Nevertheless, he

---

[235] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 52.

[236] As René was unable to have any children, his younger brother's son, François, was made the heir to the estate at Arrancy. René's brother Aymar had predeceased him. François, incidentally, was the father of the great twentieth century religious poet, Patrice de La Tour du Pin.

[237] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 52.

[238] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 329; Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 182.

[239] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 182.

[240] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 331; Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 182.

[241] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 331-333.

[242] Ibid., 337.

refused to return to dwell in Arrancy while the village itself had not yet been reconstructed.[243] He chose exile. In this he remained in solidarity with his people. On 4 December 1924 René de La Tour du Pin died in Lausanne, Switzerland.[244]

---

[243] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 53.

[244] Bossan de Garagnol, *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin*, 341.

CHAPTER 5.

THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF LA TOUR DU PIN, PART I

A. Introduction

In this chapter and the following chapter, I will examine La Tour du Pin's social thought. His critique of the political and social institutions of nineteenth century France and his own contributions to the restoration of a Christian social order will be scrutinized. This present chapter will focus on certain general matters, the family, and role of the Church in society. Among the topics to be examined in the first section of the present chapter will be La Tour du Pin's views on the following: individualism; original sin; the nature of private property; the family wage; and the intervention of the State in the Worker Question. In the second section of this chapter, I will examine La Tour du Pin's ideas on the family. Specifically, this will include the following: the family as the basic unit of society; the indissoluble nature of marriage; the authority of the father; and lastly, family property and testamentary freedom. In the third section of this chapter, I will examine the role of the Church in society. This last section will focus on the effects of individualism on religious society, the relations between Church and State within society, and the Church's directive role in ministry, teaching, and discipline within society.

Vers un ordre social chrétien, La Tour du Pin's chief work, will hold the central place as a primary resource in this section, since La Tour du Pin himself personally

collected what he thought to be his most important articles in this work. Other articles from the journal *Association catholique*, the main vehicle of La Tour du Pin's social doctrine, will be drawn upon as well. His two important shorter works, *Aphorismes de politique social* and his definition of "Individualisme" in the *Dictionnaire apologetique de la foi catholique* will also be consulted.

In this section of the dissertation, the work of political and social theorists, especially Rousseau, Locke, and de Tocqueville, will be drawn upon to make a comparative analysis of La Tour du Pin's work. In addition, Catholic social teaching, especially papal encyclicals, will be drawn upon to assess and critique both the work of La Tour du Pin and the institutions which he was attacking.

B. General Matters

1. Individualism

Before looking at La Tour du Pin's view of the family, it is worthwhile to consider his anthropological presuppositions. He does not see man as an isolated, abstract individual, teeming with a multiplicity of rights; rather, he understands man to be social by nature, a creature who is born within a particular social context and who has duties to his fellow man.

La Tour du Pin views the ideology of individualism as the origin of much of the social dislocation found in the nineteenth century. He devotes a whole chapter to it in his *Aphorismes de politique sociale*. He defines *individualism* thus:

> Individualism is the principle of a social system in which the individual is considered as being a social unit, the primordial element of society.[1]

For the philosophical partisans of individualism it follows that the individual man is prior to the family, which itself is prior to society.[2]

For La Tour du Pin individualism is the chief bane of the modern world. Illustrating this, he maintains that individualism has given birth to various ideologies such as liberalism, anarchy,[3] socialism[4] and it has wrought great destruction within religious society, domestic society, civil society, and political society.[5] In summing up his view of individualism with great concision, he declares, "Individualism, it is the Revolution."[6] Furthermore, he states that the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* was the point of departure for the "modern error" and it is "the most pure expression of individualism."[7] As the *Declaration* regards men as isolated individuals abstracted from every group except the State, it is anti-social. Rights are enunciated, but duties and responsibilities are ignored.

He condemns individualism on account of its focus on the selfish interests of the

---

[1] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 41.

[2] Ibid., 42.

[3] Réne de La Tour du Pin, "Individualisme," in *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*, 4th ed., 716.

[4] Ibid., 718.

[5] Ibid., 716.

[6] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 143.

[7] Ibid., 378.

individual and its depreciation of one's duties to his fellow man. Mankind is interdependent claims La Tour du Pin. According to him, the first murderer was the first individualist. He states:

> Individualism is an abnormal state of mind, although more and more predominant, which is characterized by the systematic ignorance of social bonds and duties, and by the cult of 'me.'
>
> This condition is abnormal and against nature, because the nature of man is essentially social; he is only able to live in a social state. The human race is called human society, humanity. It stands together, not only in time, but in eternity….
>
> The first historic word of individualism was that of Cain: 'Am I my brother's keeper'?[8]

La Tour du Pin not only contends that men should stand together and answer for one another as brothers, but he also recognizes that living men have bonds with the dead. There is, then, a solidarity between the living and the dead.[9] In particular, he mentions this in the context of religious society or the Catholic Church. This is reminiscent of Edmund Burke's own ruminations of "society" in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Burke declares:

> Society is indeed a contract….As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.[10]

This is not just any kind of contract. It is not voluntary like a commercial contract. One is born into it, one does not choose it—it is thrust upon him. It is not at our discretion to unilaterally abrogate this contract. One is required to faithfully pass on to succeeding

---

[8] La Tour du Pin, "Individualisme," 716.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 1987), 85.

generations what one has been given by preceding generations. It is with certainty known that La Tour du Pin read the works of Burke. He may have influenced him in this matter.

Alexis de Tocqueville also saw individualism as one of the chief scourges of modern times. He claims that it is a novel thing and that it has democratic origins. Distinguishing between selfishness, which is as old as man, and individualism, Tocqueville states:

> Selfishness is a passionate and exaggerated love of self, which leads a man to connect everything with himself and to prefer himself to everything in the world. Individualism is a mature and calm feeling, which disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellows and to draw apart with his family and his friends, so that after he has thus formed a little circle of his own, he willingly leaves society at large to itself.[11]

It is interesting that Tocqueville defines individualism thus. La Tour du Pin very precisely and narrowly defines individualism as the social principle whereby the individual is considered the "social unit." Tocqueville, on the other hand, notes, with greater latitude, that the practitioner of individualism does not just draw apart to himself, but to his family and close circle of friends. He is drawing apart from the larger community which surrounds him. Nevertheless, from La Tour du Pin's point of view, he would not be completely an individualist as he maintains social ties and bonds with his family and close friends.

Tocqueville then brilliantly compares the bonds and ties of men living in aristocratic nations with those living in democratic nations. He relates:

---

[11] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 2, ch. 2, 104.

> Among aristocratic nations, as families remain for centuries in the same condition, often on the same spot, all generations become, as it were, contemporaneous. A man almost knows his forefathers and respects them; he thinks he already sees his remote descendants and he loves them. He willingly imposes duties on himself towards the former and the latter, and he will frequently sacrifice his personal gratifications to those who went before and to those who will come after him. Aristocratic institutions, moreover, have the effect of closely binding every man to several of his fellow citizens….Men living in aristocratic ages are therefore almost always closely attached to something placed out of their own sphere, and they are often disposed to forget themselves….
>
> Among democratic nations new families are constantly springing up, others are constantly falling away, and all that remain change their condition; the woof of time is every instant broken and the track of generations effaced. Those who went before are soon forgotten; of those who will come after, no one has any idea; the interest of man is confined to those in close propinquity to himself....
>
> Thus not only does democracy make every man forget his ancestors, but it hides his descendants and separates his contemporaries from him; it throws him back forever upon himself alone and threatens in the end to confine him entirely within the solitude of his own heart.[12]

Men belonging to societies within aristocratic nations then have concrete ties and bonds in many directions, both vertical and horizontal, as well as through time. Men are bound to their ancestors and to their descendants, i.e., those who have passed away[13] from the earth and those who are yet to inherit it. Again, one thinks of Burke's society as a contract. They are bound to others of their own class who dwell near them. In addition, they have ties to those above them in the social ladder as well as those below them in the social ladder. The Great Chain of Being unites them all. Thinking of others rather than themselves, they are accustomed to make sacrifices. Duty is impressed on their minds. On the other hand, men belonging to societies within democratic nations have broken all these ties. They have forgotten their ancestors and they care not about their descendants, perhaps with the exception of following generation. They have no ties with those of

---

[12] Ibid., 104-106.

[13] Again, one thinks of Burke's society as a great contract between the living, the dead, and those yet to be born.

other classes, whether above them or below them. They often have few ties with those of their own class, perhaps with some family members and a few close neighbors. Summing this all up, Tocqueville aptly declares, "Aristocracy had made a chain of all members of the community, from the peasant to the king; democracy breaks that chain and severs every link of it."[14]

This is a good summation of La Tour du Pin's thoughts on the subject as well. Both men see eye to eye on the dangers of individualism, although La Tour du Pin's definition of individualism is narrower and more precise. They both understand the numerous and strong social bonds of an aristocratic nation to be a major bulwark against the plague of individualism. La Tour du Pin's own understanding[15] of what it means to be an aristocrat parallels what Tocqueville is here relating. The individualism which arises out of a democratic society acts as a powerful solvent on all the numerous social bonds and ties, breaking them up completely. After all this destruction has been accomplished, in the dust below remains the individual man, all social ties now severed, at the mercy of the all-powerful State.

2. Original Sin

La Tour du Pin had no illusions about the deeply wounded nature of man.

---

[14] Ibid., 105.

[15] See pages 151, 154-159 of this paper which focus on the noble's duties and responsibilities as La Tour du Pin understood them.

Although he does not analyze the effects of original sin on humanity in great detail, he does accept this dogma as a starting point for his understanding of man and society. He notes that the deists of the eighteenth century denied original sin and claimed that men were born good and vitiated by society.[16] Because of their warped and optimistic anthropology, these men failed to understand the basics of governance. La Tour du Pin mentions that humanity revolted against God's law and, even though this revolt was redeemed one time by a just chastisement, it persists in humanity "by original sin."[17] Continuing on, he states that it "does not suffice to try persuading men to be just, it is necessary, if need be, to constrain[18] them thither."[19] If man was truly born good and free, then he should be moved to virtue merely by willing to do the good[20] or by reasonable persuasion. Or further, if man was born in an unfallen state, he should be able to achieve virtue after being properly educated. This view is not in accordance with either man's experience or reality.

As a particular target of his displeasure, La Tour du Pin also launches out against

---

[16] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 163.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Burke, in his commonsensical way, also indirectly acknowledges the existence of original sin when he states, "Society requires not only that the passions of individuals should be subjected, but that even in the mass and body as well as in the individuals, the inclinations of men should frequently be thwarted, their will controlled, and their passions brought into subjection." Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France,* 52.

[19] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 163.

[20] St. Paul points out the futility of this idea in his *Letter to the Romans.* He says, "For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me." Rom. 7:19-20, RSV.

the master-piece of the Revolution, the *Declaration of the Rights of Man.*[21] For it too assumes that men are born good and virtuous,[22] thereby denying the truth of original sin.[23] One might think that this is only a minor stepping stone in La Tour du Pin's social thought.[24] On the contrary, he realized that one must correctly assess man's nature if one is going to provide a program for the restoration of society, which itself is composed of men.

---

[21] In the Christian past, public misfortunes and corruption of governments were seen to arise from neglecting man's duties toward God, or if you will, neglecting the "rights of God." Here the revolutionaries state, "…considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man are the sole causes of public misfortunes and the corruption of governments,…" National Constituent Assembly, "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution,* ed. John Hall Stewart, 113.

[22] This, of course, is the contention of many of the Enlightenment thinkers who were deists. According to them, man was not corrupted by an "original fall from grace" and, therefore, not wounded in his nature by a "slavery to sin." For this reason, there is no need for a savior to save men from their sins. According to them, man is naturally good. This was most dramatically expressed by J.J. Rousseau in *On the Social Contract* in which he exculpates man's nature from any "slavery to sin" and blames society for all the evils in the world. He declares, "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains." Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Social Contract,* 141. Many of the French Revolutionaries were influenced by his thought, none more so than the Jacobins. In particular, article 6 of the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* denies original sin. It states, "Law is the expression of the general will." National Consituent Assembly, "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen," 114. As Rousseau himself claims, "…the general will is always right and always tends toward the public utility." Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 2, ch. 3, in *Basic Political Writings*, 155. The general will, therefore, based on the will of individual men, determines what is just. There is no external, objective standard, such as natural law or divine positive law, whereby the "expression of the general will" is itself judged.

[23] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 246.

[24] Idealistic social and political schemes, based on the denial of original sin, are dead ends, because they deny the truth of mans nature in this life and substitute for it fanciful products of fertile imaginations. Utter Machiavellian realism or *Realpolitik*, on the other hand, may acknowledge the fallen nature of man and his situation, but it approaches politics apart from morality so as to get the job done; according to such a point of view, the ends justify the means.

3. –Comparative Analysis

In contrast, the liberal thinker, John Locke, guardedly acknowledges an "original sin," but he denies it in the orthodox Christian sense. For him, "original sin" is merely the loss of bliss and the punishment of "death" inflicted upon Adam and his descendants for his disobedience in the Garden of Eden. Insinuating that human nature itself could not be corrupted by this sin, Locke states:

> If by death threatened to Adam, were meant the corruption of human nature in his posterity, 'tis strange that the New Testament should not any where take notice of it, and tell us, that corruption seized on all because of Adam's transgression, as well as it tells us so of death.[25]

He also claims that it is eminently unreasonable to suggest that millions of people who have never heard of Adam and never asked him to act on their behalf or as their representative[26] should be eternally punished by his transgression.[27] Here the rationalist in Locke comes out. This is no surprise. For in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* Locke stated, "Reason must be our last judge and guide in everything."[28]

On the other hand, the socialist thinker, Jean-Jacques Rousseau is very plain in his discussion of the dogma of original sin. He repudiates it. In his work, *Émile,* Rousseau firmly declares:

> Let us lay it down as an incontrovertible rule that the first impulses of nature are always right; there

---

[25] John Locke, *The Reasonableness of Christianity, and A Discourse of Miracles,* para. 5, ed. Ian T. Ramsey (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958), 27.

[26] Note here the ubiquitous contractarian element in Locke.

[27] Locke, *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, para. 1, 25.

[28] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* bk. 4, ch. 19, para. 14 (London: Thomas Tegg, 1828), 538.

> is no original sin in the human heart, the how and why of the entrance of every vice can be traced. The only natural passion is self-love or selfishness taken in a wider sense. This selfishness is good in itself and in relation to ourselves;…[29]

Rousseau claims that the natural motions of selfishness in the young child are not the result of a corrupted human nature, but rather a source of goodness. There is no struggle to be good. It happens naturally, unless one, of course, is corrupted by society. In another place, opposing Thomas Hobbes, Rousseau asserts that just because man does not have an idea of goodness, it does not follow that his nature is evil.[30] Here too he lays his cards on the table. Man's nature is inherently good. If there is any "original sin" for Rousseau, it was committed by the "true founder of civil society" when he laid claim to private property and deceived everyone else into believing his title was legitimate. According to Rousseau, crimes, wars, murders, miseries, and the like all followed from this assertion of the right to private property.[31]

In the encyclical *Humanum genus,* Leo XIII condemns the view of the naturalists, such as Locke and Rousseau, who claim that man's nature is incorrupt and inherently good. Reaffirming constant Christian teaching, the pope states that human nature is "stained by original sin, and is therefore more disposed to vice than virtue."[32] Against

---

[29] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Émile,* trans. Barbara Foxley (1911; reprint, London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1989), 56.

[30] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Discourse on the Origin of Inequality," Pt. I, in *Basic Political Writings*, trans. Donald A. Cress (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1987), 53.

[31] Ibid., Pt. II, 60.

[32] Leo XIII, "Humanum genus," no. 20, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903,* vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 95.

those naturalists who claim that justice is effortlessly achieved by an uncorrupted human nature, Leo points out that a virtuous life is only attained by an intense struggle to control one's disordered passions.[33] As we will see later, this optimistic view of human nature of the naturalists will also inform their idea of government.

4. The Nature of Private Property

Given the importance of property in the foundation of any society, it is important to examine La Tour du Pin's views on private property. Like his mentor Bishop von Ketteler, La Tour du Pin is a firm proponent of the social character of private property. At the same time, La Tour du Pin clearly defends the property right. He says, "The right of property, which is not placed in question here, is a natural, essential, and constant attribute of man."[34] He would later define property as "the fruit of social work, that is to say, of work executed in society."[35] Property, therefore, has a social function. Insofar as it has a social character, property should not just profit the owner himself, but it should also benefit society. La Tour du Pin points out that this is the Christian conception of property as laid out by the medieval doctors in opposition to the view of the ancients. The pagans of the ancient world understood the right of property as the right to enjoy a good to the exclusion of all others, rather than the right to use it in order to transmit it to

---

[33] Ibid., no. 20, 96.

[34] La Tour du Pin, *L'Association catholique*, mars 1885, 277, quoted in Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 75.

[35] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 167.

others. He notes that the modern school has returned to this pagan and inhuman notion of property.[36] The pagan notion of property was one of absolute ownership and this was now being reintroduced by the liberal school into the modern world. Distinguishing the pagan absolute ownership of property from the Christian socially responsible ownership of property, Rodger Charles comments:

> The Roman property law centred on the concept of absolute ownership,…there was an 'unrestricted right of control over a physical thing and whoever has this right could claim the thing he owns wherever it is and no matter who possesses it.'…it included not only the right of using, but also of abusing. He who was in possession of something had unlimited power over him who was not.[37]
>
> Against this tyranny of abuse by holders of private property, the Fathers were to set the concept of the socially responsible ownership of that property. Since the gift of the world was made to all men in general by its creator, all men had a right to earn a living from it. Man has a right to private property, but that property has of its nature a social mortgage on it. It has to be socially responsible.[38]

La Tour du Pin understood that the right to private property was not an instrument for selfish usage. The right existed to benefit others in society and it must be used responsibly. In particular, La Tour du Pin stressed the stewardship of private property, especially landed property which belonged to one's family. One should use the property in order to build it up and transmit it to successive generations.[39] Often enough, in the post-Napoleonic period, men sold their parceled-up landed property in order to get quick cash.

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Rodger Charles, S.J., *Christian Social Witness and Teaching: The Catholic Tradition from Genesis to Centesimus Annus*, vol. 1 (Leominster, England: Gracewing, 1998), 85.

[38] Ibid., vol. 1, 86.

[39] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 282.

La Tour du Pin does not particularly focus on the individual character of private property. It appears that he saw the ravages of liberalism and individualism as more destructive and toxic than the collectivism of the socialists. Hence, he focuses more on the liberals in this matter of property. Nevertheless, knowing his character, it is difficult to imagine him defending the "individual" character of private property. In his eyes this would be well nigh equivalent to defending individualism.

In particular, La Tour du Pin focuses on the duties of property rather than the rights of property. Highlighting the right that the poor have to the good things of the world, he specifically concentrates on property holders' duties to the poor. Yet again, this demonstrates his focus on the social character of property. He states:

> If property establishes by right whoever possesses it, it also establishes a duty toward the poor, and the latter have a certain natural right on property, in the measure where their means of existence are exclusively dependant on this property of another.[40]

In another passage he observes that these words "the rights of property" are understood in an un-Christian sense in place of "the duties of property." He underscores his point by reminding the reader of the duties of those with property to those who have none in the Parable of Dives and Lazarus.[41] La Tour du Pin's position here has much in common with Kettler and Aquinas' view on the enjoyment of the benefits of property. Men have the duty to share with those in want.

---

[40] Robert Talmy, *Aux sources du catholicisme social: L'École de La Tour du Pin* (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Cie, 1963), 122.

[41] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 63.

Although Leo XIII stressed the individual character of property rather than its social character, he did not deny its social character. Rather, he focused on the individual character mainly because that was heavily under attack by the socialists of the time. The socialists wished to make individual possessions the common property of all.[42] When discussing the two-fold character of property, Pope Pius XI defends his predecessor from these false charges by saying:

> First, then, let it be considered as certain and established that neither Leo nor those theologians who have taught under the guidance and authority of the Church have ever denied or questioned the twofold character of ownership, called usually individual or social according as it regards either separate persons or the common good.[43]

Pius XI then proceeds to underscore the necessity of safeguarding both the individual and social characters of property. He states:

> Accordingly, twin rocks of shipwreck must be carefully avoided. For, as one is wrecked upon, or comes close to, what is known as "individualism" by denying or minimizing the social and public character of the right of property, so by rejecting or minimizing the private and individual character of this same right, one inevitably runs into "collectivism" or at least closely approaches its tenets.[44]

The liberals are attacking the social character of property, because they do not view the ownership of private property as attended by duties to others in society. On the other hand, the socialists are attacking the individual character of private property, because they envy the rich and they claim that possessions should be the common property of all

---

[42] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 4, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 242.

[43] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 45, 422.

[44] Ibid., no. 46, 422.

administered by the State.[45] The pope navigates well between the Scylla of individualism and the Charybdis of socialism, finding a happy mean between the two extremes.

5. The Family Wage

Next it is important to examine La Tour du Pin's position on the workingmen's wage. As this wage will be used to support the worker and his family, it is necessary that it be adequate for him to provide necessities for both himself and his family and allow them to live with dignity. In the view of La Tour du Pin, a "just wage" for a worker was a "family wage," that is, it provided the worker with enough means to reasonably support a family. He claims that this is a matter of justice not charity. As we will see later, he also attempted to provide the worker with various forms of property, many of them collective.

In 1883 the *Conseil d'Études* published a collection of texts, entitled *Questions sociales et ouvrières, régime du travail.* Among the matters discussed was the just wage.[46] Tenants of economic liberalism held that work is merchandise and that the work contract is a sales contract. According to them, wages should be determined by the law of supply and demand. On account the of the "iron law of wages" this would often approach the natural salary. Catholic economic liberals, opposed to the "iron law," proposed a "general wage," their idea of a "just wage." The general wage conformed to

---

[45] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 4, 242.

[46] Talmy, *Réne de La Tour du Pin,* 17.

what was paid by all the employers in a certain region. Even if this wage was insufficient to live on, this conformed to justice. According to the Catholic liberals, anything given beyond this to the worker was a matter of charity on the part of the employer.[47]

La Tour du Pin felt that this liberal approach misunderstood the personal character of the work. The work was inseparable from the worker. Consequently, the object of the contract was not merely the work, but the worker with the work. The sales contract was not just a sales contract, but an "exchange of services." The wage was remuneration to the worker for the renunciation of the fruits of his work.[48] According to "good justice," La Tour du Pin claims that the worker is entitled to a wage whereby he is able to meet all of the necessities of an honest life. This would include the possession of a home, the means to raise his family according to his condition, and the possibility of savings for the time when he can no longer work.[49] At the same time, in "strict justice," La Tour du Pin states that the conditions of the workshop in which the worker carries out his labor must be healthful, disciplined, and moral. By "strict justice," La Tour du Pin means that these matters should be "procured directly by legal coercion," if necessary. By "good justice" he is referring to matters that ought to be procured "indirectly by the assistance of customs, of institutions, and of laws." Nevertheless, he does add that both types of

---

[47] Ibid., 17-18.

[48] Ibid., 18.

[49] Ibid., 69. See: Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers, Conseil d'Études, *Questions sociales et ouvrières: Régime du travail,* vol. 1 (Paris : V. Lecoffre, 1883), 215.

"justice" ought to be the "fruit of love of neighbor." [50]

In the written minutes of the 27 May 1892 meeting of the OCCO, La Tour du Pin states:

> We persist in our conclusions and we say that the wage rate be raised to a point sufficient to support the family of the worker is a question of *justice and not of charity*.[51]

The just wage rate, then, is not what it takes to support the worker himself, but his whole family. Consequently, it is a "family wage." It is important to note that this is owed to the worker. In La Tour du Pin's view it is a matter of commutative justice. It is a matter of fair exchange.

In *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII takes up the issue of the just wage. Prior to discussing this, he comments on the freedom of contract.

> Wages, as we are told, are regulated by free consent, and therefore the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part and seemingly is not called upon to do anything beyond. The only way, it is said, in which injustice might occur would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or if the workman should not complete the work undertaken; in such cases the public authority should intervene, to see that each obtains his due, but not under any other circumstances.
>
> To this kind of argument a fair-minded man will not easily or entirely assent; it is not complete, for there are important considerations which it leaves out of account altogether. To labor is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the various purposes of life, and chief of all for self preservation. "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread."[52]

The pope is frankly pointing out that a worker who agrees to work for a wage less than it takes to support him in the necessities of life is not free. He is in a position of weakness

---

[50] Talmy, *Réne de La Tour du Pin*, 69. See: Conseil d'Études (OCCO), *Questions sociales et ouvrières*, 215.

[51] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 200. See: Procès-verbaux du Comité de l'Oeuvre des Cercles, 27 mai 1892. The *Procès-verbaux* refers to the recorded minutes of the weekly meetings of the OCCO. See: Talmy, *Aux sources*, 7. The highlighting of the text is by Talmy.

[52] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," nos. 43-44, 252.

vis-à-vis the employer. He will take on that job because it will provide him with immediate needs in the short term. If he does not take the job, someone else will take it. The exchange between employer and employee is manifestly unjust. In commutative justice, the exchange has to be equal. In such an exchange the worker is not getting the equivalent of what he is giving to the employer.

The pope declares what type of wage the worker should expect in strict justice. He states:

> Let the working man and the employer make free agreements, and in particular let them agree freely as to the wages; nevertheless, there underlies 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.
>
> If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him comfortably to support himself, his wife, and his children, he will find it easy, if he be a sensible man, to practice thrift, and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by some little savings and thus secure a modest source of income.[53]

At first he does not appear to be supporting a family wage. He asserts that the worker must merely be paid a just wage to support himself alone. Nevertheless, in the second paragraph, he makes mention to a wage that supports a wife and children. This would be a "family wage." Nevertheless, neither here nor in any other place, does Leo XIII mandate a "family wage." As we will see, Pius XI is much more direct in his call for a "family wage."

As mentioned, Pius XI is very forthright in his understanding of the just wage. The just wage is the family wage. He firmly declares, "In the first place, the worker must

---

[53] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," nos. 45 and 46, 253.

be paid a wage sufficient to support him and his family."[54] He then mentions that it is right and fitting that, in certain types of work, the whole family contributes to the support of the same. Examples of this might be farming or the work of craftsmen. Nevertheless, it is not right that the early years of childhood be abused by work or that mothers abandon their family duties to work outside the home.[55] The pope states:

> It is an intolerable abuse, and to be abolished at all cost, for mothers on account of the father's low wage to be forced to engage in gainful occupations outside the home to the neglect of their proper cares and duties, especially the training of children. Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage large enough to meet ordinary family needs adequately. But if this cannot always be done under existing circumstances, social justice demands that changes be introduced as soon as possible whereby such a wage will be assured to every adult workingman.[56]

Pope Pius is clearly stated that institutional changes in society are required if present day circumstances prevent a worker from being paid a family wage. It is above all a matter of justice not of charity. He goes on to declare that those who are responsible for this unjust state of affairs are guilty of a grave wrong for the workers are forced to accept a wage that is less than just.[57] This gives the lie to the freedom of contract—it is not free, it is constrained.

La Tour du Pin is clearly far ahead of his time in his view on the "family wage." This is not to say that he was the only socially-concerned Catholic who was promoting the justice of the "family wage." Nevertheless, the family wage was not accepted by the

---

[54] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 71, 426.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid., no. 72, 426-427.

Church in a manifestly clear way in his own time. By the time of Pius XI, however, the pope himself clearly maintains that in strict justice, a worker must be paid a "family wage." La Tour du Pin, displaying great prescience, had formulated his ideas on the family wage in 1883,[58] eight years before *Rerum novarum* and forty-eight years before *Quadragesimo anno.*

6. The Intervention of the State in the Worker Question

La Tour du Pin agrees that the State has a role to play in social legislation. As mentioned earlier, the *Conseil d'Études,* of which La Tour du Pin was the president, clearly recognized the legitimacy of state intervention into the social and economic domains in 1883.[59] He had come to understand that charity was insufficient to solve the social problems of the day, in particular, the Worker Question. La Tour du Pin recounts the three attributions of social power, viz. the legislative power, the administrative power, and the judicial power. He points out that the Christian reformer should focus on the first of these attributions over the second.[60] He states, "Legislation protects in effect social organisms without substituting itself for them as administration would do it."[61] In the latter case, the beginnings of bureaucratic centralization would be found. Insofar as the

---

[58] Talmy, *Réne de La Tour du Pin,* 17-19, 68-69.

[59] Ibid., 26.

[60] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 144-145.

[61] Ibid., 145.

State is involved in promoting justice, he calls it legal justice. He points out that this is not commutative justice because it involves invoking the social power. Rather it is called "social justice."[62]

In discussing social justice, he claims that it is a new word and it is now being bandied about. Depending upon the school to which one belongs "social justice" can have three different meanings.[63] He declares:

> Social justice, it is the conformity of social relations to an ideal order resting on the conscience of those who employ the word. This changes thus the sense according to the schools:
>
> For Christians, it is the conformity to a providential plan whereof they explore the paths in evangelical morals and the teachings of the Church;
>
> For the economists called "orthodox," social justice consists in the most complete liberty for each individual in the employment of his activity in the struggle for life;
>
> For the socialists, social justice is only able to be conceived in the realization of an innate equality of social conditions: to each according to his merits, say the one; to each according to his needs, prefer the others,--provided that there are not inequalities of another source.[64]

As the principle of all legislation is justice, La Tour du Pin claims that the "principle of social legislation is social justice." In describing the purpose of social legislation, La Tour du Pin says it has "above all a character of protection for the industrial worker."[65] Among other things, he claims that social legislation forbids abuses such as an excessively long work day or Sunday work. Social legislation might moderate

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 25.

[64] Ibid., 25-26.

[65] Ibid., 30.

or outright forbid the employment of women and children in certain types of work; this may also apply to workers on account of certain conditions of health or age. Social legislation provides workers with recourse to indemnities in the case of an accident. It can also be used to secure assistance and relief in the case of sickness, old age, or unemployment.[66] In concluding his discussion of social legislation, he states, "It tends, in a word, to generalize and even render obligatory succoring institutions which until now had only been assumed to have an optional and charitable character."

While Leo XIII was very wary of socialism[67] and objected to the State meddling in matters that were not its proper domain, he did advocate State intervention in the matter of the Worker Question. In his encyclical *Rerum novarum*, the pope states:

> Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with harm, which can in no other way be met or prevented, the public authority must step in to deal with it.
>
> …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, nor proceed further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the mischief.
>
> …The richer class have many ways of shielding themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; whereas the mass of the poor have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly depend upon the assistance of the State.[68]

The pope argues that the State does have a right to intervene when the common good or the good of any particular class suffers. In this case, it is the working class that particularly suffers. Insofar as it is weaker, it needs the special support of the State.

---

[66] Ibid.

[67] See: Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," nos. 4-6.

[68] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," nos. 36-37, 250-251.

Nevertheless, adumbrating the principle of the subsidiary function, Leo XIII points out that the State should only intervene as much as is necessary to correct the problem.

Later in the document the pope proceeds to mention the areas in which the State should intervene to look after the worker's interest. The State should settle strikes,[69] limit the duration of working hours,[70] ensure safe and moral working conditions,[71] regulate labor by women and children,[72] provide Sunday and Holy Day rest,[73] ensure a just wage that can support a family,[74] favor the ownership of private property for as many citizens as possible,[75] and encourage worker associations, such as trade unions. Although La Tour du Pin was not the only Christian social reformer promoting the intervention of the State in these areas, there is a clear correlation between both his own views and the pope's teaching on the importance of State intervention in the Worker Question.

---

[69] Ibid., no. 36, 250.

[70] Ibid., no. 42, 252.

[71] Ibid., no. 36, 250.

[72] Ibid., no. 42, 252.

[73] Ibid., no. 41, 251-252.

[74] Ibid., nos. 43-46, 252-253.

[75] Ibid., nos. 46-47, 253.

C. The Family

1. The Basic Unit of Society

Since La Tour du Pin upholds the family as the basic societal unit, it is fitting to examine his views on the family before investigating other aspects of his sociological thought. In this section I will appraise La Tour du Pin's view of the family as the basic unit of society. I will, then, in turn, consider his views on the indissoluble nature of marriage, on the authority of the father, and lastly, on family property and testamentary freedom. La Tour du Pin defines the family as "the cell of the social organism in the order of preservation,…[76]

2. –Comparative Analysis

This is in strong contrast with John Locke's understanding of the family as an artificial society. Locke's claim that God saw that "it was not good for him [man] to be alone" hints of an original individualism of man who was driven by God into the first society, the family, under "strong obligations of necessity, convenience, and inclination."[77] But how can one possibly imagine men being driven into the society of the family? Families pre-exist the individuals who are born into them. Men cannot choose into which family they will be born.

---

[76] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 89.

[77] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, para. 77, 42.

On the other hand, that other notable contractarian thinker, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, did admit that the family was a "natural society," albeit a temporary one, which is dissolved after the needs of the children have been met by their father.[78] He notes that if the family stays united after the children have reached adulthood, it is merely by convention. At this point, the family ceases to be natural, but becomes voluntary.[79]

In stark contrast to the atomized view of society in which the individual is the basic social unit, La Tour du Pin maintains the traditional view,[80] that is, that the family is the fundamental unit of society. He states that "…the social unit is the family."[81] Society is composed of families as its elements.

Here La Tour du Pin is in perfect agreement with the Church's teaching on the subject. A number of Church documents assert the centrality of the family as the nucleus of social life. A few examples follow. In the document *Apostolicam Actuositatem,* the fathers of the Second Vatican Council teach, "The mission of being the primary vital cell of society has been given to the family by God himself."[82] Next, no. 2207 of the

---

[78] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 1, ch. 2, in *Basic Political Writings*, 142.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Aristotle, the greatest of the classical political theorists, also regards the family as the primordial natural social unit. In the *Politics*, Aristotle states, "The first form of association naturally instituted for the satisfaction of daily recurrent needs is thus the family." Aristotle, *Politics*, bk. 1, ch. 2, trans. Ernest Barker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 1252b12-13, 9.

[81] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 42.

[82] Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, "Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People, *Apostolicam Actuositatem,*" no. 11, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, vol. 1, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984), 779. See also: John Paul II, *The Role of*

Catechism of the Catholic Church declares, "The family is the original cell of social life."[83] Furthermore, the *Compendium for the Social Doctrine of the Church* states, "Enlightened by the radiance of the biblical message, the Church considers the family as the first natural society, with underived rights that are proper to it, and places it at the center of social life."[84] Finally, the *Compendium* also maintains, "The priority of the family over society and over the State must be affirmed….The family, then, does not exist for society or the State, society and the State exist for the family."[85]

According to La Tour du Pin the family is also subject to three main noxious influences that undermine it. They are the following: the denial of the indissolubility of marriage, which leads to divorce and free union, rendering the family chaotic;[86] the forced partitioning of family patrimony in the spirit of equality in each generation, which leads to the squandering of the family inheritance; the system whereupon reaching his majority,[87] a son is on an equal footing with his father in the same house, thereby

---

the Christian Family in the Modern World, Familiaris Consortio, no. 42 (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1981), 67

[83] *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* no. 2207, (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co, 1994), 533.

[84] Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church,* no. 211, (Washington, DC: USCCB Publishing, 2004), 95-96.

[85] Ibid., no. 214, 97.

[86] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 381.

[87] Ibid.

destroying elemental social authorities.[88] Each of these will be examined in turn.

3. The Indissoluble Nature of Marriage

Not surprisingly, La Tour du Pin affirms that the family originates in the marriage contract between man and woman;[89] he points out that this bond is indissoluble in a well-ordered society.[90] The family must be considered an integral whole. He charges the regnant individualism of his time as the chief dissolving agent on familial social ties. He further states that the path to divorce and free union had been suggested by a widespread indulgent literature.[91] His point of view was consonant with the traditional Christian doctrine on marriage as it was understood before it fell under the heady blows of both Protestantism[92] and the secularism of the Enlightenment and Revolution.

The swansong of the Revolutionary Legislative Assembly was its "Decree Regulating Divorce." On 20 September 1792 the "privilege" of divorce was legalized.[93] As a logical outcome of individual liberty, laid out in the *Declaration of the Rights of*

---

[88] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 89.

[89] As the idea of homosexual marriage was not publicly broached during his lifetime, this would not have been an issue for him as it is for societies today.

[90] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 89.

[91] La Tour du Pin, "Individualisme," 717.

[92] See: Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 654-656.

[93] Divorce was also incorporated into the Civil Code by Napoleon in 1804. After the restoration of the Bourbons, divorce was abolished in 1816. Nevertheless, it would be reinstated later in the century, in 1884, under the virulently secularist Third Republic.

Man and Citizen, marriage could not be considered permanent for it would doom spouses to "indissoluble engagements."[94] On account of the "Decree," divorce was not difficult to obtain and was it was considered quite progressive by modern standards. It could be obtained by mutual consent of the two parties, an allegation of incompatibility by one of the parties, and certain determined grounds such as insanity, cruelty, adultery, desertion, and the like.[95] On account of the disintegrating influences of individualism as well as the centrifugal forces of liberalism, the social bonds within the family were broken down, both between spouses, between parents and children, and between brothers and sisters. Divorced parties could remarry other divorced parties, thereby leading to all kinds of confusion in the family setting and its destruction thereof. Technically, girls and boys under the age of seven are to be entrusted to the mother. Boys above the age of seven are to be entrusted to the father.[96] In the end, then, these various social groups, some consecrated by nature, others hallowed by custom and tradition, were sacrificed at the Revolutionary altar of liberty and individualism. La Tour du Pin, like his master Bonald, was a firm opponent both of liberalism and of individualism, as well as their corrosive offspring, "divorce." Both men marked themselves as defenders of the indissolubility of marriage.

---

[94] "Decree Regulating Divorce," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, ed. John Hall Stewart, 333-334.

[95] Ibid., 333-337.

[96] Ibid., 338-340.

4. –Comparative Analysis

John Locke, the "father of liberalism," defends the right to divorce in certain circumstances. In the context of clarifying that the husband's powers are limited, Locke states "that the wife has in many cases a liberty to separate from him, where natural right, or their contract allows it."[97] The children are allotted to the mother or father, pursuant to the contract.[98] With his focus on freedom and individual rights it is logical that Locke would support divorce in some capacity.

On the other hand, Rousseau, the collectivist, albeit with some individualist strains, makes no overt case for divorce. One might think that the great enemy of intermediary bodies would have strong words for the family as a "partial society," and smile encouragingly or, even eagerly, on divorce. That is not the case. While he does not discuss the relation between man and wife in *The Social Contract*, he does discuss the relationship between the father and his children. Rousseau argues that the natural bond of the family which exists while the children are in need of the father's care is altered into a voluntary or conventional bond after the children rise to maturity. The children no longer need obey the father, the father needs no longer care for the children—they are now completely independent of one another. He appears to be saying that a continuing union among "family members" is accidental. Although not calling for outright divorce between spouses, Rousseau does seem to think that the natural bond of the family, at least

---

[97] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, para. 82, 44.

[98] Ibid.

the relationship between father and children, will naturally fade away as the children mature. Perhaps, that is why he does not fear the family as a "partial society" in the same way he fears other intermediary bodies. For him, the maturation process itself is a solvent on the family bond.

The Catholic Church, in season and out of season, has been known for its vigorous defense of the indissolubility of marriage and its forceful denunciation of divorce in any form. A few examples from Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI in their respective encyclicals regarding marriage will press home the point. Reinforcing his own teaching with the authority of Christ and the Apostles, Leo XIII gravely points out that there are no exceptions to the unity and indissolubility of marriage. He states:

> In like manner from the teaching of the Apostles we learn that the unity of marriage and its perpetual indissolubility, the indispensable conditions of its very origin, must, according to the command of Christ, be holy and inviolable without exception.[99]

Pius XI goes so far as to say that even natural marriages, prior to Christian times and sacramental marriages, were meant to be indissoluble. Neither the State nor any civil law has the power to dissolve it. It is beyond the competence of the State. The pontiff remarks:

> Wherefore, Our predecessor Pius VI of happy memory, writing to the Bishop of Agria, most wisely said: "Hence it is clear that marriage even in the state of nature, and certainly long before it was raised to the dignity of a sacrament, was divinely instituted in such a way that it should carry with it a perpetual and indissoluble bond which cannot therefore be dissolved by any civil law. Therefore, although the sacramental element may be absent from a marriage as is the case among unbelievers, still in such a marriage, inasmuch as it is a true marriage there must remain and indeed there does remain that perpetual bond which by divine right is so bound up with matrimony from its first

---

[99] Leo XIII, "Arcanum," no. 9, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 31.

> institution that it is not subject to any civil power.[100]

Pope Pius also lists a number of benefits which accrue to society on account of the indissolubility of marriage. Among these advantages of indissolubility are the following: 1) There is a guarantee of marriage stability for both spouses; 2) it is a shield to defend chastity and fight temptations to infidelity; 3) the dignity of the spouses is secured and mutual aid is assured; 4) the difficult training and education of children is shared by both spouses; 5) and a virtuous life and wholesome habits are encouraged. These benefits redound not just to the "private good" of the family, but also to the "public good" of larger society.[101] This all bespeaks the well-ordered society which La Tour du Pin claimed was the result of indissolubility. Whereas La Tour du Pin keeps his defense of indissolubility short and simple, Pius IX provides multiple reasons to buttress the indissolubility of marriage.

5. Social Hierarchy within the Family: The Authority of the Father

In nineteenth century France, the social authority of the father of the family was on the wane. As mentioned earlier, State legislation in the post-Revolutionary settlement, had weakened the social authority of the father. On account of this, La Tour du Pin felt that it was important to focus on strengthening the social authority of the father once again.

---

[100] Pius XI, "Casti Connubii," no. 34, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 3, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 396.

[101] Ibid., no. 37, 397.

While affirming strong social hierarchies throughout his work, La Tour du Pin states that the government of the family should be under the father as head; his authority is indivisible, yet limited. According to him there is no real separation of powers[102] in the father's authority; at the same time, however, the father's power is not absolute, but circumscribed. The father is to respect the mother's role as counselor[103] and should undertake nothing without her counsel. The children, however, are the subjects, no matter how old they may be, as long as they dwell at the family home.[104]

La Tour du Pin is at special pains to show his disgust with the post-Revolutionary egalitarian settlement in France where a son who has reached his majority[105] is on equal footing with his father. He calls such a state of affairs "absurd and "antisocial," the latter, because it is opposed to natural and revealed law, the former, because the "emancipated

---

[102] Although the legislative, executive, and judicial powers may be distinguished from one another, they are not separated. Regarding the prince or monarch, La Tour du Pin also holds that these three powers are indivisible, but limited.

[103] In a later section of the paper, La Tour du Pin's discussion of the prince or the public power will be addressed. He understands the prince or the public power to include the monarch himself and his councils. While it is the role of the public power to exercise control, it is the role of the people to consent or obey. La Tour du Pin's view of government is very patriarchal. One can see an interesting parallel here in the family. The father resembles the monarch and his wife is likened to his council; in fact, she is his counselor. Together they form the "public power" within the family and they unitedly exercise control over the children. The children, like the people, are to consent or obey. Although La Tour du Pin's understanding of the family is patriarchal and the father clearly exercises a greater degree of authority than the mother, there is a clear role for the mother to share in the parental authority. In fact, the father should listen to the counsel of the mother.

[104] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 89.

[105] The son's majority is reached at 21 years of age.

son" does not have the same cares and responsibilities as the father.[106] One can clearly see here the influence of Bonald on La Tour du Pin. As responsibilities justify the exercising of authority, why should a 21 year old son, who is just emerging out of adolescence, be treated on an equal level with his father? In La Tour du Pin's view, this settlement contributes greatly to the destruction of elemental social authorities.

According to natural law and revealed law, a son owes deference to his father because he has received his being/life from him and he should also have received, at the very least, a moral and spiritual education from him; therefore, he is dependent on him and is in the relation to his father as a permanent beneficiary to a permanent benefactor. Even when he has become a self-sufficing adult, he is still in a position of "obligation" to his father and mother. In the revealed law, the commandment states, "Honor thy father and thy mother." How does one truly give lasting honor to someone who is considered on the same social plane as oneself? According to La Tour du Pin, this new egalitarian settlement in France wreaks havoc on the natural hierarchy within the family and despoils the father of his rightful authority. As a matter of fact, it is commonly accepted today that children dwelling under the same roof as their father/parents are to be subject to them while they are dwelling in the father's home.

6. –Comparative Analysis

John Locke, on the other hand, introduces a more limited notion of paternal

---

[106] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 89.

authority. He claims that notions of strong paternal authority are mistaken, for they attribute all authority to the father and ignore the mother as if she had no such share in it. Locke strengthens his claim with quotations from Exodus 20:12 and Ephesians 6:1, which respectively state, "Honor thy father and thy mother" and "Children obey your parents."[107] According to Locke, then, it is misguided then to speak of paternal authority, rather one should refer to parental authority; this rightly gives credit to the authority of the mother and does not place the sole emphasis on the authority of the father.[108] Nevertheless, as already mentioned, the patriarchal view never claimed that the mother had no authority; it claimed that both father and mother had authority together, but that the authority was weighted[109] more in favor of the father. Locke, then, appears to move in a more egalitarian direction.

In the bonds between parents and children, Locke certainly advances a more egalitarian relationship than that previously maintained. He points out that parents do have a rule and jurisdiction over their children for some time, but this is merely temporary; in due time, "age and reason" loosen children from this parental rule.[110] According to Locke, this parental rule is justified only while the parents are the guardians

---

[107] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, para. 52, 30.

[108] Ibid., para. 53, 31.

[109] Recalling the patriarchs in the Old Testament, it was always the father who imparted the family blessing to his son, not the mother. See: Gen. 9:26-27; Gen. 27:27-29; Gen. 49:2-28.

[110] Ibid., para. 55, 31.

of their children, responsible for their nourishment and education.[111] Nevertheless, while Locke does admit that parents are entitled to "honor and support" by their children, they no longer have the power of commanding them.[112]

In the case of testamentary freedom, Locke acknowledges that a father often continues to maintain a hold on his childrens' obedience even after their minority. This he says is not in virtue of the inherent rights of fatherhood, but rather by the reward or inheritance which fathers hold in their hands and dispose of accordingly.[113] There may be compliance with paternal wishes, but this is obedience *per accidens*, not *per se*. Consequently, it is in virtue of the father's control over the inheritance that he is able to exact obedience from his grown children.

Concerning his view of paternal authority, Jean-Jacques Rousseau moves yet further down the path of egalitarianism. Like Locke he agrees that a father is the master of the child while the latter is in a position of dependence. At a point when the son no longer requires the help of his father, the son becomes independent of the father and "equal" to him. Following the "emancipation" of the son, the son no longer has to obey his father; he "owes him merely respect."[114] He points out that while the son owes

---

[111] Ibid., para. 65, 36.

[112] Ibid., para. 68 and 69, 38.

[113] Ibid., para. 72 and 73, 39-40.

[114] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Discourse on the Origin of Inequality," Part II, in *The Basic Political Writings*, trans. Donald A. Cress (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987), 73.

respect to his father as a duty, the father cannot demand respect from his son as a right owed to him.[115] As mentioned, Rousseau goes further than Locke in that he states that the son, after reaching adulthood, is equal to his father. Rousseau also denies that the father has the right to expect respect from his son. He does not seem to recognize that rights and duties are mutually interdependent, i.e., that rights imply duties and that duties imply rights. This conferment of equal status on the son with the father is the state of affairs which La Tour du Pin calls "absurd and "antisocial." For the son does not have the same all-consuming cares and important responsibilities as the father of a family. In addition, he owes him his being.

In order to better understand the nature of the American family, Tocqueville discusses what distinguishes the family in an aristocratic society from a family in a democratic society. In an aristocratic society, the father is much more than just the father. Tocqueville relates:

> In aristocracies, then, the father is not only the civil head of the family, but the organ of its traditions, the expounder of its customs, the arbiter of its manners. He is listened to with deference, he is addressed with respect, and the love that is felt for him is always tempered with fear.[116]

In such a society, men are also much more attuned to the remembrance of the past. The thoughts of one's ancestors are much more important than one's own thoughts. Being linked through time with his forbearers, their traditions and thoughts deeply influence and

---

[115] Ibid.

[116] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 3, ch. 8, 204.

shape him.[117] The organ which transmits these traditions, thoughts, and sentiments is the father of the family. As society becomes more democratic or in the case of a more democratic society, not only does the father's legal power over his son diminish, but his opinions also affect his sons less and less. His sons do not approach him with ceremony, but with confidence. There is no stilted and cold conversation. Rather, they speak to him frequently, familiarly, and with affection.[118] Tocqueville states, "The master and the constituted ruler have vanished; the father remains."[119] Even the children within an aristocratic society are not equal. The age and sex of each determines one's rank and privileges. The eldest son, by right of primogeniture, will inherit most of the estate and privileges and he will become the head of his brothers. In democratic societies, these distinctions are abridged or abolished outright.[120] In conclusion, Tocqueville, although an aristocrat, displays an admiration for the family in the democratic society. He relates:

> I do not know, on the whole, whether society loses by the change, but I am inclined to believe that man individually is a gainer by it. I think that in proportion as manners and laws become more democratic, the relation of father and son becomes more intimate and affectionate; rules and authority are less talked of, confidence and tenderness are often increased, and it would seem that the natural bond is drawn closer in proportion as the social bond is loosened.[121]

By way of contrast, La Tour du Pin, also an aristocrat, is greatly displeased with advent of the democratic family and the growing inclination in French society to it. As a

---

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid., 205-206.

[119] Ibid., 206.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid., 205.

sociologist concerned with the ravages of individualism, La Tour du Pin is primarily concerned with maintaining strong social ties. This is a huge part of his life's work. Tocqueville himself freely admits that the democratic family has loosened social ties, while at the same time, strengthened the familial bond. Furthermore, La Tour du Pin has no inclinations to liberalism as did Tocqueville. It is no surprise that La Tour du Pin would be firmly opposed to anything which contributes to the breaking up of social ties. He is a traditional aristocrat at heart. As can be seen in the account of his earlier life, respect, ceremony, and tradition are much more important to him than familiarity, tenderness, and affection.

In *Gaudium et Spes*, the Second Vatican Council fathers declare, "With sentiments of gratitude, affection and trust, they [children] will repay their parents for the benefits given them…."[122] This too contends that children and parents are on an unequal footing. The children have received something from parents that they are incapable of reciprocating.

Nevertheless, this phraseology in this document is certainly not as forceful and as clear as the words of John Paul II in his *Letter to Families.* The pope states:

> "Honor your father and your mother", because for you they are in a certain sense representatives of the Lord; they are the ones who gave you life, who introduced you to human existence in a particular family line, nation and culture. After God, they are your first benefactors. While God alone is good, indeed the Good itself, parents participate in this supreme goodness in a unique way.

---

[122] Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, "Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes,"* no. 48, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents,* vol. 1, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984), 951.

> And so, honor your parents! *There is a certain analogy* here *with the worship owed to God.*[123]

According to the pope, the parents stand in the place of the Lord—the parents are the visible representatives of the Lord to the children. This is hardly a footing of equality between parents and children. Because parents are truly the chief benefactors of children after God, the Holy Father claims that there is a parallel between the worship owed to God and the filial piety which children owe their parents. The teaching of La Tour du Pin, where the son is not on an equal footing with the father is certainly in accord with the teaching of the Catholic Church.

Although it is not based on the authority of an encyclical, it is interesting to consider the teaching of Pius XII on the relations between parents and children. In one of his many *Addresses to Families,* Pius relates:

> Instinct gives even irrational animals tenderness for their young. How, then, could it be useful to inculcate it in you, young married couples and future Christian parents? It may happen, however, that too much severity, lack of understanding, may raise a sort of barrier between the hearts of children and those of their parents. St. Paul said: "To the weak I became weak…; I became all things to all men, that I might save all." It is a great quality to be able to became small with the small, a child with children, without compromising, by so doing, paternal or maternal authority.[124]

From this passage it appears that Pius XII has much more sympathy with Tocqueville's "democratic" family than with the "aristocratic" family. Standing on ceremony and maintaining a respectful distance with one's children is very likely to create barriers between parents and children. The pope would be much inclined to see the relations

---

[123] John Paul II, *Letter to Families from Pope John Paul II*, no.15 (Boston, MA: St. Paul Books and Media, 1994), 49. The italicized emphasis is that of the pope.

[124] Pius XII, *Address to Married Couples*, July 14, 1940, quoted in Michael Chinigo, ed. and trans., *The Pope Speaks: The Teachings of Pope Pius XII* (New York: Pantheon, 1957), 72-73.

between parents and children become more tender, affectionate, and familiar as long as parental authority is maintained. This would create stronger familial bonds. La Tour du Pin, being an aristocrat, might find it difficult to accept this relationship between father and children. It is safe to conclude that although the popes clearly teach that children are by no means on an equal footing with their parents, strong bonds are formed between parents and children when parents and children relate to each other familiarly, tenderly, and affectionately.

Although both the council fathers and John Paul II speak of both parents together in their respective documents, Pope Pius XI, in *Casti Connubii*, declares that the primacy or headship of the father is in relation to both the wife and the children.[125] In this document, the pope maintains a delicate balance with regard to the relations between the husband and the wife. He does buttress the precept of St. Paul in his *Letter to the Ephesians*,[126] by commanding the "ready subjection of the wife and her willing obedience" to the husband.[127] The husband "occupies the chief place in ruling."[128] Nevertheless, at the same time, he upholds the liberty of the wife, on account of her dignity as a person, and her "most noble office of wife, mother, and companion."[129] The

---

[125] Pius XI, "Casti Connubii," no. 26, 395.

[126] Ephesians 5:22-23, RSV.

[127] Pius XI, "Casti Connubii," no. 26, 395.

[128] Ibid., no. 27, 395.

[129] Ibid.

wife is not on the same level[130] as a minor. In fact, she does not have to obey all of her husband's requests if they are not "in harmony with right reason or with the dignity due to wife."[131] Rather, the pope clarifies that the "exaggerated liberty" which cares not for the good of the family and causes the separation of the heart (wife) of the family from the head (husband) is to be avoided. For this will bring about the ruin of the family altogether.[132] Although La Tour du Pin does not discuss whether a wife is allowed to disobey her husband in certain matters, his views on the relations between man and wife appear to be compatible with those of the Catholic Church.

7. Family Property and Testamentary Freedom

As Frederic Le Play had earlier noted, the "forced division of property in every generation" was creating family instability, especially in rural areas. In his article "Le Bien de famille" La Tour du Pin develops his notion of the transmission of family property in opposition to the prevailing egalitarian transmission of property mandated by the Civil Code in France. He is also a very firm proponent of testamentary freedom. In

---

[130] In pre-Christian civilizations as well as certain non-Christian civilizations today, women were and still are treated as minors or as a form of property. Christianity played a very important role in elevating the dignity of women. Some of these cultures, like Islam, have allowed men to enter into polygamous marriages as well, whereas Christianity has inculcated monogamous marriages. For an interesting discussion of these matters, see: Balmes, Jaime, *European Civilization: Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in Their Effects on the Civilization of Europe* (Baltimore: John Murphy & Co, 1850), 135-140.

[131] Pius XI, "Casti Connubii," no. 27, 395.

[132] Ibid.

the latter case, he acknowledges the previous spadework done by Frederic Le Play.[133] Given La Tour du Pin's support of the father's authority in the previous section, it follows that the father should be the decisive voice in matters concerning inheritance within the family. Furthermore, the testamentary freedom of the father should not be circumscribed by the State as he is in a better position to know how to dispose of his estate than is the State.

The notion that the juridical state of property relates only to the individual or the State, a plain symptom of individualism, is among the grave problems following from the Revolution. Corporative property or mortmain property is troublesome for socialists who see nothing between the individual and the State. The idea that family bonds could be perpetuated by a property was considered a dangerous idea. The refusal by the State to admit that the "family" can possess property had led to a mobility of residence, the parceling up of small properties, the abandonment of the countryside, and the halt of birthrates.[134]

A possible solution to this unsettling problem was the concept of *biens de famille* or family property. There were many reformers, like Le Play, who wished to preserve rural homes and convert them into a family property. In defining family property, La Tour du Pin relates:

> It is a good whose successive possessors are inducted by entailment in the same line of descent,

---

[133] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 282.

[134] Ibid.

> according to fixed rules. This is by consequence neither a collective property, since it is always in the hands of a unique possessor, nor a mortmain property, since this possessor is living and dying.[135]

He then points out that both Germany and England, the two neighbors of France, uphold this form of possession and transmission of property. It is not regarded as a class privilege, but rather as a common law. It is a matter of testamentary freedom.[136] The homes of ancestors are preserved for their descendants and the work of stout pioneers is continued. He claims that the stability of homes contributes to their fecundity for it banishes the unhealthy selfish motives which now plague France. He goes further by asserting that the habits with which the civil code has endowed the nation earn it the sobriquet, "code of individualism."[137]

La Tour du Pin realizes that the main obstacle to the restoration of family property is the civil code. The text of the civil code is absolutely opposed to any consolidation or perpetuation of family property. It views the family as a momentary society which falls into dissolution at the death of the contracting party. It recognizes no succession except that which liquidates itself.[138] Concerning the legal recognition of family property, La Tour du Pin maintains that no new conditions of property need to be created nor does the civil code need to be revised. The answer is very simple. He says, "A little article which

---

[135] Ibid.

[136] Ibid., 283.

[137] Ibid.

[138] Ibid., 284.

passes almost unperceived among the heap" needs to be annulled.[139] Although he does not mention the article number within the civil code, his biographer Antoine Murat points out that it is article no. 896 in which entailments are prohibited.[140] La Tour du Pin declares that this is the one nail in the civil code that forbids successive entailments and prevents the establishment of a family property by a stem family. With the removal of this one article alone, property could become "indivisible, untransferable, and unseizable."[141]

Although La Tour du Pin does not directly state that freedom of testation would contribute to the restoration of paternal authority, this logically follows from his thought. Like Le Play, he is outspoken in his calls for the restoration of strong paternal authority. Also like Le Play, he is a strong advocate of freedom of testation. Freedom of testation, by its very nature, strengthens the authority of the father, for he is able to choose whom he wishes as his heir. The father would most naturally choose the most promising son as his heir. As undivided family property is passed down from generation to generation to the most promising heir, the stability of rural life could be restored.

8. –Comparative Analysis

Locke also supports the limited freedom of testation, but he does not appear to be

---

[139] Ibid., 285.

[140] Murat, *La Tour du Pin en son temps,* 72-73.

[141] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 285.

willing to give the father of the family complete control over testation as does Le Play and La Tour du Pin. Oddly, in this matter, the liberal Locke is not as liberal as the traditionalist La Tour du Pin. While at first glance this might appear strange, upon reflection, it is in perfect accord with their respective principles. La Tour du Pin, following Le Play, and anticipating the later "principle of subsidiarity,"[142] stressed that the father of the home should determine the disposal of the inheritance within his own family. He knows his children better than the government and, therefore, is in the best position to determine how the estate will be best maintained. The government, not interested in the individual qualities of the various children, will treat all of the children the same. One of Locke's concerns involves the control of the son by the father after the son has reached adulthood. He is an opponent of strong paternal authority. He did note that the disposal of inheritance is one means by which a father is able to secure the obedience of his children even while they are adults.[143] Nevertheless, Locke supports a view of limited government and it is fitting that he would oppose a government enacting laws which would tightly control how a father is to dispose of his property. He does mentions that the inheritance of the property is given "ordinarily in certain proportions,

---

[142] The principle of the "subsidiary function" was laid out by Pope Pius XI in paragraphs 79-80 of the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno.* When La Tour du Pin was writing, this had not yet been written. Nevertheless, in his views of decentralization, he maintained the principles which were later enunciated by Pius XI.

[143] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, para. 72, 39.

according to the law and custom of each country."[144] Yet he does concede that men are typically empowered "to bestow their estates on those who please them best" and that a father is free to be more sparing or liberal with his inheritance to the degree that a child is obedient or pleasing to him.[145] In his work, however, he nowhere advocates that one son alone should be given all the inheritance. He holds that inheritance should be governed by the laws, perhaps unwritten, and the customs of the country. As a result, although Locke is willing to uphold a certain latitude in the testamentary freedom of the father within the structure of the law, he does not, like La Tour du Pin, wish to give the father complete or absolute testamentary freedom.

Like Le Play and La Tour du Pin, Tocqueville adversely critiques the equal partition of family property among the heirs after the death of the owner. He asserts that laws of inheritance, which encourage or decree this, have caused revolutionary changes in property. Not only does the property change hands, but it is parceled out in smaller and smaller shares with each subsequent division. The disappearance of landed fortunes is an obvious result.[146] Not only does this law of equal division affect the property itself, it also affects the minds and passions of the heirs. Tocqueville observes that in nations which transmit entailed property, the family feeling is closely bound up with the estate and the glories of the past. The family is identified with the estate and the estate is

---

[144] Ibid.

[145] Ibid., para. 72, 39-40.

[146] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 1, ch. 3, 50.

identified with the family. After the family property is subjected to equal partition, however, the tight bond between family feeling and the preservation of the estate is severed. The estate is no longer identified with the family.[147] Tocqueville then says:

> Now, as soon as you divest the landowner of that interest in the preservation of the estate which he derives from association, from tradition, and from family pride, you may be certain that, sooner or later, he will dispose of it; for there is a strong pecuniary interest in favor of selling, as floating capital produces higher interest than real property and is more readily available to gratify the passions of the moment.[148]

He continues further by claiming that as family feeling ceases, individual selfishness asserts itself more and more. The man is no longer concerned with passing on his property to his remote descendants as before, but merely to the following generation. As a result, this "law of inheritance" inclines men not to preserve their family domains, but rather predisposes them to participate in their extinction, thus "dispersing rapidly both families and fortunes."[149]

The Catholic Church does not maintain an official stance on the freedom of testation. Nevertheless, the Church does maintain the principle of subsidiarity as part of its magisterial teaching. Consequently, it is reasonable to conclude that the Church would normally support the authority of the father or of both parents to dispose of his or their inheritance as is seen fit.

It must be stressed that La Tour du Pin is not merely attempting to turn back the

---

[147] Ibid., 51.

[148] Ibid.

[149] Ibid., 52.

clock and hearkening back to the inheritance laws of the Old Regime. He is opposed to the law of primogeniture with regard to rural estates. He wishes to give the father of the family even more authority than he had during the Old Regime. Like his mentor Le Play, he wants to keep rural estates undivided, but he also wishes to give the father the freedom to choose the most competent heir. La Tour du Pin makes no original contribution in the area of testamentary freedom. Le Play developed the idea of "freedom of testation" and La Tour du Pin is merely his disciple in this matter. Like Le Play and Tocqueville, La Tour du Pin recognizes that the new French law of inheritance contributes not just to the destruction of large rural domains, but it also creates a selfish mindset that encourages the liquidation of rural property and a "flight from the land."

D. The Role of the Church in Society

1. The Effects of Individualism on Religious Society

In this third and last section of this chapter, I will examine the role of the Church in society. This last section will focus on La Tour du Pin's views concerning the effects of individualism on religious society, the relations between Church and State within society, and the Church's directive role in ministry, teaching, and discipline within society.

Although La Tour du Pin regards the Church as a very important element in society, he does not devote much time to it in his works. He has written no articles which are fully devoted to the Church and its role in society. One must, therefore, assemble

together strands concerning the Church from various articles and piece them together to view the role of the Church in La Tour du Pin's thought. I will begin by examining sections of La Tour du Pin's article "Individualisme," in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique.*

First of all, La Tour du Pin asserts that all peoples at all times have held that religious society rests on the idea of the solidarity of the human race. This solidarity is not just between the living, but between the living and the dead as well. The dogmas concerning original sin, the communion of the saints, and the constitution of the Church all rest on this solidarity. He then points out that individualism was introduced into the reformed churches when they refused to recognize any authority mediating relations between the individual Christian and God. As Protestantism recognizes each individual as his own proper judge in matters religious, Protestantism has proliferated into innumerable sects. La Tour du Pin claims that Protestantism is moving from individualism to anarchy via liberalism.[150]

Secondly, La Tour du Pin points out that liberty of conscience is the most notable fact of this individualist order in modern society. Many Christians, in good faith and unaware of the consequences, understand religion to be a purely personal and individual thing. They really believe that "practicing religion" is nothing other than following their own conscience.[151] As can be seen from this, their "religious truth" is subjective and is

---

[150] La Tour du Pin, "Individualisme," 716.

[151] Ibid.

ultimately a projection of their own views. Rather than conforming to a standard of objective truth received from authority, they exercise "liberty of conscience" and "make their own truth." La Tour du Pin claims that this is a denial of the existence of the Church or "the social order established by Christianity."[152] As a symptom of this denial, he notes that the word "Christianity" is disappearing from public usage.[153] This individualism in the religious sphere is also acting as a solvent on morality and institutions, yet it is hailed as progress.[154] The institution of the family is especially a victim of the ravages of individualism. According to La Tour du Pin, divorce, the diminution of marriages, the decrease in the number of children, feminism, and the forced division of family property exemplify the rotten fruits of individualism. Divorce, and its logical outcome, free union, point to the corrosive affects of individualism on sexual morality.[155]

Many years before La Tour du Pin began to write, Pope Gregory XVI had already condemned "liberty of conscience" in his encyclical *Mirari Vos.*[156] There is no doubt that La Tour du Pin was well aware of this encyclical as he was an ardent student of papal

---

[152] Ibid.

[153] Ibid.

[154] Ibid., 716-717.

[155] Ibid., 717.

[156] Gregory XVI, "Mirari Vos," no. 14, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 1, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 238. This encyclical, although it did not specifically name the Abbé Felicité de Lamennais, condemned many of his liberal ideas which were aired in his journal *L'Avenir*. This included "liberty of conscience."

thought.[157] In his encyclical Gregory states:

> This shameful font of indifferentism gives rise to that absurd and erroneous proposition which claims that liberty of conscience must be maintained for everyone. It spreads ruin in sacred and civil affairs, though some repeat over and over again with the greatest impudence that some advantage accrues to religion from it. "But the death of the soul is worse than freedom of error," as Augustine was wont to say. When all restraints are removed by which men are kept on the narrow path of truth, their nature, which is already inclined to evil, propels them to ruin. Then truly "the bottomless pit" is open from which John saw smoke ascending which obscured the sun, and out of which locusts flew forth to devastate the earth. Thence comes transformation of minds, corruption of youths, contempt of sacred things and holy laws—in other words, a pestilence more deadly to the state than any other.[158]

In addition, La Tour du Pin was much influenced by the Pope Pius IX's *Quanta Cura* and its accompanying *Syllabus of Errors*.[159] In particular, La Tour du Pin was a firm proponent of Émile Keller's strong defense of this encyclical. Pius IX later reaffirmed Gregory XVI's condemnation of the "liberty of conscience." In *Quanta Cura* he condemns

> …that erroneous opinion, most fatal in its effects on the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls, called by Our Predecessor, Gregory XVI, an "insanity," viz., that "liberty of conscience and worship is each man's personal right, which ought to be legally proclaimed and asserted in every rightly constituted society;…[160]

Furthermore, in article 15 of the *Syllabus of Errors*, Pius condemns the proposition that "Every man is free to embrace and profess whatever religion which, he, led by the light

---

[157] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 137.

[158] Gregory XVI, "Mirari Vos," no. 14, 238.

[159] Because of their devotion to the Encyclical of 1864 and its accompanying Syllabus of Errors, Paul Misner refers to Maurice Maignen, Albert de Mun, and Rene de La Tour du Pin as "Knights of the Syllabus." See: Misner, *Social Catholicism in Europe*, 148.

[160] Pius IX, "Quanta Cura," no. 3, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1878*, vol. 1, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 382.

of reason, believes to be true."[161] In short, Pius IX is maintaining that error[162] has no rights. Moreover, Pope Leo XIII asserts that it is "contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights."[163] It is clear that the popes of recent centuries have condemned the "liberty of conscience" and have maintained that "error has no rights."

Although some might hold that this papal teaching on the "liberty of conscience" is outdated and no longer valid on account of the recent teaching of the Second Vatican Council's *Dignitatis humanae*, this does not logically follow. Regarding religious freedom, *Dignitatis humanae* states that no individual, social group, or human power (including the State) can use coercion to prevent a person from exercising their religious convictions as long as "just requirements of the public order are preserved."[164] This is not the same as maintaining that the individual person himself has a right to choose error. As shown, this has been condemned by past popes and that condemnation is still valid. This is manifest in *Dignitatis humanae* itself. Concerning the duties of individuals and

---

[161] Pius IX, "Syllabus of Errors," no. 15, 1715, in *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, eds. Heinrich Denzinger, Clement Bannwart, S.J., and John Baptist Umberg, S.J., 14th and 15th edition, (Freiburg: Herder, 1922), 467. The original Latin is "Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem, quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit." The translation from the Latin is my own.

[162] The Catechism of the Catholic Church, taking into account the more recent papal and conciliar documents, also maintains that error has no rights. See: *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 2108, (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1994), 511.

[163] Leo XIII, "Libertas Praestantissimum," no. 34, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 179.

[164] Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, "Declaration on Religious Freedom, *Dignitatis humanae*," nos. 2 and 3, in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, vol. 1, ed. Austin Flannery, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984), 800, 802.

societies toward the true religion and the Catholic Church, the council fathers state:

> All men are bound to seek the truth, especially in what concerns God and His Church, and to embrace it and hold onto it as they come to know it.
>
> The sacred Council likewise proclaims that these obligations bind man's conscience. Truth can impose itself on the mind of man only in virtue of its own truth, which wins over the mind of man with both gentleness and power. So while the religious freedom, which men demand in fulfilling their obligation to worship God has to do with freedom from coercion in civil society, it leaves intact the traditional Catholic teaching on the moral duty of individuals and societies towards the true religion and the one Church of Christ.[165]

The teaching of La Tour du Pin on the "freedom of conscience" is in complete accord with Catholic teaching based on papal and conciliar documents that men and nations have a moral duty to "the true religion and the one Church of Christ."[166] Being a social thinker, he underscores the tragic consequences of "liberty of conscience" in the social order. He points out that this is a denial of the Church itself. One might even conclude that each individual exercising his "freedom of conscience" is a "Church unto himself." For each individual has no beliefs in common with anyone else, except accidentally. He does not categorically submit himself, in combination with others, to an outside teaching authority and to the doctrine which it affirms.

2. General Considerations

After having assessed the ravages which individualism has made in religious

---

[165] Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, "Declaration on Religious Freedom, *Dignitatis humanae,"* no. 1, 799-800.

[166] In La Tour du Pin's own time, as the Second Vatican Council had not yet pronounced on man's right to be free "from coercion in civil society" in the matter of religious freedom, one cannot surmise precisely where he would have stood on this point. Given his known viewpoints, it would not be amiss to claim that he might find this teaching objectionable.

society, it is now requisite to investigate La Tour du Pin's ideas on religious society and the relations between Church and State. According to La Tour du Pin, the first object of study for a social reformer is religious society or the Church. For "it is the guardian and the natural interpreter of the moral law and that the latter is the principle of law and of civil society."[167] He likens the Church to the "soul of civil society" in that it animates it or gives it life. By its teaching and its worship the Church presides over civil society.[168] Although La Tour du Pin recognizes the separate spheres of the civil and religious powers, he affirms the supremacy of the religious power over the civil power in matters of judgment. He also makes the claim that this notion of the "supremacy of the spiritual" informed consciences throughout all civilizations in history as well as within all philosophical religions.[169]

This religious society is a "perfect society"[170] which should be free to develop itself. He asserts that the civil power has no business thwarting the action of religious society or attempting to alter either her nature or her teaching. La Tour du Pin highlights

---

[167] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 169.

[168] Ibid., 165.

[169] Ibid., 136-137.

[170] The *Church* is a "perfect society" in that it is capable of satisfying all of the needs of man's *supernatural end* (eternal salvation) and it is not dependent on any other higher society to complete its mission. Leo XIII states, "In like manner it is to be understood that the Church no less than the State itself is a society perfect in its own nature and its own right,…" Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei, no. 35," in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 115. The *State* is also a "perfect society" in that it is capable of satisfying all the needs of men for their *natural end* (the life of virtue) in this world and it is not dependent on any other higher society to complete its mission. See: Heinrich A. Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought: A Treatise in Political Philosophy* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co, 1945; repr., New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1969), 248-268.

"religious liberty"[171] as the first condition in any true constitution, so obvious that it need not be written down.[172]

The state must not just profess respect for religious society, but must go a step further. It must exercise the precepts socially as well as individually. It has the duty to protect religion from attacks directed from all quarters. La Tour du Pin declares that religious dissidents should be tolerated and protected from all violence, but they should not be given any other rights than the protection normally given foreigners. Nor should they be required to do more than respect the law and the government of the country.[173] La Tour du Pin dismisses the idea that Protestants are foreigners within Christian society; rather he claims that there are citizens, but that their situation is irregular.

On the other hand, his view of Jews[174] is very different. In his opinion, whether

---

[171] The "religious liberty" to which La Tour du Pin refers is not the same thing as modern "religious liberty." That is more related to "freedom of conscience." As we have already seen, La Tour condemns that as a corrosive effect of individualism. The "religious liberty" to which La Tour du Pin is referring is the "religious liberty" of the Church within the State. In short, this "liberty" maintains that the state has to respect the rights of the Church; the State, therefore, does not have the right to wield control over the Church or dominate her. He is opposed to Erastianism.

[172] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 169.

[173] Ibid.

[174] Most of La Tour du Pin's ideas on the "Jewish Question" were drafted in his "La question juive et la Révolution sociale" in 1898 during the height of the Dreyfus Affair. This later became a chapter within *Vers un ordre social chrétien.* Like certain other zealous French Catholics of the late nineteenth century, he was an anti-Drefusard and he saw Jews as "aliens" or "foreigners" within a Christian society. Although he would probably be regarded an anti-Semite in today's cultural climate, he was not a proponent of biological racism. It would be more correct to call him anti-Jewish. At the same time, however, he is clearly opposed to any persecution of Jews. According to him, Jews ought to be allowed to worship freely as long as they do not injure Christian society. In the end, however, he does not see how Christian society and Jewish society can be reconciled and, on that account, wants Christians and Jews to be kept separate from one another in society. He mentions that Judaism is a national religion and, as such, claims that the loyalties of the Jews are not to the foreign nation in which they dwell. He maintains that the First Zionist

they are naturalized or not, they are foreigners to Christian society; in fact, providing them with citizenship is highly prejudicial to Christian society.[175] He states that the Church and rulers who are guided by the Church's maxims should keep the Christian people at a distance from the Jews. Nevertheless, they should not persecute Jews nor should they treat Jews as enemies for this is opposed to Christian charity. They should, however, treat Jews as citizens of a foreign nation or as aliens. Christians should not suppress the worship, laws, and customs of the Jews, but allow their free exercise as long as they do not offend or injure Christian society.[176]

3. –Comparative Analysis

In *A Letter Concerning Toleration,* John Locke refuses to allow freedom for the Roman Catholic Church; he argues against toleration for this Church. Again, not only is he claiming that the State should not support the Church or protect it, he is maintaining that the State must not tolerate the Roman Catholic Church. In his opinion,[177] the Roman Catholic Church, not the State, claims the primary loyalty of its adherents. He claims that members of this Church "deliver themselves up to the Protection and Service of another

---

Congress of Basle in 1897 is proof that the Jews are a nation unto themselves. La Tour du Pin also takes the Jews to task for their practice of usury on gentiles. See: La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 257-273.

[175] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 169, n. 1.

[176] Ibid., 261.

[177] Prior to the confiscation of the Papal States, many Protestants presumed that Catholics' primary loyalty is not to the nation in which they dwell, but to a foreign prince, the pope. At that time the pope was not just the universal bishop, but also a territorial prince.

Prince."[178] By this, of course, he means the pope. According to him, this Church creates a "state within a state" and by allowing practitioners of such a religion to dwell in his realm, a ruler is creating a ready-made army of his own people to rebel against him and oppose his State.[179] Locke will have none of this. Earlier he argues that Catholics, secretly rather than openly, arrogate peculiar prerogatives to themselves. For example, he mentions that Catholics hold that excommunicated kings "forfeit their crowns and kingdoms."[180] It appears that his views are colored by the medieval papacy's arrogation of the direct power of the Church over the State as manifested in the bull *Unam Sanctam*[181] of Pope Boniface VIII. Like most Protestant Englishmen, however, he was probably more affected by the background of the Spanish Armada and another papal bull closer to his own lifetime, i.e., *Regnans in Excelsis.*[182] In this bull Pius V

---

[178] John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration and Other Writings,* ed. Mark Goldie (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2010), 52.

[179] Ibid.

[180] Ibid., 50.

[181] *Unam Sanctam* was a papal bull issued by Boniface VIII in 1302 during a series of quarrels with Philip IV of France. In this bull Boniface claims that there are two swords, viz. the spiritual and the temporal. The pope holds the spiritual sword (power) which he asserts is superior to the temporal sword (power) held by the prince. As the temporal power is subordinate to the spiritual power, the latter has the right to pass judgment on the former. For the text of *Unam Sanctam,* wherein the relationship between the spiritual and temporal powers is laid out by Boniface VIII, see: Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press in association with the Medieval Academy of America, 1988), 188-189; Sidney Z. Ehler and John B. Morrall, eds. and trans., *Church and State through the Centuries* (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1954), 90-92.

[182] This bull was issued by Pope Pius V on February 25, 1570. This papal bull followed the Rising of the North (Northern Rebellion) of 1569 against Elizabeth. The rebellion was an attempt to wipe out the new Protestant religion which had been imposed on the North of England and to restore the old religion of Catholicism. The rebellion was led by the Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland. Both men had vexing scruples of conscience concerning rebellion against their sovereign Elizabeth. Pius V, in attempting

excommunicated Elizabeth I, “deposed” her, and freed all of her subjects from their oath of allegiance to her. In particular, this bull made it difficult for Protestant Englishmen to believe that English Catholics were in good faith when they claimed that they could be faithful subjects[183] of the queen and, at the same time, good Catholics. They were suspect from then on.

In Book 4, Chapter VIII of his work *On the Social Contract*, Jean-Jacques Rousseau discusses the relation of religion to society. He puts all religions into three classes, viz. the religion of man, the religion of the priest, and the religion of the citizen. He then discusses the merits and the defects of each of them. Although it cannot be clearly inferred from Rousseau’s writing, the “religion of man” would seem to correspond to certain sects[184] of Protestantism. Rousseau states that this religion is the

---

to resolve the earls’ case of conscience, issued the bull *Regnans in Excelsis.* Unfortunately, the timing of the bull was off. Rather than preceding the rebellion, as planned, it followed the rebellion. Elizabeth was busy hanging many of the rebels when Pius V signed this bull. For a discussion of *Regnans in Excelsis* and its relationship to the Rising in the North, see: Marvin R. O'Connell, *The Counter Reformation, 1560-1610* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974), 166-167. For the text of *Regnans in Excelsis*, see: Ehler and Morrall, *Church and State through the Centuries*, 181-183.

[183] There is no inconsistency in orthodox Catholics being good subjects of a heretical or even a pagan ruler. St. Paul says, "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment." Rom. 13: 1-2, RSV. St. Paul does not refer only to orthodox Christian monarchs. It was well-known that the early Christians were dutiful in obeying the pagan Caesar in all things that pertained to Caesar. Nevertheless, if the earthly rulers attempted to encroach on spiritual matters, they followed Peter and the apostles' counsel that "We must obey God rather than men." Acts 5: 29, RSV. As Catholics were willing to obey a pagan ruler in the “things that pertained to Caesar,” *a fortiori*, they would they obey a heretical ruler in those same matters.

[184] By "religion of man" Rousseau does not appear to be referring to any of the magisterial Protestant sects, such as Lutheranism, Anglicanism, or Calvinism. External worship, churches, and dogma are all underscored in these branches of Protestantism. Nevertheless, Rousseau does claim that this is the "pure and simple religion of the Gospel." Perhaps, he is referring to Pietism. Pietists downplayed the importance of dogma and formal church worship. They also stressed the importance of devotional over

"pure and simple religion of the Gospel."[185] It has no "temples, altars, or rites" the focus is on a purely internal worship of God and the duties of morality.[186] Nevertheless, according to Rousseau, this religion is problematic because it is "other-worldly" in its focus. Although members of this religion do their duty well, as their true homeland is not in this world, they are not really concerned with the progress or the decline of the state in which they live. In addition, the spirit of this religion provides a fertile breeding ground for tyranny. For Rousseau claims this religion "preaches only servitude and dependence."[187]

Rousseau also analyzes the "religion of the priest." This would correspond to Roman Catholicism. He does not give this religion much attention as he claims that, as it "breaks up social unity," it is worthless.[188] He asserts that the "religion of the priest" is bizarre in that it requires dual loyalties of men. Rousseau states:

> In giving men two sets of legislation, two leaders, and two homelands, it subjects them to

---

disputational sermons. In addition, they placed an emphasis on "the moral responsibilities of the Christian" and on living a godly life. Furthermore, religion, for the Pietists, was often identified with their own personal religious experience. For this reason, Pietism becomes a subjective and inward looking religion. Nevertheless, an important counterclaim can be made. Rousseau claims that this religion "preaches only servitude and dependence." The Pietists were well known for their outspoken denunciations of the German princes' absolutist pretentions. This certainly demonstrates that they were not an abject and servile group of Christians. See: Gerald R. Cragg, *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648-1789* (London: Penguin Books, 1970), 100-106. It appears that the jury is still out on this matter.

[185] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 4, ch. 8, 223.

[186] Ibid.

[187] Ibid., 224-225.

[188] Ibid., 223.

> contradictory duties and prevents them from being simultaneously devout men and citizens.[189]

Nevertheless, practitioners of this religion are merely implementing Christ's teaching to "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mark 12:17, RSV). In matters of purely temporal concern, they should obey the earthly ruler. In matters of spiritual import, they should obey God and his earthly representatives, members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. In the case of mixed matters[190] Leo XIII has spoken clearly. He states:

> Whatever, therefore in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or 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 power and judgment of the Church….
>
> There are, nevertheless, occasions when another method of concord is available for the sake of peace and liberty: We mean when rulers of the State and the Roman Pontiff come to an understanding touching some special matter. At such times the Church gives signal proof of her motherly love by showing the greatest possible kindliness and indulgence.[191]

Leo XIII speaks firmly, yet diplomatically. If things by their very nature or by their purpose relate to the salvation of souls or the worship of God, judgment on such matters falls to the spiritual power. Public education and marriage are two clear examples of such matters. Marriage is involved in producing citizens for heaven. For instance, children brought up in a mixed marriage must be taught to adhere to the true religion for the sake of their salvation and the true worship of God. Education deals with instructing

---

[189] Ibid.

[190] Matters of a mixed nature are those matters which belong to both the temporal and spiritual orders under different aspects. Examples might include marriage, public education, the legal position of Church property, etc. In order to bring about a lasting agreement on such matters, the Church has often entered into a concordat with a particular state in order to regulate such matters.

[191] Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," nos. 14 and 15, 110.

children in matters of the faith, the correct belief of which is necessary for the salvation of the children. Hence, the Church cannot be neutral or uninterested in such matters. Nevertheless, whenever possible, the Church attempts to be indulgent to the State in these matters by working out a bilateral agreement. In the end Rousseau refuses to acknowledge that the State can really cooperate effectively with the Church or that individuals can be good and dutiful members of both societies at the same time. He seems to think that any man attempting to reconcile membership in both Church and State is a "house divided" and cannot last. Social disunity is the result. Rousseau sees such a Church as "partial society" which distracts the citizen from giving his full unqualified allegiance to the State.[192] Commenting on this he quips, "All institutions which place man in contradiction with himself are of no value."[193]

Finally, Rousseau examines the "religion of the citizen." This is the religion which he favors. In this civic religion service to the State is equated with service to god. As the political theorist James Wiser has noted, "Here the spheres of the sacred and the secular are identified with one another."[194] The prince is the pope and the magistrates are the priests. Martyrdom is dying for one's country and impiety is defined as breaking the

---

[192] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 2, ch. 3, 156.

[193] Ibid., bk. 4, ch. 8, 223.

[194] James L. Wiser, *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1983), 270.

laws of one's country.[195] At the same time, Rousseau is cognizant of the faults of such a religion. He acknowledges that it is based on error and lies and it causes men to be deceived and superstitious. Such a religion can also become quite tyrannical[196] and fanatical. For it can cause the people to wallow in murder and bloodshed and "believe they are performing a holy action in killing anyone who does not accept their gods."[197] This also could endanger the security of the State as it will likely come to war with its neighbors.[198] Nevertheless, in the end, with all of its faults, Rousseau opts for this civil religion. The articles of faith for this civic religion will be "sentiments of sociability" rather than religious dogmas. In Rousseau's opinion, one cannot be a good citizen and refuse to acknowledge them. Being unsociable, failing to love the laws and justice with all of one's heart, and refusing to sacrifice one's life when duty calls for it are three examples of heretical behavior within the civic religion. A person could be banished if he refuses to acknowledge these "dogmas." If he has once acknowledged these dogmas, but has failed to act[199] as though he believed them, he could be put to death for the

---

[195] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 4, ch. 8, 223.

[196] Rousseau appears to foresee the kind of fanaticism and bloodshed which his "civic religion" would usher in during the French Revolution.

[197] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 4, ch. 8, 223.

[198] Ibid.

[199] During the French Revolution, the *Law of 22 Prairial* (10 June 1794) listed the type of individuals who were considered enemies of the people. It included "Those who have sought to mislead opinion and to prevent the instruction of the people, to deprave morals and to corrupt the public conscience, *to impair the energy and the purity of revolutionary and republican principles, or to impede the progress thereof,* either by counter-revolutionary or insidious writings, or by any other machination." Stewart, "The

"greatest of crimes," i.e., lying before the laws. These are the latter-day heretics for Rousseau. This is the civil religion's equivalent to burning at the stake. Unconditional and fervent patriotism is the civil religion.

In *Democracy in America* Alexis de Tocqueville maintains that religion should play a critical role in society; but, at the same time, he advocates the separation of Church and State. Underscoring the importance of religion, he claims that when the religion of a people is destroyed, men no longer consider the problems concerning man's destiny. This in turn enervates the soul, weakens the will, and "prepares men for servitude."[200] Tocqueville is not concerning himself with the essential purpose of Christianity, i.e., the true worship of God and the salvation of souls. In this work he is interested in the utility or the secondary effects of Christianity on society and the State. Illustrating his views on this he states:

> The chief concern of religion is to purify, to regulate, and to restrain the excessive and exclusive taste for well-being that men feel in periods of equality;…Men cannot be cured of the love of riches, but they may be persuaded to enrich themselves by none but honest means.[201]

In America Tocqueville points out that religion does not influence the laws or public opinion much, "but it directs the customs of the community and, by regulating domestic life, it regulates the State." In other words, religion is firmly grounded in the domestic life of the family and in the community life of the neighborhood and the

---

Law of 22 Prairial," in *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, 529. The italicized emphasis is my own.

[200] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 1, ch. 5, 22-23.

[201] Ibid., 27.

village.[202] In particular, he notes the influence of religion upon the minds of women, whom he refers to as the "protector of morals."[203] He also notes that married life is highly appreciated and that the marriage bond is more respected in America than anywhere else.[204] The influence of religion, therefore, percolates up from below in a grassroots fashion.

After visiting America, Tocqueville was completely won over to the idea of separation of Church and State. In discussions with American Catholic priests, he states that all of them, without exception, claimed that the "peaceful dominion" of religion in America was a result of the separation of Church and State.[205] In addition, he noticed that American clergymen do not aspire to political appointments or legislative positions. Some states, such as New York, even forbade them from entering political life.[206] Reflecting upon this phenomenon, he concludes that when religion makes its primary concern the eternal destiny of man, it will exercise a universal dominion. On the contrary, when religion mixes with a particular government, it temporizes itself by adopting rules of conduct that apply only to certain nations. It thereby loses its influence. Encapsulating this, he says, "…in forming an alliance with a political power, religion

---

[202] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 1, ch. 17, 314-315.

[203] Ibid., 315.

[204] Ibid.

[205] Ibid., 319-320.

[206] Ibid., 320.

augments its authority over a few and forfeits the hope of reigning over all."[207] When an established church is connected to a particular government, men who favor or hate the political regime will love or hate the Church on account of its temporal alliance with the stated regime. [208] Tocqueville, then, although a proponent of the separation of Church and State, still maintains that the Church ought to influence society.

In his encyclical *Quod nunquam* of 1875, Pope Pius IX condemns the violation of the Church's freedoms and its rights within the kingdom of Prussia during the *Kulturkampf*.[209] He also points out that temporal rulers or leaders were not set over the bishops in "matters which pertain to the sacred ministry" nor can these bishops be deprived of their office by worldly powers.[210] This is a clear and firm defense of the "liberty of the Church." In the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, *Pastor Aeternus*, the Vatican I council fathers maintain that the secular power has no right to prevent or limit the communication of the pope with the pastors and the flock of a particular country. Nor can the secular power claim that papal missives have no force unless they are confirmed by the secular power.[211] This too is a ringing declaration of the freedom of

---

[207] Ibid., 321.

[208] Ibid., 321-322.

[209] Pius IX, "Quod Nunquam," no. 1, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1878*, vol. 1, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 447.

[210] Ibid., no. 5, 448.

[211] Vatican Council I, "Cap. 3: De Primatu Romani Pontificis," no. 1829, in *Enchiridion symbolorum*, 486-487.

the Church from any Erastian state control and Gallicanism of the past.

The Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes* of the Second Vatican Council also distinctly champions the "freedom of the Church." The council fathers state that the State and the Church are "autonomous and independent of each other in their own fields."[212] This is a critical and fundamental principle which ensures the freedom of the Church. That being said, the welfare of all will be better maintained if the two institutions, that is, Church and State, cooperate with one another.[213] At any rate, the State has no business thwarting the Church as it carries out its mission. In fact, the council fathers maintain:

> But at all times and in all places the Church should have the true freedom to preach the faith, to proclaim its teaching about society, to carry out its task among men without hindrance, and to pass moral judgments even in matters relating to politics, whenever the fundamental rights of man or the salvation of souls requires it.[214]

In his encyclical *Immortale Dei*, Pope Leo XIII lays out the relationship between the Church and the State. Both powers have authority over the same subjects. He claims that in order to avoid conflict there must be an orderly relationship between the Church and State which "may be compared to the union of the soul and body in man."[215] He then goes on to point out that the connection between Church and State is determined by the

---

[212] Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, "Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes,"* no. 76, 984.

[213] Ibid.

[214] Ibid., no. 76, 985.

[215] Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," no. 14, 110.

"relative excellence and nobleness of their purpose." The State has for its purpose the well-being of this earthly life and the Church has for its purpose the well-being of eternal life. Whatever involves the civil and political order is subject to the temporal power and this is its rightful domain. Matters, which by their nature or by their end involve the worship of God or the salvation of souls, are "subject to the power and judgment of the Church."[216] Hence, if there is ever a conflict between Church or State over such matters, the Church overrides the State as these affairs pertain to the realm of "the sacred." Although the pope is not as forthright and lucid on this question as some other writers, such as St. Robert Bellarmine and Francis Suarez,[217] this text appears to be a polite and diplomatic assertion of the indirect power of the Church over the State.

Leo XIII clearly advocates that the State must support the Church in its mission. As a matter of fact, he claims that it is a sin for the State to have no concern for religion.[218] He posits that it is the one of main duties of the rulers of the State to

> favor religion, to protect it, to shield it under the credit and sanction of the laws, and neither to organize nor enact any measure that may compromise its safety. This is the bounden duty of rulers to the people over whom they rule.[219]

Concerning the relationship between the Church and the State, La Tour du Pin was probably influenced by the encyclical *Immortale Dei*. La Tour du Pin wrote about

---

[216] Ibid.

[217] Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought*, 547-550.

[218] Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," no. 6, 109.

[219] Ibid.

these matters in 1887 just two years following the publication of the encyclical. In particular, he uses the analogy of the body and soul respectively for the State and the Church. It appears that this was borrowed from the encyclical. He also strongly upholds the freedom of the head of the Church to communicate with his flock and pastors within the various states. Furthermore, he asserts that the Church has to have the freedom to carry out her own particular mission—this includes teaching her truths in an unvarnished matter to her flock, without having them altered by the State. Nor should she herself have her constitution altered by the State. Like Leo XIII, La Tour du Pin recognizes the independence of the spiritual and temporal powers. Nevertheless, he is a bit more direct in asserting the indirect power of the Church over the State. He even uses the term "supremacy of the spiritual." This claim is not so overtly maintained in either Leo XIII's *Immortale Dei* or in *Gaudium et Spes*, yet it does appears to be more discretely contained in Leo's document. Finally, like Leo XIII, who influenced him deeply, La Tour du Pin also declares that it is the duty of the State to protect religion just as Leo points out that it is the duty of the State to protect the Church. Concerning the relations between Church and State, La Tour du Pin is not original or creative; nevertheless, he is docile and he takes his cue from papal documents.

4. The Ministerial, Teaching, and Disciplinary Roles of the Church

La Tour du Pin then focuses his attention on the three important functions of the Church, namely, ministry, teaching, and judgment. He begins by noting that no-one

contests the Church's power to administer the sacraments and preach morality within its churches. This is private and affects only members of the Church.[220] Opponents of the Church would be mighty pleased if the Catholic Church limited her mission within these narrow limits.

Nevertheless, the Church's mission is much greater than this. The Church also has the mission to teach. This includes the role of running schools and distributing instruction within those schools. This "liberty of teaching"[221] itself has been the scene of profound struggles and it has been very difficult to maintain the bare minimum of this "liberty of teaching." But beyond this, the Church also has a greater role to play. Within a Christian society, the Church ought to direct all teaching. Even further, it should have the imprescriptible right "to establish, maintain, and distribute social doctrine."[222] This is an extremely important role for La Tour du Pin. He later points out that many self-styled conservatives use the ideas of the French Revolution as their social gospel. Moreover, there are also many journalists, professors, and authors who claim to disseminate Christian social teaching, but their social teaching is primarily based on liberal economic theory and Roman Law—they never cite the Fathers of the Church, conciliar decrees, or works of the Roman pontiffs.[223] He ends by stating that conservatives have "more

---

[220] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 136.

[221] For a discussion of the "liberty of teaching," see n. 26 on pp. 20-21 of this dissertation.

[222] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 136.

[223] Ibid., 137-138.

religion in their hearts than in their minds."[224] Yes, it is important to provide the Church with liberty of action, but it is also essential for conservatives to make the Church their guide in their activities.[225] In particular, he underscores the role of the papacy as "the guide" for it offers

> its apostolic ministry, its integral doctrine, and its irreformable judgment for all Catholic consciences faithful to their faith:
>
> —the ministry of the Church is charity, and charity penetrates all;
>
> —its doctrine is truth, and truth clarifies all;
>
> —its judgment is justice, and justice sustains all.[226]

Lastly, La Tour du Pin comments on the right of the Church to judge. He states that a consequence of the right to teach society is the right to persuade society of sin. This can only effectively be done when the Church has the right of judgment, accompanied by penal sanctions, not just for clerics, but for all of the faithful.[227] He asserts that this is the "normal and regular exercise of the providential mission of the Church."[228] Nevertheless, this can only be effectively accomplished in a society that recognizes the mission of the Church to involve itself in such binding teaching and judgments. This distinguishes the time in which the philosophy of the gospel governed

---

[224] Ibid., 138.

[225] Ibid.

[226] Ibid., 137.

[227] Ibid., 136.

[228] Ibid.

the State from the time in which the philosophy of the Revolution was unleashed upon it.[229]

[229] Ibid.

CHAPTER 6.

THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF LA TOUR DU PIN, PART II

A. Introduction

In this chapter, I will continue my examination of La Tour du Pin's social thought. This present chapter will focus on capitalism, corporations, decentralization, and effective political representation. Among the topics to be examined in the first section of the present chapter will be La Tour du Pin's views on usury and the freedom of work. In the second section of this chapter, I will investigate La Tour du Pin's ideas on intermediate bodies, especially corporations. In addition, I will focus on the functions of a corporation and the implementation of the corporative regime as the path to decentralization. In the third section of this chapter, I will scrutinize La Tour du Pin's views on the following: the parliamentary regime; the nature of the State and the role of monarchy; the necessary conditions for true representation; the corporative model of representation; and the implementation of the representative regime.

B. Capitalism

1. Usury

In this section I will examine La Tour du Pin's views on specifically economic

matters. Capitalism,[1] another one of the progeny of individualism, received especially harsh treatment from La Tour du Pin. He asserts, "as for the economic system of this century which rests on usury, it has a name: capitalism."[2] Because capitalism widens the gap between owners and workers, rich and poor, as well as accentuating the extreme elements of these groups, he claims it will result in a social revolution.[3] He sees the capitalist system, based on usury, as evil in itself and maintains that it must be legislated out of existence.[4] Having spent four years in Austria, he was clearly affected by Vogelsang's extreme views on capitalism; for both men, capitalism must not be reformed, but replaced with the corporative system.

Recognizing that usury has always been considered a scourge of humanity, it has been declared illicit by the highest moral authorities and has even encouraged the most severe chastisements as in the case of the Knights Templar.[5] Although usury today typically signifies lending at exorbitantly high rates of interest, La Tour du Pin claims that usury, indeed, is taking interest on any lent money even if it be legal or at a moderate

---

[1] In 1889, La Tour du Pin wrote "Du Capitalisme," which was to be published in *Association catholique*. This work, however, received an episcopal condemnation and hence, was not published in the journal. Nevertheless, La Tour du Pin ensured that this article did appear in *Vers un ordre social chrétien.*

[2] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 66.

[3] Ibid., 85.

[4] Ibid., 81.

[5] Ibid., 68.

rate.[6] He also remarks that it is vain to talk of differences between loans destined for production and loans destined for consumption; hence, he even considers a loan at interest which suffers no deterioration as usury.[7] In either case the substance of the borrower is consumed without any exchange of services.[8] Responding to those who believe that usury can be considered legitimate, since it is the power of capital reproducing itself, La Tour du Pin asserts:

> But this power of reproduction is not the deed of capital, but that of work, and capital loses in reality everything which is not employed by work.[9]

Usury results in unjust social consequences as well. The working class, by means of its labor, provides for the consumption of the usurious class, which lives without any need of working. As mentioned before, society is divided more sharply into two classes.[10]

In order to eliminate usury, La Tour du Pin suggests that government bonds (*rente d'État*) should be abolished. In order to pay off the government debt, La Tour du Pin states, first of all, that government services should be diminished. With the budget revenues saved from government services as well as revenues from sumptuary taxes on

---

[6] Ibid., 66.

[7] Ibid., 69.

[8] Ibid., 67.

[9] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 50.

[10] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 73.

luxury goods and tariffs from foreign goods, the debt should be amortized.[11] According to La Tour du Pin, *sociétés anonymes* should be restructured as well. Their pecuniary responsibilities should not be limited as they have been in the past, but rather should be unlimited. He advocates that the legal constitution of these industrial societies should be altered so that they are no longer places of employment for the "father of the family," but rather "strictly cooperative transactions."[12] Championing these cooperative associations, he proposes that manual workers, today salaried, should become members in the particular industrial society, slowly acquiring joint ownership of the working implements. This would be a great means of diminishing the hatred between the two classes and this would lead to the solidarity of all elements in production.[13] Usurious speculation should be outlawed by the government through the rigorous application of existing laws.[14] By means of mutual aid associations and charity, the workers can avoid usurious loans of consumption as well.[15]

In his encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, John XXIII also advocated that workers be given the opportunity to become part owners in their companies. He states:

---

[11] Ibid., 77.

[12] Ibid., 80. La Tour du Pin wants the workingman to have some "stake" in the industry in which he is involved. This is why he believes that a workman should not be a mere employee, but rather a cooperator in the industry, even though he may have a subordinate role in the hierarchy in the industrial society.

[13] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 80.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

> We believe that the workers should be allocated shares in the firms for which they work, especially when they are paid no more than a minimum wage….
>
> Experience suggests many ways in which the demands of justice can be satisfied. Not to mention other ways, it is especially desirable today that workers gradually come to share in the ownership of their company, by ways and in the manner that seem most suitable.[16]

Again, La Tour du Pin was well ahead of his time in championing ownership of company capital by workers. He was determined to provide workers with some ownership of property, even if it was collective company property. He realized that this would lessen the antagonism between work and capital.[17] For workers would now see that they had a vested interest in the company. Pope John XXIII, in using the flexible phrase "by means and in the manner that seem most suitable" to describe worker "ownership," would most certainly be supportive of La Tour du Pin's initiative.

La Tour du Pin also considers farm-tenancy (*fermage*) as a form of usury. Unlike the landowners of old who exercised social responsibilities, the new owners are non-resident and idle. In addition, they do not pay legal indemnities to the farmer for the surplus produced from the land during his tenancy;[18] this is a new usury. This problem of *fermage* has developed from the parceling-up of landed inheritances.

In addition to social laws, La Tour du Pin also recommends association as a solution to agrarian problems. He states:

---

[16] John XXIII, "Mater et Magistra," nos. 75, 77, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1958-1981*, vol. 5, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 68.

[17] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 80.

[18] Ibid., 78-79.

> The remedy to the difficulty is in association, as we see it practiced in neighboring countries, either among great proprietors in order to guarantee the preservation of hereditary domains in their families, or between small proprietors in order to facilitate the improvement of the land by institutions of credit or mutual insurance societies.[19]

La Tour du Pin adds that the existence of corporations, as organic social organizations, would be a great threat to usurious practices. They will not, however, be concentrated in the State as in the case of socialism.[20]

In the only recent modern encyclical which addresses usury, Leo XIII takes issue with both usury[21] and unrestrained competition. Both of these are seen as key elements of capitalism by Leo XIII. In condemnatory tones, the pope states:

> Hence, by degrees it has come to pass that working men have been surrendered, isolated and helpless, to the hardheartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition. The mischief has been increased by rapacious usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different guise, but with like injustice, still practiced by covetous and grasping men.[22]

The pope refers to usury in harsh terms and recalls that it has been condemned several times by the Church in the past.[23] As far as he is concerned it is still under

---

[19] Ibid., 79.

[20] Ibid., 80.

[21] For the classic work on the Church's stance on usury, see: John Thomas Noonan, *The Scholastic Analysis of Usury* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957). Other useful studies which address the subject of interest and usury are the following: Thomas F. Divine, S.J., *Interest: An Historical and Analytical Study in Economics and Modern Ethics* (Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1959); Benjamin N. Nelson, *The Idea of Usury: From Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949); Bernard W. Dempsey, *Interest and Usury* (Washington, DC: American Council on Public Affairs, 1943); R.H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study* (New York: Harcourt Brace, and Company, 1926).

[22] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 3, 242.

[23] In the eighteenth century, Pope Benedict XIV quite unequivocably condemned usury on all accounts. See: Benedict XIV, *Vix pervenit,* no. 3, I & II.

condemnation. Nevertheless, Leo XIII may have a much more restrictive understanding of usury than La Tour du Pin. In describing usury, he uses the word "rapacious" which means "inordinately greedy" or "predatory." This seems to imply a very high rate of interest, leveled at vulnerable people with few means. From his point of view, La Tour du Pin clearly maintains that taking any interest whatsoever, even on a productive loan, is usury. It is clearly evident that the pope is condemning a narrow understanding of usury, viz. high rates of interest. On the other hand, it is not clear that he is condemning La Tour du Pin's very broad understanding of usury, viz. charging any interest at all, even at a very low rate.

Like La Tour du Pin, Pius XI also notes that there are problems associated with the limited liability of *sociétés anonymes* or corporate businesses. He mentions that such businesses hide under the cloak of limited liability, but their reduced accountability does not affect the consciences of those involved in the business. It gives rise to "sordid license." By hiding under a joint name, or anonymity, various kinds of frauds and injustices are perpetrated. Furthermore, certain business directors abuse their position when mal-administering the savings of those entrusted to them.[24] Although the pope does not call for these businesses to be restructured with unlimited liability as does La Tour du Pin, he does note the manifold problems arising from the character of their limited liability and anonymity.

---

[24] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno," no. 132, 436.

2. Liberty of Work

La Tour du Pin also states that capitalism[25] or the "freedom of work" leads to economic, moral, and political decline. The economic decline can be stopped by honesty in competition and the prosperity of trades. Capitalism is the system in the social economy which attempts to increase the return on capital by decreasing the cost of production. It accomplishes this by paying the cheapest price for manual labor and raw materials and using the minimal amount of quantity and quality of each of them in the finished product.[26] Once the product is made, however, someone else tries to make a similar, cheaper product with manual labor and raw materials of a lower quality.[27] In the end, it promotes shoddy work rather than the best product. It also leads to the further degeneration of the manual laborer by rewarding poor workmanship. Commenting on competition, La Tour du Pin remarks:

> Competition, it is said, is the soul of production, but it existed as well in the past, even with the corporative monopoly which, on the one side, did not permit the raising of the price above the just price, because the public authorities oversaw it, and on the other side, did not allow the decline of the product because the masters kept their hands on it. There was competition between masters of the same corporation to see who could deliver the best product with the same wages, the same costs for raw materials, and the same price. Everyone gained from this: the client was well served, the worker and the master had a secure condition.[28]

He also mentions that the "unlimited freedom of capital" has brought about the death of production on French soil by the capital emigrating to parts of the world where it can

---

[25] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 37.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

secure labor and raw materials at better prices.[29] In a prescient moment he comments that as paths of exchanges multiply, the market will be inundated with products by the most miserable of peoples.[30] He states, "The Chinese worker will become the best worker of both worlds because he has no other needs than those of a beast."[31] It is a commonplace that today most of the manufactured materials which make their way into the United States are today produced in China. It is also well known that Chinese workers are paid notoriously low wages and their work environment is often unsafe and unwholesome.

He next describes how the liberty of work leads to moral decline and subsequently to the destruction of the worker family. He states:

> The organization of the family is not able to resist the disorganization of the workshop where each of its members works in conditions which take no account of the rights and needs of the home.[32]

The conditions of the workplace do not respect the rights and needs of the home. But above all, the dignity of the father as the head of the family is not respected as positions of authority are respected in the workplace. He claims that laws can bring about respect for Sunday rest and provide preventative means to protect women and children from abuse. Nevertheless, he states that laws cannot bring about the moral discipline that is founded on the respect for the hierarchy in the family as in the workshop.[33] La Tour du

---

[29] Ibid., 37-38.

[30] Ibid., 38.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid., 39.

[33] Ibid.

Pin asserts:

> Alone the corporation is capable of maintaining the family father in his dignity altogether by assisting him in his responsibilities, and the family mother in her home by preserving it for her, and to prepare thus for the influences, morals, and practices of religion a shelter where they are able to usually prevail, that is to say, without which it is at the price of heroic efforts which will always be rare.[34]

La Tour du Pin's claim here seems to be that the corporation shelters the family, preventing the employment of the wife and the children and keeping them within the protective influences of the home. The young girls are not in an environment where their morals may be threatened. At the same time, the dignity of the father is sustained because he is the only bread winner in the family—there are no other monetary competitors with him within the family unit. In addition, Sunday rest allows the family the time and rest to rise up to contemplate God and practice their religion.

Immediately after discussing these matters, La Tour du Pin quotes Bishop von Ketteler from *The Worker Question and Christianity.*[35] The bishop states, "May God in his goodness soon raise up men who will introduce this fertile idea of productive associations on the soil of Christianity and there make them prosper for the salvation of the working classes."[36] La Tour du Pin sees his attempt to "reestablish" the corporative

---

[34] Ibid.

[35] This has also been translated as *The Labor Problem and Christianity* by Rupert Ederer earlier in the paper. The English title here is based on La Tour du Pin's more literal French translation of the German original. The German original is *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christenthum* and La Tour du Pin's French translation is that is *La Question ouvrière et le christianisme*.

[36] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 39.

regime as the fulfillment of the bishop's wishes.[37] It clearly follows that La Tour du Pin was influenced by the particular recommendations of Bishop von Ketteler in his aforementioned influential work as well as by *The Labor Movement and Its Goals in Terms of Religion and Morality*.[38]

Lastly, he investigates how it has lead to political decline. The corporative regime can arrest the political decline by providing a foundation for social reorganization "on the principle of the *possession d'état* for all and of the representation of all interests."[39] He then adds that if we want the people to become conservative, we must provide them with something to conserve.[40] Going further yet, he remarks that a stable political condition cannot be established on an unstable social condition, because the former is just the crown of the edifice of society.[41] He then distinguishes between the State and society and maintains that the State exists to preserve society. But, if society is in turmoil and members of society do not wish to solve its problems, then the State's mission is hopeless. Eventually, discontent wells up within the people and they begin to hate the State and wish to overturn it. This is how liberal anarchy leads to social

---

[37] Ibid.

[38] See pp. 135-138 of this dissertation which treats of Kettler's principal measures for alleviating the problems of the working class.

[39] Ibid., 40.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

despotism.[42] As Ketteler earlier pointed out, liberalism leads to socialism. According to La Tour du Pin, all three types of decadence can be arrested by instituting the corporative regime. Before examining the corporative regime itself, I will first consider La Tour du Pin's ideas on corporations and the role which they play in decentralization.

C. Corporations and Decentralization

1. The Role of Intermediate Bodies

In this section I will first examine intermediate bodies in general. In the next section, I will inspect a particular type of intermediate body, i.e. the corporation which plays such an important role in La Tour du Pin's social vision. This will also involve surveying the functions of the corporation. Then I will investigate La Tour du Pin's corporative regime and how this system creates an environment of decentralization.

As mentioned in Chapter 1 of this paper, the Revolution had destroyed many of the important social institutions within France and had contributed to a highly centralized administrative apparatus within the State. In order to understand La Tour du Pin's response to this work of "social demolition," it is important to discuss the role of mediating social institutions within society. Social thinkers often use the term "intermediate bodies" in reference to those institutions that mediate between the individual person and the State within society. As men participate as members of groups

---

[42] Ibid., 40-41.

bonds of solidarity are formed among them. These networks of ties prevent the individual from being socially isolated. Moreover, these intermediate bodies often act as a series of buffers[43] between the weak isolated individual and the powerful overarching State. Moreover, a large variety of healthy and well-embedded social bodies contributes to the decentralization of power.

Before examining La Tour du Pin's views on the corporation, a species of intermediate body, it would be helpful to define what an intermediate body is and also to provide some examples of the various sorts of bodies which exist. In his work, *Les corps intermédiaries*, Michel Creuzet asserts:

> Intermediate bodies are social groups, human groups, situated between the isolated individual (or the family, the basic unit) and the State.
>
> They are constituted either naturally, or by deliberate agreement in view of attaining a common end for the persons who compose them.[44]

There might be disagreement over whether the family itself is an intermediate body between the individual and the State or whether the family, being understood as the basic social unit, is at the opposite spectrum from the State, with larger social bodies intervening. That is immaterial. Although some such bodies are natural groupings of

---

[43] They are buffers or checks on the unbridled freedom of the individual from below as well as on the absolute power of the State from above.

[44] Michel Creuzet, *Les corps intermédiaries* (Martigny, Suisse: Édition des Cercles Saint-Joseph, 1963; repr., Paris: Club du livre civique, 1964), 23. Note that page references are to the reprint edition. This work by Creuzet is truly unique. In the first part of the work he reviews the various kinds of intermediate bodies which form part of man's social life. In the second part he examines the hierarchical order and auxiliary functions of such bodies. In the third part he investigates the role of the state and decentralization. In the fourth part he examines totalitarian systems. Lastly, in the fifth part he relates intermediate bodies to their role in the development of civilization.

persons and some are voluntary groupings of persons, they essentially exist to achieve a particular purpose or end. Each intermediate body strengthens social ties within it and wields an influence over its own members in its own proper sphere.[45] Properly constituted intermediate bodies will, *per accidens,* form buffers between the individual/family and the State.

Creuzet provides a scheme of five "species" of intermediate bodies; these should suffice to categorize all possibilities. There are local or territorial bodies, professional bodies, cultural bodies, religious bodies, and recreational bodies. First of all, local intermediate bodies include villages, parishes, towns, cities, cantons, counties, provinces, and dioceses. Secondly, professional intermediate bodies are comprised of professions, trades, guilds, trade unions, professional groups, and the like. Next, cultural intermediate bodies include schools, academies, musical societies, theatrical troupes, and evening courses, etc. Following this, there are religious intermediate bodies are comprised of the parish and the diocese as well as their attendant works of education, charity, and so forth. Finally, recreational intermediate bodies are groups devoted to matters of sport, tourism, leisure pursuits, and the like.[46]

True intermediate bodies do not devolve from the State. They are natural bodies which arise and develop organically from below on the initiative of their members. Recognizing this essential characteristic of intermediate bodies, Creuzet observes:

---

[45] Creuzet, *Les corps intermédiaries,* 23.

[46] Ibid.

> It is evident that these intermediate bodies—regions, provinces, municipalities, intermediate bodies, and syndicates—ought to be representative, that is to say, that they ought to grow as plants, from the bottom up, and not, conversely, to come down from top to bottom, controlled by the State, the majoritary party, the single party, or other organisms superior to the associations which ought to be representative. In this latter case there would no longer be true intermediate bodies, but simple branches of the dominant power, totally under its heel and thus, not representative.[47]

Like anything organic, these intermediate bodies must slowly develop over time and they must be autonomous from the State and independent of it.[48] Furthermore, their development must be inspired by and arise from the initiative of the members of these various communities.[49] Otherwise, such bodies are clearly not representative. If they are a mere appendage of the State, they do not represent the people as members of these communities, but rather the governing power of the State. In the end, this is not representation, but control. John XXIII, in *Mater et Magistra,* also concurs that these bodies must not be mere appurtenances of the State. Referring to the previous teaching of his predecessor, Pius XI, the pope states:

> This, he taught, necessitated an orderly reconstruction of society, with the establishment of economic and vocational bodies which would be autonomous and independent of the State.[50]

Creuzet goes on to say that the intermediate bodies are the natural bloom of social life.[51] As they grow, then, they eventually come to fruition as long as they are developing in a healthy social environment.

---

[47] Ibid., 93.

[48] Ibid., 90.

[49] Ibid.

[50] John XXIII, "Mater et Magistra," no. 37, 63.

[51] Creuzet, *Les corps intermédiaries,* 93.

According to Creuzet, it is one of the State's duties to create a healthy environment for intermediate bodies to blossom. He maintains:

> The State, thus, has for its aim aiding intermediate bodies, protecting and promoting their initiatives, but also integrating their activities in the highest unity, of the national good, indispensable to all.[52]

The goals of the State, then, include the creation of a healthy and secure atmosphere for the growth of intermediate bodies, furthering their work, and harmonizing them with the common good of the nation. Pius XI himself says:

> For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help to the members of the body social, and never destroy and absorb them.[53]

In his encyclical *Centesimus annus,* Pope John Paul II points out the important role which intermediate bodies play in society today. He declares:

> Apart from the family, other intermediate communities exercise primary functions and give life to specific networks of solidarity. These develop as real communities of persons and strengthen the social fabric, preventing society from becoming an anonymous and impersonal mass, as unfortunately often happens today.[54]

He notes that these bodies help strengthen social ties and bonds. He points out that today the individual is often caught between the State and the marketplace. He is merely seen as an object of state administration or as a producer and consumer of goods. Consequently, these varied intermediate bodies help contribute to society becoming "more personalized."[55] It is now appropos to turn to the corporation, a specific type of

---

[52] Ibid., 113.

[53] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno," no. 79, 428.

[54] John Paul II, *Centesimus annus*, no. 49, trans. Vatican Polyglot Press (Boston, MA: St. Paul Books & Media, 1991), 70.

[55] Ibid., no. 49, 70-71.

intermediate body which looms large in the thought of La Tour du Pin.

As professional intermediate bodies are chief desiderata within La Tour du Pin's view of society, I will restrict my attention to them in this paper. For this reason, corporations or guilds will be given prominent attention as they loom so large in the thought of La Tour du Pin.

2. The Corporation

Prior to discussing the corporation, it is important to define what La Tour du Pin means by a corporation. He himself acknowledges that precision of language is necessary so that confusion of ideas be avoided.[56] To that end, La Tour du Pin carefully defines the following three terms, viz. syndicate, corporation, and *corps d'état.* He comments:

> For the clarity of language, we call professional association or *syndicate* the society formed with the purpose of defending professional interests among people of the same state and the same condition;—*corporation*, the society which unites the diverse elements of the same profession, that is to say, its employers, its white-collar workers, and its blue-collar workers in a perfect society from a professional point of view; finally *corps d'état*, the ensemble of all the workshops where the same profession is carried out.[57]

The syndicate, then, can be either a workers association/trade union or an employers association. In the case of a corporation these two groups are brought together in one integral body. In a more clearly delineated description, La Tour du Pin states that the *corps d'état* "comprises all the individuals, all the workshops, and all the corporations

---

[56] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 385.

[57] Ibid.

exercising the same profession in the same circumscription."[58] Consequently, practitioners of the same profession who are in a trade union or who are unaffiliated with either a corporation or a trade union would still be included in the *corps d'état.* Thus, La Tour du Pin speaks of "the free corporation in an organized *corps d'état.*"

As mentioned in the previous section of this paper, intermediate bodies do not devolve from the State; they are natural bodies which exist in their own right and their development is rooted in the initiative of their members. Corporations, themselves, are a species of intermediate body. Therefore, all that was said of intermediate bodies also applies to corporations. Marcel Clément comments:

> However, the corporations cannot be conjured into existence merely by the State enacting the appropriate legislation. The essential thing is that they be composed of men who are conscious of the common aim which unites them and are determined to bring it to reality.[59]

In other words, true corporations cannot be created by state fiat. As earlier mentioned, such bodies created by the State are not representative bodies. They must organically grow from the bottom up under the inspiration of men who are attempting to realize the common aim of the group. Clément, continuing on, adds:

> Because of the fact that the professional corporation is a natural cell, it must come into being and develop essentially as the result of an internal dynamism and not of external direction.[60]

This is a key point and it corroborates what Creuzet said about intermediate bodies

---

[58] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 98.

[59] Marcel Clément, *The Social Programme of the Church*, vol.4, trans. Frank Macmillan (Saltcoats, Scotland: Approaches, 1984), 176.

[60] Ibid., 177.

generally. The corporation is a natural body. It does not devolve from the State. It comes into being through the dynamic initiative of a group of men pursuing a common aim in their profession. It grows from the bottom up.

Although La Tour du Pin does not treat of the origins of the corporation in detail, he does indicate his thoughts on the subject.[61] He seems to assume that the corporation exists in its own right; nowhere does he claim or intimate that the corporation devolves from the State. At the same time, he discusses the importance of the State creating a wholesome environment for corporations to develop. La Tour du Pin claims that the State should not determine the rules of corporations. It should, however, officially recognize the corporation's rules in order to maintain them as long as they are not averse to the public good. The State should also protect the corporation from material difficulties and harmful outside influences.[62] In addition, the State must go beyond merely preserving the corporation, but must rather promote it as well. The State should act with solicitude toward the corporation and play the role of "vigilant tutor" with the corporation until it reaches it maturity.[63]

In his shorter work, *Aphorismes de politique sociale*, La Tour du Pin maintains that the contemporary reformation of the various trades is basically a question of organization rather than of state legislation. Creating healthy conditions for the

---

[61] For La Tour du Pin's treatment of these matters, see pp. 306-307 of this dissertation.

[62] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 31.

[63] Ibid.

organization of labor and the autonomous management of its own affairs should be a chief concern of the State. La Tour du Pin points out that labor organization is dependent upon the association of the trades into corporations within a particular geographical area, according to the particular profession. The corporation must rest on a contract, not a mere contract of work, but rather a contract of association.[64] In other words, a corporation does not merely determine that an employee will be paid such and such by the employer for so many hours of a specified labor. There are duties and rules involved. These rules, which are common to the exercise of the trade, apply to both employer and employee. Having taken stock of La Tour du Pin's definition of the corporation and observed that a corporation must rest on a contract of association, I will now consider the chief functions of a corporation from the perspective of La Tour du Pin.

3. The Functions of the Corporation

La Tour du Pin then discusses three essential functions within the framework of the corporation. They are the following:

> The existence of a corporative patrimony participating in the prosperity of the industry;
>
> The authentication of the professional capacity of the owner-manager as of the worker;
>
> The representation of each involved part in the government of the whole.[65]

First of all, he begins by addressing the corporative patrimony or common property of the

---

[64] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 96.

[65] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 33.

corporation. La Tour du Pin points out that if property is to be regarded as one of the foundations of society, it follows that all members of society should have access to some property. The classification into property owners and into proletariats created by the modern system needs to be brought to an end. Since the working classes have trouble acquiring property, then some sort of collective property should be made available to them. As property is considered one of the fundamental principles of society, property must, in one form of another, be available to all. He states that this collective property of the workers should be an indivisible and inalienable corporative patrimony which participates in the prosperity of the industry. This corporative patrimony would provide, among other things, for workers' unemployment, pensions, security, and professional schooling; it is, therefore, indispensable. Both the owner and the worker should contribute to this fund. Workers would be bound by a commitment to work for a certain period of time before they could participate in the collective property. However this may be done, it should ensure that the corporate fund participates in the profits of the industry. This is a sort of "profit sharing." These practices would substitute a "social contract" between the owner and worker for the mere "work contract."[66] It would be a social contract precisely because it demonstrates that the industry or employer has duties and responsibilities to the worker besides mere payment of wages.

This would also give flesh to the idea of "Fraternity," one of the great catchwords

---

[66] Ibid., 33-34.

of the French Revolution. The "brotherhood of the French people" or the "brotherhood of humanity," was an alluring, but empty slogan. This "brotherhood of the workers," that is, men who are working in the same trade and within the same geographical circumscription, is both practical and concrete. For people united in the same social function are forming strong bonds and ties by working together, advancing one another, and taking care of each other in a true expression of solidarity.

Next, La Tour du Pin demonstrates his ingenuity as he extends the meaning of what might be considered property. Capital, he claims, is not the only type of property which a man may possess. He may also possess a *possession d'état*,[67] which, if it is guaranteed by law, has the character of property. This *possession d'état* must be determined by a *brevet*[68] or certificate of professional capacity. The certificate would contain certain privileges that are independent from what kind of work a man is doing at a particular moment. This is nothing other than the legal recognition of the possession of a certain trade mastery or skill level as a form of property. All agents of production would be required to have such a certificate. A man would have the opportunity to progress up the social ladder. Manual laborers, who are hired not for their skill, but for

---

[67] *Possession d'état* does not translate well into English. It can be literally translated as "the possession of an estate." This translation, however, is a bit awkward as it does not readily convey anything obvious in English. Instead, it is best understood as "mastery of the profession" or "mastery of the trade." This does not mean that the individual is a "master tradesman" in the sense used in the old guilds. It means that he has a certain degree of competency and knowledge within his particular trade.

[68] *Brevet* is best translated as "certificate of professional capacity." The nuances of the word might also include "license" or "diploma" as well.

their strength, would more and more be replaced with machines. Hence, it would be necessary for them to acquire skills which would be confirmed by a certificate of professional capacity and which, therefore, would continue to guarantee them work.[69] As production became more and more automated, the certificate of professional capacity would ensure that the skilled worker did not fall into unemployment for he would be continually acquiring new and useful skills in his particular line of work. Furthermore, the ownership of a *possession d'état* would also impede the dehumanization of the worker. Rather than performing the same, unthinking, and repetitious actions he would utilize his acquired skills in combination with his reason to perform his duties.

Insofar as the corporation guarantees the "mastery of the trade," it ensures that both employers and employees have proof of both skill and moral character to work as members of the corporation. Furthermore, the corporation preserves this property for the members' children by means of apprenticeships, scholarly grants, and *brevets.*

Finally, he notes that each involved part of a corporation should be represented in the government of the whole. Since production is the goal of an association of work, all parties and interests should be integrated so as to achieve its goals. La Tour du Pin distinguishes among three types of agents in most lines of work. Big industry is divided into capitalist, manager, and the manual laborer. Agriculture is divided into large proprietor, the farmer, and tenant farmer. Arts and trades are divided into master,

---

[69] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 34-35.

journeyman, and client. In their respective lines of work, all three types of agents ought to be represented in the same corporation.[70] Within the governing council of each corporation, there should be reciprocal interplay of the aforementioned three elements—each element should be reestablished as an "order" and each order represented by one vote.[71] La Tour du Pin, therefore, advocates corporations or mixed syndicates of owners and workers, rather than separate syndicates for both workers and owners. With separate syndicates of owners and workers, a problem enters the picture—all involved parts are not participating in the government of the whole. They are artificially split up and opposed to each other. Because an environment of class warfare is allowed to flourish, workers and owners regard each other as adversaries rather than esteem each other as colleagues working toward a common end.

As with other types of representation, representation within the context of the corporation refers to the ability of particular members to wield influence within it. According to La Tour du Pin, representation in the government of the corporation should be according to the order of social function, not according to the plurality of individuals involved.[72] In other words, some functions within the corporation should be given greater weight or influence in representation. Those who contribute more to the good of the corporation should have their representation weighted more heavily; those who

---

[70] Ibid., 36.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

contribute less to the good of the corporation should have their representation weighted more lightly; nevertheless, all involved members should have some influence.

Among other things, the corporation exists for the purpose of preserving the good customs of the trade which have developed over the years. For this reason, the corporation must have a "government" to ensure that both the rules and the practices of the trade are being followed by the members. This governing body of the corporation is called the corporative council; whereas in the past it was originally composed only of masters, La Tour du Pin notes that today the corporative council is open to workers, equal in number to the masters.[73] Although the corporative council is the governing body of the corporation and it is hierarchical, La Tour du Pin is quite open to allowing the workers to participate in the council itself. Although his view is not strictly democratic, it does allow the workers to be realistically represented in the governing body of the corporation. Anything concerning the common interest of the trade, such as contingency funds, relief funds, and the extension of credit pertains to the council. It has jurisdiction over any incorporated workshops.[74] The corporative council does for the individual workshops what the town council does for the individual homes. Therefore, the corporation should exercise the same function over its members that the town exercises over its inhabitants. Even to a greater degree ought the corporation to exercise its

---

[73] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 96.

[74] Ibid., 96-97.

functions, for it provides subsistence for the member and his family.[75] In short, the corporation ensures that the member is employed and, if difficulties arise, he and his family can draw on funds for subsistence. The corporation, therefore, plays a very important social role for it looks after the future of the trade and its good reputation as well as the needs of its members and their families. La Tour du Pin claims that his ideas on the constitution of corporations are not just another utopian scheme. The current situation, however, in which both the employee and employer are legally isolated, needs to change in the interest of social peace. Social legislation, therefore, must act as a support, rather than as a hindrance to the various benefits of social harmony.[76]

Drawing on Montesquieu's understanding of the mechanism of government, La Tour du Pin asserts that all governing bodies have executive, legislative and judiciary powers; therefore, the corporation, as a self-governing body, ought to contain these three powers.[77] Utilizing its legislative power, the corporation would be responsible for enacting the rules for the corporation. Exercising its judiciary power, the corporation would judge disputes between its own members. Finally, employing its executive power, the corporation would administer its own patrimony or communal property by delegates chosen from among its members.[78]

---

[75] Ibid., 97.

[76] Ibid., 97

[77] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 35-36.

[78] Ibid., 36.

4. –Comparative Analysis

As John Locke has a fairly optimistic view of human nature, he gives the individual person a very wide ambit of freedom. He does distinguish the natural liberty of man in the state of nature from the liberty of man within civil society. In the former case there are really no checks on his liberty except that he cannot destroy himself, nor can he "harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions."[79] In the latter case, his freedom is more restricted than in the state of nature because he is now subject to the legislative power, established, by consent. Locke, however, wants to underscore that even so, the liberty of man within civil society is still fairly uninhibited. He claims that man is not "under the dominion of any will, or restraint of any law, but what that legislative shall enact, according to the trust put in it."[80]

In no place does Locke make any clear judgment on the nature of intermediate bodies, such as guilds. Nevertheless, if we understand his view of liberty correctly, it would logically follow that he disapproves of them. According to Locke, a man is temporarily subject to the authority of his parents until "age and reason" free him from their bonds. In addition, he is also subject to the authority of the legislative power, established by consent. Those are the two limitations. Nowhere else does Locke state that a man is subject to the authority of any additional social bodies. For these would inhibit a man's liberty. Naturally, this would include guilds. Besides the temporary

---

[79] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, para. 6, 9.

[80] Ibid., para. 22, 17.

power of the parents, only the legislative power has some claim to his obedience. Therefore, with indirect proof we can conclude that Locke would be opposed to guilds and corporations because they place additional checks on man's liberty to do what he wants.

On the other hand, Jean-Jacques Rousseau does not hide his feelings on intermediate bodies. His animosity toward them is patent. Nevertheless, when discussing such social bodies, he does not use the word intermediate body, nor does he use the word guild. Although Rousseau believes in radical individualism, at the same time he is also an advocate of the absolute power of the State. In describing what should be the relations of individual members of the community between themselves, on the one hand, and the relations between the individual members and the State, on the other, Rousseau states:

> And this relationship should be as small as possible in regard to the former and as large as possible in regard to the latter, so that each citizen would be perfectly independent of all the others and excessively dependent on the city [state].[81]

Rousseau appears to be denying the social nature of man. In fact, he sees the State as the one society which brings men together. Individual friendships and private groups in which men form more localized bonds are anathema to Rousseau. For they distract men from giving their unswerving allegiance to the State. Aristotle asserted[82] that such

---

[81] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 2, ch. 12, 172.

[82] Although corporations did not exist in ancient Greece, Aristotle makes a similar observation on the prohibition of associations by tyrants. He writes of the successful tyrant thus: "In addition, it is possible: (1) to prohibit common meals, clubs, education, and anything of a like character—or, in other words, to adopt a defensive attitude against everything likely to produce the two qualities of mutual

conditions as Rousseau is proposing are the preconditions for tyranny. Roussellian thought leads down an odd, but interesting path. Whereas Rousseau is completely unconcerned with the absolute tyranny of the State, he is vitally concerned with the "petty tyrannies" of smaller intermediate social bodies. As the Maistre scholar Richard Lebrun notes:

> One of the implications of the traditional Christian doctrine of original sin is that the state, like every other human creation, always remains imperfect. Rousseau, denying original sin, could envisage an "ideal city" to which men could owe absolute loyalty.[83]

In Rousseau's mind the State has become god. Whereas in Christian thought man owes absolute loyalty and obedience to God,[84] in Rousseau's thought the State is substituted for God and, therefore, man's unqualified loyalty and obedience is transferred to the State. Aping the Christian maxim that "men ought to love their fellow men for Christ's sake," it is possible to deduce from Rousseau's thought that "men ought to love their fellow men for the State's sake." In the Roussellian vision, the only society that truly unites men is the political community. Partial societies, such as corporations, divide men's loyalties.

Labeling groups which mediate between the individual and the State as "partial

---

confidence and a high spirit; (2) to forbid societies for cultural purposes, and any gathering of a similar character, and to use every means for making every subject as much of a stranger as is possible to every other (since mutual acquaintance creates mutual confidence)…" Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Ernest Barker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 1313b 1-5, 218. Aristotle indirectly acknowledges, then, that a spirit of confidence and solidarity was brought about through associating men with one another.

[83] Richard A. Lebrun, introduction to *Against Rousseau: "On the State of Nature" and "on the Sovereignty of the People"*, by Joseph de Maistre (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), xxi.

[84] See: Acts 5: 29, RSV.

societies" and "intrigues," Rousseau claims that they thwart the general will.[85] In fact, these smaller societies or social bodies claim the primary loyalty of men, preventing them from considering the "general interest" on their own. As Rousseau relates it, these partial societies corrupt men by subverting their primary loyalty to the "general interest" and replacing it with fidelity to their "private interests.[86] According to him, the general will is unable to be well articulated in such a situation unless there remains "no partial society in the state and that each citizen make [sic] up his own mind."[87] Given Rousseau's hostility toward partial societies, he cannot tolerate guilds within his society. Acquiring a strong esprit de corps through the guilds to which they belong, working men would primarily focus on their private group interests at the expense of the general interest of the political community. When discussing the divided loyalties within the human heart, Christ said, "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon."[88] We could easily see Rousseau wholeheartedly agreeing with the first part of this admonition. Yet, in the latter part of the warning Rousseau might easily have substituted "You cannot serve the State and a faction."

Tocqueville, like La Tour du Pin, highlights the importance of intermediate

---

[85] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 2, ch. 3, 156.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Matthew 6:24, RSV.

bodies in society, although he is not an outright advocate of guilds. Like Aristotle and Plato, he realizes that tyrannies are not just found in the rule of one man or of a few men, but they are distinctly possible in the rule of the many—democracy can easily lead to the tyranny of the majority.[89] Consequently, although Tocqueville feels that democracy is here to stay with us in the modern world, he points out some of the shortcomings of both despotisms and democracies and how they propagate individualism. He has some very lucid observations on selfishness as a symptom of despotism and equality as a symptom of democracy. Realizing that separating men from their fellow men creates a fertile seedbed for tyranny, he relates:

> Despotism, which by its very nature is suspicious, sees in the separation among men the surest guarantee of its continuance, and it usually makes every effort to keep them separate. No vice of the human heart is so acceptable to it as selfishness: a despot easily forgives his subjects for not loving him, provided they do not love one another….He stigmatizes as turbulent and unruly spirits those who would combine their exertions to promote the prosperity of the community; and perverting the natural meaning of words, he applauds good citizens those who have no sympathy for any but themselves.[90]

Whereas selfishness creates barriers to keep men apart, Tocqueville notes that equality,[91] the quintessential value found in democratic nations, "places men side by side, unconnected by any common tie."[92] According to him, both selfishness and equality, promoted by despotism and democracy respectively, contribute powerfully to the lack of

---

[89] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 1, ch. 15, 270.

[90] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 2, ch. 4, 109.

[91] See pages 205-207 of this dissertation where Tocqueville's ideas on equality and its role in severing social bonds is treated.

[92] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 2, ch. 4, 109.

concern of man for his fellow man, thereby severing social bonds.[93] In short, they both contribute to individualism. As a democracy becomes more and more despotic, these values are reinforced and there remains nothing to check the tyranny of the majority. He mentions that the "absolute sovereignty of the majority" is the essence of democratic government. Commenting on this, he observes that there is nothing in democracies which is capable of stemming the irresistible power of the majority.[94] Tocqueville has no illusions about this uncircumscribed power. He maintains:

> Unlimited power is in itself a bad and dangerous thing. Human beings are not competent to exercise it with discretion. God alone can be omnipotent, because his wisdom and his justice are always equal to his power.[95]

This is especially the case in a legislature which has frequent direct election cycles. In such cases, the legislative body is constantly at the mercy of the whim of the majority.

In order to minimize the individualism propagated by selfishness, Tocqueville highlights the importance of fostering such intermediate bodies as political associations[96] and civil associations.[97] As solidarity among men is very weak in democratic countries it needs to be artificially propagated by such associations.[98] These will draw the citizen out

---

[93] Ibid.

[94] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 1, ch. 15, 264.

[95] Ibid., 270.

[96] See: Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 1, ch. 12, 198-205.

[97] See: Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 2, ch. 5-7, 114-128.

[98] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, bk. 2, ch. 5, 117.

of his own private sphere and into the public sphere where men voluntarily learn how to work with and help their fellow men. In addition, the tyranny of the majority will be avoided by the multiplication and strengthening of associations. Through political associations, citizens in the minority demonstrate their numerical strength, thus depreciating the moral authority of the majority. In addition, they also stimulate rivalry with the majority and lead to the formulation of arguments by which the majority can be brought over to their way of thinking.[99] Tocqueville observes that associations "stand in lieu of those powerful private individuals whom the equality of conditions had swept away."[100] As a matter of fact, he mentions that governments view powerful political associations in the modern age with the same regard that medieval monarchs viewed powerful vassals.[101] They act, therefore, as checks on the absolute power of the majority in the same manner that the great nobles of the past exercised restraint on the absolute power of sovereigns. Thus, these intermediate bodies aid in dissipating the selfish nature of the individuals composing them as they act in common with their fellows in pursuit of a common objective. At the same time it also restricts the exercise of the absolute authority of the State.

Tocqueville does directly examine guilds as well. He contrasts the high quality commodities produced by guilds during the climate of privilege with the imperfect

---

[99] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America,* vol. 1, ch. 12, 203.

[100] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America,* vol. 2, bk. 2, ch. 5, 117.

[101] Ibid., bk. 2, ch. 7, 126.

commodities produced today in the climate of the "liberty of work." He mentions that in an age of privilege, not all are allowed to enter into every profession. In aristocratic nations all those who practice a particular trade become segregated into a distinct class. It is made up of families who know each other well and eventually establish a strong corporate pride.[102] There is a certain esprit de corps among the various members on account of the tight professional bonds they share with one another. Because of this solidarity, they look out for each other and show concern for each other's needs. In examining the outlook of such guild members, Tocqueville relates:

> In a class or guild of this kind each artisan has not only his fortune to make, but his reputation to preserve. He is not exclusively swayed by his own interest or even by that of his customer, but by that of the body to which he belongs; and the interest of that body is that each artisan should produce the best possible workmanship. In aristocratic ages the object of the arts is therefore to manufacture as well as possible, not with the greatest speed or at the lowest cost.[103]

In other words, the guild member's primary loyalty is toward the guild itself. He is habituated to unselfish behavior by realizing on a daily basis that he has duties to this corporate body, the guild. His own desires and his customers' desires do not sway him; they are repressed. Not looking for a quick profit with low cost materials and speedy production methods, he does his work according to established rules of the trade with the materials prescribed by the guild. His goal is to produce high quality craftsmanship with the best materials possible.

In contrast to this, Tocqueville surveys the working situation in the democratic

---

[102] Ibid., bk. 1, ch. 11, 50.

[103] Ibid.

age when anyone can enter into any profession. He states:

> When, on the contrary, every profession is open to all, when a multitude of persons are constantly embracing and abandoning it, and when its several members are strangers, indifferent to and because of their numbers hardly seen by each other, the social tie is destroyed, and each workman, standing alone, endeavors simply to gain the most money at the least cost. The will of the customer is then his only limit.[104]

In such a situation individualism becomes rabid. For workers have no duties and responsibilities to a common corporate body. Because these tradesmen lack professional standards with regard to production processes and quality of materials, their work becomes shoddy. Even if they did have such standards, there is no one to enforce them. As tradesmen require no formal training, professions are open to all and workers enter a trade and leave a trade as they wish. They have not had to make a costly time investment through an apprenticeship. Seeking to gain the highest profit with the least cost to themselves, they look only to their own interest and that of the customer. Last, but not least, they have no concern for their fellow workers in the same trade. No social ties exist among fellow workers; therefore, they lack an esprit de corps. They could care less about the needs of other workers in the same trade. If it resulted in a greater profit to themselves, they may well have no qualms about running them out of business.

In his encyclical *Humanum Genus*, Pope Leo XIII underscores the importance of guilds in the lives of workingmen. Nevertheless, he highlights the confessional character of these organizations. They are professional bodies in that they protect the temporal and moral interests of the workers. At the same time, they resemble confraternities insofar as

---

[104] Ibid., 50-51.

they are under the guidance of religion.[105] It is interesting that Leo recalls the guilds of the past, but he does not turn back the clock of progress. He states that the guilds of the past "may now be used as a pattern and form of something similar."[106] In other words, he is calling for the establishment of modern professional bodies to aid the workers in the way that the guilds succored them in the past.

In *Rerum Novarum,* Leo XIII devotes a considerable portion of the work to the importance of men forming associations. Utilizing the scriptures, the pope recounts:

> The consciousness of his own weakness urges man to call in aid from without. We read in the pages of holy Writ: "It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up." [Eccle. 4:9-10]. And further: "A brother that is helped by his brother is like a strong city. [Prov. 18:19].[107]

In addition, he also uses natural grounds to defend the right of association. Noting that private societies exist within the State and are separately part of the State, Leo maintains that their existence cannot be absolutely prohibited by the State.[108] He does, however, make allowance for the State to outlaw associations "which are evidently bad, unlawful, or dangerous to the State."[109] In defending man's right to enter into society with impeccable logic, Leo affirms:

---

[105] Leo XIII, "Humanum Genus," no. 35, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903,* vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 100.

[106] Leo XIII, "Humanum Genus," no. 35, 100.

[107] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 50, 254.

[108] Ibid., no. 51, 254.

[109] Ibid., no. 52, 254.

> For, to enter into a "society" of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State has for its office to protect natural rights, not to destroy them; and, if it forbid its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence, for both they and it exist in virtue of the like principle, namely, the natural tendency of man to dwell in society.[110]

Leo then claims that the right to associate or to form societies, as long as they are not injurious to the common good, is supported both by Scripture and the nature of man. It therefore follows that political theories and contemporary States which refuse men the right of association are, on that account, manifestly unjust.

Demonstrating great flexibility in non-essential matters, Pope Leo refuses to advocate only true guilds or mixed syndicates. He also shows support for trade unions or workers syndicates. Leo speaks of associations of "workmen alone" and "workmen and employers together."[111] As mentioned in *Humanum Genus,* he demonstrates his willingness to support new associations appropriate to the age. Leo also reaffirms the confessional nature of these associations. He stresses the importance to "look first and before all things to God." In particular, he stresses that workingmen should be given religious instruction, urged to worship God, exhorted to love the Church and obey its precepts, and finally, to frequent the sacraments.[112] He then recommends that members within the society have peaceful relations among themselves and that all offices should be focused on the common good. In particular, the "common funds must be administered

---

[110] Ibid., no. 51, 254.

[111] Ibid., no. 49, 254.

[112] Ibid., no. 57, 256.

with strict honesty" so that all members receive the assistance that is their due.[113] Committees, made up of qualified individuals, should be appointed to oversee disputes. The society should ensure that its members receive continuous employment. Lastly, a common fund should be created to help all members in time of need, "not only in the cases of accident, but also in sickness, old age, and distress." [114]

In his encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno,* Pius XI discusses the vital importance of associations within society. In his day the ravages of individualism had taken a heavy toll on the rich and highly developed social life of the past. He underscores that the numerous associations of the past were the mainspring of this healthy vibrant social life. Now he says, "there remains virtually only individuals and the State."[115] Furthermore, he points out how this development has been injurious to the State itself. For it cannot focus on its primary duties and do them well. The State now finds itself overwhelmed with tasks, duties, burdens which numerous and varied associations had overseen in the past.[116]

By the time of Pius XI's papacy, matters had changed drastically and trade unions, through the syndicalist movement, had resorted to violence and aggravated the class struggle. In order to preclude the class struggle, Pius advocated corporations that

---

[113] Ibid., no. 58, 256.

[114] Ibid.

[115] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno," no. 78, 427.

[116] Ibid., no. 78 and 80, 427-428.

were composed of delegates from both worker syndicates and owner syndicates. They would be able to reconcile their interests and work toward a common end.[117] Like La Tour du Pin, Pius also advocated corporations. Nevertheless, instead of the corporations of La Tour du Pin that included both workers and owners, Pius' "corporation" would be a mixed council of delegates from both workers' syndicates and owners' syndicates. It would, however, still prevent the class struggle which the social Catholics wished to avoid. Like La Tour du Pin, Pius wished for the syndicates to be given a "juridical personality" such that they could govern their members as well as conduct labor agreements for them.[118]

In the post-modern era today, we have government regulatory bodies that provide oversight and establish standards for processes, quality of materials, safety regulations, and work environment. These are enforced by State bureaucratic controls. Nevertheless, this often brings the State into matters that are not its proper sphere. As this leads to centralization of State power, such an approach would be anathema to a man like La Tour du Pin. He certainly accepted state intervention when necessary, but only when necessary. If supervisory matters could be performed by lower level social bodies such as corporations, then they should be overseen at that level. To that end, he wanted corporations to be legally recognized, autonomous, public bodies. The State would have to sanction this state of affairs before it became a reality.

---

[117] Ibid., no. 93, 430.

[118] Ibid., no. 92, 430.

If corporations were officially recognized in public law, then corporations could provide oversight and establish standards for work processes, quality of materials, safety regulations, work environment, job security, insurance, etc. This is what the guilds of the past accomplished. This would aid decentralization by removing the State from matters over which it does not have proper competence. Greater flexibility would be exercised and personal attention would be given in many matters. For oversight would be accomplished on a human scale with a human face. Both employers and workers would work together to provide input and decisions on pertinent matters, such as customs of the trade, work materials, working conditions, insurance, etc. These decision makers would have a certain expertise in their particular line of work. All in all, it would be cheaper, more professional, and more efficient (less bureaucratic paperwork) to provide corporations with autonomy and binding decision making power in their own proper sphere. As such a society would act in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, decentralization of power would result.

In John Paul II's encyclical *Centesimus Annus*, La Tour du Pin also finds support for his novel idea of property, i.e., the *possession d'état*, or a mastery of the trade. The pope states:

> In our time, in particular, there exists another form of ownership which is becoming no less important than land: the possession of know-how, technology, and skill. The wealth of the industrialized nations is based much more on this kind of ownership than on natural resources.[119]

As a matter of fact, the pope claims that this kind of property is more valuable

---

[119] John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, no. 32, 45.

type of property than natural resources for people living in modernized, industrialized nations. This is clearly shown by the increasing number of licenses, degrees, and certificates which are offered by institutes, colleges, and universities today. In the fields of business and computer science, this is dramatically seen. Having examined corporations themselves and attended to their functions, it is important now to study how they would contribute to the organization of society.

5. The Corporative Regime: The Path to Decentralization

Examining the corporative regime or the corporative system is essential for contemplating La Tour du Pin's vision for the organization of society. Whereas the corporative regime refers to "society organized by social function," the representative regime is merely the "extension of the corporative regime into political life." After examining La Tour du Pin's views on corporations and prior to looking directly at the representative regime, it is critical to focus on the essential characteristics of the corporative regime.[120]

First of all, La Tour du Pin addresses certain rights which need to be recognized in order to serve as a basis for the corporative regime. This involves the recognition of the proper right to each member of the association, to the association within the State,

---

[120] The French word *régime* could also be translated into English as "system." Nevertheless, I will use the English word "regime" throughout the paper.

and to the State with regard to the association.[121] According to La Tour du Pin, conservatives prize the corporative regime

> because of the character of stability which it communicates to institutions of which it is the foundation and which seem to them alone able to secure social justice and peace.[122]

The particular system of government within a State must look after the common good and attend to the welfare of all classes within the population. La Tour du Pin indicts the liberal regime of his own time for failing to protect the rights of the working class. This was exemplified by the fact that there was no guarantee that the laborer would be assured fixed conditions of labor either in the present or in the future.[123] No stable form of government could be firmly established if the individual workers, a large majority of the population, are bordering on the threat, if not the reality, of unemployment. The liberal regime has displayed its inability to protect the rights of the worker. La Tour du Pin states that if you wish the people to be conservative, "it is necessary to give them something to conserve."[124] Liberalism's failure to do this clearly disqualifies it.

La Tour du Pin points out that a stable political order cannot be erected onto an unstable social order. As the State is the exterior form of society, when discontent and hatred wells up in the hearts of the people against the prevailing unjust social order, they

---

[121] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 29.

[122] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes*, 19.

[123] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 30.

[124] Ibid., 40.

take it out on the State and attempt to overthrow it.[125] The social evolution then passes from liberal anarchy to despotic socialism. They are two phases of one and the same malady, born of the Revolution.[126] At any rate, La Tour du Pin concludes, "Liberalism has engendered socialism by the logic of its principles and by the reaction against its practices."[127]

On the other hand, within the socialist regime, La Tour du Pin observes that the rights of the owners were not secured. In order to be successful, all enterprises need at least one overseer. Within a socialist regime, the professional mastery and security of the employers will not be secured?[128] Socialism, therefore, does not succeed in protecting the rights of the proprietary class. It too is disqualified for that reason.

After his criticisms of liberalism and socialism, La Tour du Pin makes his bid for the corporative regime. He claims that it alone assures the proper right to each individual. Nevertheless, he admits that there is not one type of right for all, but diverse rights for those with different occupations. Only in the corporative regime, he says, is there an "equal respect of diverse rights and it is there the basis of every social order worthy of the name."[129] Within the corporative regime, these various rights are not

---

[125] Ibid.

[126] Ibid.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid., 30.

[129] Ibid.

weapons to use against one another, but a means of protecting the interests of everyone, building strong social ties, uniting everyone in social harmony and, ultimately, promoting the common good.[130]

Another characteristic right within the corporative regime is the right of association within the State. La Tour du Pin clarifies that the corporation is not just a mere private society, but is a social institution with a fixed place in the town and in the State.[131] He then addresses whether corporations should be free or obligatory. Free corporations, he claims, are unable to exist in the current climate of unbridled competition without further protection than just the basics of the common law. Obligatory corporations, on the other hand, cannot be enacted by decree or they will not be spontaneous organisms, but rather appendages of a bureaucratic mechanism.[132] La Tour du Pin recognizes that corporations must begin as free organisms. Drawing on a concrete example, he points out that Austrian legislation has given special privileges to already existing free corporations in order that they are not stifled by dishonest competition. He claims that such a special privilege is necessary for the development of free corporations. Nevertheless, this does not establish a monopoly, for this new jurisdiction over competition is given only to contain it within just limits and in the interest of social peace. Although La Tour du Pin argues that corporations must begin as

---

[130] Ibid.

[131] Ibid.

[132] Ibid.

free, he asserts that eventually they will become obligatory by force of circumstances; moreover, it is necessary for them to become mandatory if they are to exercise a political function.[133] As we shall see, corporations play a very important political role within La Tour du Pin's representative regime.

Finally, the rights of the State with regard to association must be laid out. La Tour du Pin claims that the corporation is like a town, even a "state within the State."[134] As the corporation is bound to the State in a moral contract, this involves mutual privileges and duties. He maintains that the State should not dictate the rules of corporations, but it should officially recognize the corporation's rules in order to maintain them as long as they are not averse to the public good. The State should also protect the corporation from material difficulties and noxious outside influences.[135] In addition, the State must go beyond merely preserving the corporation, but must rather promote it as well.[136] To this end, the public power or State must act as a "vigilant tutor" to the corporation. Acting on its behalf with solicitude, the State should provide for the corporation whatever the latter is incapable of providing for itself. Moreover, the State should also look to the future of its "pupil" when it attains maturity and is capable of

---

[133] Ibid., 30-31.

[134] Ibid., 31.

[135] Ibid.

[136] This is similar to what La Tour du Pin said about the Church. See pp. 251-252 of this dissertation. The State should not merely protect and preserve the Church and corporations, but the State should also positively promote both of them.

standing on its own two feet. At that time the State will promulgate only those laws which will contribute to the coordination of the new forces released by the now mature corporations within the ensemble of all the social and political institutions.[137] Like Bonald, La Tour du Pin is interested in promoting the "freedom of groups," in this case the "freedom of corporations."

In continuing his discussion of the rights of the State, he distinguishes between two different ways in which the State might carry out its duties. This involves distinguishing between "governing" a country and "administering" it on a national level. La Tour du Pin lays out why governing is beneficial and administering is noxious. In a State which is governed, for instance, the elements regulate themselves within the framework of the law.[138] In such a case, the public power might empower the local or regional governments to carry out responsibilities appropriate[139] to their level of social function. This organic governance gives a wide berth to geographical diversity and is, therefore, both original and flexible. Administering, on the other hand, does not account for any local or regional diversities and needs. All regions and locales within the State are subjected to the same inflexible and unoriginal regimentation. It follows, therefore, that the government which administers is, by its very nature, absolutist for it attempts to

---

[137] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 31.

[138] Ibid.

[139] This intimates what will later be referred to as the principle of subsidiarity.

do everything and ends up doing nothing well.[140] In special cases, however, if a regional government cannot carry out its responsibilities effectively, then the sovereign power of the State, overseeing the common good, would have the right to carry out these duties.

If the social bodies within a nation carry out the duties appropriate to their sphere of competence, decentralization of power should be the natural result. Intermediate bodies would then act as a check on unbridled liberty from below as well as on tyrannical authority from above. If these intermediate bodies are abolished or are not allowed to act in their spheres of competence, then no buffers will exist between the State and the individual. A situation of extremes will naturally follow. Individuals will more and more attempt to exercise a chaotic and unbridled freedom. In order to establish social order, the State will exercise a more comprehensive and stifling authority.

As La Tour du Pin recognizes that man's nature is affected by original sin, he asserts that men must be constrained, not merely persuaded, to be just.[141] It follows from this that one cannot give individuals below unbridled freedom, nor can the authorities of the State above be given absolute power. This will clearly lead to either an abuse of freedom or an abuse of authority. In this matter, La Tour du Pin is much more realistic[142]

---

[140] See: Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno,* no. 78.

[141] See pp. 208-210 of this dissertation for a treatment of La Tour du Pin's idea of original sin.

[142] This exemplifies that freedom needs to be rooted in truth. The truth in this case is the truth concerning man's nature, which is wounded by original sin. This important truth about man needs to be taken into account in order to realize a just and practical form of government. This idea of truth being the source of liberty was also emphasized by Keller. See pp. 91, 93-94 of this dissertation.

than Locke or Rousseau. According to the Catholic Church, man is not born free and good. He is born a slave to sin. This is the truth about man's nature. In Locke's case, because he believes man is born good, he maintains that there should be a minimum of checks on his freedom. Government should be extremely limited. This can often result in an abuse of power on behalf of the powerful and wealthy while the State stands on the sidelines unwilling to intervene and check their abuse of freedom. The result is Lockean liberalism.

On the other hand, Rousseau also believes that men are born good, but he also maintains that the people are sovereign. As the general will articulates the peoples' wishes, it is always right. The government by the people, therefore, can "force men to be free."[143] This obviously leads to an abuse of authority by the State which acknowledges that the majority is always right. Once again, the truth about man's nature is denied. The consequence of this is Roussellian socialism.

As La Tour du Pin understands man's nature to be corrupted, he cannot condone any government in which either freedom or authority is absolute and unchecked. The intermediate groups within society, i.e., the multitude of various social bodies (especially corporations), which he advocates, help check the abuses of liberty arising from the individual below as well as limit the authority arising from above by the State. Although La Tour du Pin himself does not directly make this connection, it follows that the

---

[143] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 1, ch. 7, 150.

interposition of these intermediate bodies between the State and the individual helps offset abuses which follow from man's fallen nature. These intermediate social bodies discipline the freedom of individuals and aid in political decentralization.

One might consider how intermediate bodies concretely act as checks on the excessive or irresponsible use of an individual's freedom. For instance, if a man is rooted in a particular place and sees himself as a member of a group, he will be conscious of the rights of others within that group[144] and his duties toward them. Consequently, the mere consciousness of being a member of a group will often act as a check on one's freedom. In addition, there will often be rules which apply to members of a group—these too will act as limits on the member's freedom. Insofar as the individual is rooted in a particular place and the local people know each other well, this too will act as a deterrent to an unbridled use of his freedom. A "sense of shame" will often be enough to restrict irresponsible freedom if one sees oneself as a member of a tight-knit community. On the other hand, an uprooted individual, who lives anonymously in a large city and regards himself as an isolated individual, is in a position to use his freedom quite irresponsibly. The reason is quite clear. As he does not regard himself as a member of any group, he is not consciously aware that he has any concrete duties to anyone else nor is he particularly aware of the rights of others. In addition, as he dwells in a large population center, he is anonymous and his actions are not limited by the shame that he would encounter in a

---

[144] Examples of such groups might be a family, a parish, a town, a corporation or a union.

smaller, more rooted population center where everyone knows each other.

One might also inquire how intermediate bodies can act as checks on the excessive or abusive use of authority. For instance, in a particular neighborhood of a city, there may be a lack of strong paternal authority. The families are not well disciplined or well ordered. Perhaps it may be that there are a number of divorced families where paternal authority is completely lacking. It may also be that the fathers work long hours at jobs far away from home and are disconnected with the life of the family. In such situations, it is a distinct possibility that a number of teenage males might regularly get intoxicated and drive recklessly on the city streets. Others might rob small stores to gain extra spending money, whereas others yet might deal drugs or engage in gratuitous violence. In any case, order is not being maintained over these young men by the proper authorities, the fathers of the family. Therefore, it is imperative for the town authorities to get involved. They may decide to implement a curfew on the neighborhood or they may increase the number and regularity of the police who patrol the neighborhood. As a result, the people in the neighborhood lose some of their freedom in the interest of security. Nevertheless, this increase of town authority and loss of freedom could have been avoided. If the fathers of the families had done their job well—they watched over their childrens' behavior and disciplined them appropriately—the higher level town authorities would have had no reason to get involved in the first place.

La Tour du Pin is not an enemy of the State. He feels that the State does have an important role to play, but it must be restricted to its proper sphere. If the lower level

social bodies are unable to do their job, then the State does have the right to step in and correct the situation in the interest of the common good. La Tour du Pin reminds his readers that it is important to distinguish national legislation from national administration. National legislation has always played an important role in the development of civilization and it should not be confounded with the bureaucratic centralization which derives from national administration.[145] La Tour du Pin, therefore, asserts that the State should intervene to support the interests of the working class with national legislation, when necessary. In the case of an inundation of foreign goods, the State must protect the market out of economic interests and protect the national labor out of social interests. He proposes a fixed customs tariff applied by the State rather than tariff wars, thereby defining himself as a moderate protectionist, but certainly no advocate of free trade. Insofar as the State is responsible for the common good, it must ensure the stability of the market as well as the job security of the working class.[146]

La Tour du Pin even goes a bit further. He observes that Europeans have often waged wars to open markets in other countries for products which are either physically or morally harmful. The opium trade in China is a case in point. Rather, he claims, would it not be more Christian to wage wars in order to protect humanity from being exploited by the greed of the few opportunists? La Tour du Pin rightly condemns the use of war to push noxious or deleterious substances down foreign peoples' throats for commercial

---

[145] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 31.

[146] Ibid., 32.

profit. However, he is on shakier ground with his second comment. Since he is an aristocratic warrior, it is certainly understandable why La Tour du Pin would take such a chivalrous attitude to weaker classes whom he sees unjustly exploited. This war or "crusade" is his knee-jerk reaction to righting wrongs the "old-fashioned" way. Nevertheless, one might prudently ask whether or not undertaking such a war meets the criteria for the just war doctrine. Is this really the last resort? Might not economic sanctions or diplomatic sanctions work better?

In reflection, he notes that there is not only a black slave trade, but a white slave trade as well—it is found within various nineteenth century European sweatshops.[147] When the State protects the national work, it creates a national solidarity among the workmen; only this national solidarity can bring about a solidarity of the individual workshops which is a necessary underpinning for the corporative regime.[148]

6. –Comparative Analysis

Whereas Leo XIII says nothing about a corporative regime in *Rerum novarum*, Pius XI does broach the topic. While discussing the reconstruction of the social order, he states:

> But complete cure will not come until this opposition has been abolished and well-ordered members of the social body are constituted in which men may have their place, not according to the position

---

[147] Ibid.

[148] Ibid.

> each has in the labor market but according to the respective social functions which each performs.[149]

The pope is here stating that society needs to be restructured, because the labor market has become a battlefield between the classes in which society is being destroyed.[150] In order to avoid this catastrophe, social bodies need to be established and organized within society, such that men will then have their place in society determined by the social function which they have, not the wage or salary which they earn. His thought here on the reorganization of the social order very closely resembles La Tour du Pin's idea of the corporative system. Both men would like to see society reorganized on the basis of social function. Pius even adds that these autonomous guilds or corporations are, "if not essential, at least natural to civil society."[151] When discussing the common interests of industries, Pius "almost" uses the term "representation of interests" like La Tour du Pin. He says:

> It is easily deduced from what has been said that the *interests* common to the whole Industry or Profession should hold first place in these guilds. The most important among these *interests* is to promote the cooperation in the highest degree of each industry and profession for the sake of the common good of the country. [152]

The pope is stressing that those interests which are common to all workers in a particular industry or profession should be given precedence before all others. In particular, the chief interests are those which entail the participation of a particular industry or

---

[149] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno," no. 83, 428.

[150] Ibid.

[151] Ibid.

[152] Ibid.

profession in the common good of the country. This is an indirect condemnation of those modern corporations which have no loyalty toward any particular country. These entities will move from one country to another in order to find a source of cheap labor or to avoid high taxation. Moreover, for a handsome profit, they may be willing to place their own nation's security at risk by selling weapons and other very sensitive technologies to its enemies. Their loyalty is to mammon. They could care less about the common good.

In explicating the principle of subsidiary function, Pope Pius XI states:

> As history abundantly proves, it is true that on account of changed conditions many things which were done by small associations in former times cannot be done now save by large associations. Still, that most weighty principle, which cannot be set aside or changed, remains fixed and unshaken in social philosophy: Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do. For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help to the members of the body social, and never destroy and absorb them.
>
> The supreme authority of the State ought, therefore, to let subordinate groups handle matters and concerns of lesser importance, which would otherwise dissipate its efforts greatly. Thereby the State will more freely, powerfully, and effectively do all those things that belong to it alone because it alone can do them: directing, watching, urging, restraining, as occasion requires and necessity demands. Therefore, those in power should be sure that the more perfectly a graduated order is kept among the various associations, in observance of the principle of "subsidiary function," the stronger social authority and effectiveness will be the happier and more prosperous the condition of the State.[153]

When higher level associations attempt to handle matters which are more appropriate to lower level associations, injustice is often the result. For reasons of expediency, a higher level association is wont to treat all such matters in a boilerplate fashion, i.e., in the same inflexible manner. It will also be often composed of a cumbersome and inefficient bureaucracy. On the contrary, a lower level association will be more apt to make fine

---

[153] Ibid., nos. 79 & 80, 428.

distinctions and be more flexible in carrying out its duties. It will have, if you will, a more personal touch.[154]

If the principle of subsidiarity is followed by States, then decentralization of power will naturally arise over time. The State, in this case, will focus on its proper duties, unencumbered by burdens and responsibilities which can more effectively be carried out by lower level associations. This will lead to a strong healthy social life within society as more and more people are concretely participating in social life on a regular basis.[155] People will be apt to go out of themselves and think of others. Power will be decentralized throughout society as more and more people participate in making decisions and carrying out duties and responsibilities via intermediate social bodies. People will be jealous of their responsibilities and begin to regard the State with a jaundiced eye if it dares attempt to interfere with their responsibilities. This will lead to a climate of freedom and a well balanced government.

Nevertheless, if all the lower level associations have been abolished or atrophied, then the State will ineffectively carry out both its own proper duties as well many other duties for which it is unfit. In such a situation few people will participate in the social life of the country and they will be more inclined to just look after themselves, thus bringing about a full-scale decay of social life. This will lead to even greater

---

[154] For example, people who are destitute, sick, and homeless would rather be taken care of by Mother Teresa's Missionaries of Charity than by the impersonal United States Agency for International Development. This former practices charity with a human face.

[155] Kettler has insights which are similar to this. See pp. 125-126 of this paper.

centralization of power as there will remain no lower level social bodies capable of carrying out responsibilities appropriate to their level. Everyone will naturally look to the State to take care of all duties and responsibilities; nevertheless, their freedom will be lost. This is the road to socialism and the path to serfdom.

Commenting on the principle of the subsidiary function, as found in paragraphs 79-80 of *Quadragesimo Anno*, E. F. Schumacher states:

> The higher level must not absorb the functions of the lower one, on the assumption that, being higher, it will automatically be wiser and fulfill them more efficiently. Loyalty can grow only from the smaller units to the larger (and higher) ones, not the other way around—and loyalty is an essential element in the health of any organization.[156]

As an illustration of what Schumacher is saying, the father of a family is going to be much wiser in apportioning his inheritance to his heirs than the State. He personally knows the capacities and gifts of each of his children. The State has no knowledge of such matters. One tends to be loyal to those whom one really knows. One knows the members of ones family, the neighborhood, the town, the parish, the workplace and so on. It is easy to see how one can organically build upon these smaller loyalties to develop middle level loyalties to a region or province, to a diocese, or to a particular profession in the wider arena. One could further develop even higher level loyalties to a State or the Catholic Church, and so on. On the other hand, one might ask how often a governor becomes loyal to a particular town, a bishop to a particular parish, or a king to a particular province. As loyalties grow from the bottom up and not from the top down, it

---

[156] E. F. Schumacher, *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1989), 260.

is vitally necessary to have many layers of intermediate bodies so that the "petty" loyalties can develop, thereby securing a healthy and vibrant social life.

D. The Representative Regime

1. The Critique of the Parliamentary Regime

La Tour du Pin's views on the nature of the representative regime itself and the manner in which it operates will be the focus of this section of the paper. The concentration here will be primarily on politics. In turn, I will consider his views of the parliamentary regime, the nature of the State and the role of monarchy, the necessary conditions for true representation, the corporative model of representation, and the implementation of the representative regime.

La Tour du Pin's organic approach of inculcating true political representation throughout the country as well as his exposition of the State's role in the governance of the country will be of particular concern. Prior to discussing these matters, however, it is important to survey La Tour du Pin's critique of the liberal parliamentary regime which held sway over France in his own time. For, locating the evils of the parliamentary regime will enable La Tour du Pin to focus on what are the critical elements of the corporative regime.

In his article "Le parlementarisme, voilà l'ennemi!," La Tour du Pin's censure of the contemporary parliamentary government in France is scathing. He states that it is

absolutist, irresponsible, and incompetent. Parliament is absolutist, because once a law has been passed, in due form, nothing can stop it from going into effect. There are no checks on Parliament's power. On the contrary, prior to the Revolution, there were checks on royal power. The *Parlement*[157] of the *ancien régime* could refuse to register laws and the former *États* or Estates could use such a situation as an opportunity to withhold tax subsidies.[158] In such a situation, the *Parlements* and the *États* acted as something of a check on the absolutism of the monarch. Such a check is wanting in the nineteenth century. La Tour du Pin was opposed to a monistic concept of the State, whether it was that of Louis XIV or the contemporary parliamentary government.

He also considered the contemporary government irresponsible, because the deputies who are elected to the chamber are not permanent members, but have only a temporary membership. Thus, although they can enact laws which affect the nation permanently, they themselves might lose the next election and disappear from the scene suddenly.[159] Meanwhile, the public still has to bear the brunt of their laws. Permanent members, of course, would tend to act more responsibly as they would take a long term approach to legislation. In another of La Tour du Pin's critiques, he notes that the

---

[157] For purposes of clarification, the French Parliament of the nineteenth century is a legislative body similar to the Parliament of the British Isles. On the other hand, the *Parlements* of the old regime were judicial bodies.

[158] René de La Tour du Pin, "Le parlementarisme, voilà l'ennemi!," *L' Association catholique* 27 (15 Janvier 1889): 5.

[159] Ibid., 6.

representatives[160] or *mandataires* have no precise mandate with their constituents or *mandants*. For there is no signed contract between the two parties or a *cahier*[161] established between the representative and constituent. Because there is no mandate limiting the power of the representatives, each of the representatives becomes a "little absolute sovereign" on the day following the election. Since he need not worry about his constituents' demands until the next election, in the meantime, he has a license to act irresponsibly in the meantime.[162] As his period of representation may be and often is quite short-lived, he is habituated and conditioned to think only about the immediate and passing interests of his country, rather than its permanent interests.

He next rebukes the incompetence of the parliamentary regime, whose electoral college is based on geographical circumscription. He asserts that the deputies themselves do not know the true interests, ideas, and needs of their constituents. For most of the

---

[160] In La Tour du Pin's opinion, representatives should be *delegates* rather than *trustees*. A *delegate* is a representative who merely follows his constituents' preferences with regard to a particular course of action. On the contrary, a *trustee* is a representative who follows his own judgment with respect to a particular course of action. The trustee obviously has more freedom to act than the delegate. In his "Speech to the Electors of Bristol" of 1774, Edmund Burke argues that a parliamentary representative is not a mere delegate, but rather a trustee. This is also the view of James Madison as elaborated in *Federalist* No. 10. Nevertheless, La Tour du Pin's idea of a *delegate* is more nuanced than that of the modern politician who merely "sounds out public opinion" or obeys the "will of the people" within the camp of his constituents and then acts on it. La Tour du Pin's "corporative" representatives are not delegated to "merely" follow the "whims" of their constituents, whatever they might be. Rather, there is a process of enlightened discussion within the concerned corporation beforehand, bringing to the fore the wisdom and expertise of all of its members, who are particularly knowledgeable within their own bailiwick. Therefore, the views of the corporation are "enlarged and refined" by the prudence, reflection, and the wisdom of the members prior to the representative or *mandataire* carrying out the corporation's mandate.

[161] Within this context, *cahier* is best translated as "a determined list of desires, needs, or grievances."

[162] La Tour du Pin, "Le parlementarisme, voilà l'ennemi!," 6.

deputies are lawyers, some are doctors and engineers, but they are not the most prominent men in their respective fields or the flower of their professions.[163] Noting that national life ultimately rests on social functions carried out by the clergy, the army, magistrates, agriculture, industry, and the trades, he remarks that men drawn from these professions scarcely ever hold the position of deputy.[164] As the professional politician does not represent "the people of his own condition, their ideas, their interests, and their rights," he does not speak in the name of a particular social class or estate, "but in the name of France"; therefore, they [these politicians] are "proper to all and good for nothing."[165] These professional politicians, an artificially created class, mainly lawyers, do not understand the needs, interests, or desires of the people. They are, therefore, incompetent representatives. In his own scheme of the corporative regime, this will lead La Tour du Pin to base representation more heavily on social function than on geographical circumscription. La Tour du Pin then looses his Parthian shot at parliamentary government. This incompetence, he contends, is not accidental, but rather constitutional. In short, it is bound up with the system. By abandoning itself to an absolute, irresponsible, and incompetent power, he claims that parliamentary government manifests phenomena similar to barbarism.[166]

---

[163] Ibid., 7.

[164] Ibid.

[165] Ibid.

[166] Ibid., 8.

Lastly, La Tour du Pin observes that even while these minority interests are ignored, the special preferences of parliamentary majorities are also sacrificed. This comes about because no one party has a majority of votes, and therefore every party must combine with another party to achieve a majority and get legislative results. At any rate, in this process, each party must compromise and give up his own special interests in order to achieve its lesser goals. This does not bring about the greater good, but the lesser evil.[167]

2. –Comparative Analysis

Regarding the instability of democratic government, Alexis de Tocqueville concurs with La Tour du Pin. He points out that one of the reasons for the democratic instability in America is the constant change of laws. In fact, in the world of the 1830s, he claims that laws have their shortest life span in America. He states, "the mutability of the laws is an evil inherent in a democratic government, because it is natural to democracies to raise new men to power."[168] La Tour du Pin, living during the tenure of the Third Republic and after the time of Tocqueville, observes the same instability in the Chamber of Deputies in France. His observation of the laws is slightly different. True, instability is caused by new men continuously moving in and out of the legislature, but

---

[167] Ibid., 8-9.

[168] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 1, ch. 15, 267.

the laws of these "irresponsible little sovereigns" remain on the books. La Tour du Pin realizes that a more permanent membership in the legislature would help the deputies focus on a long term vision. They also both agree that there are no checks on the power of the legislature and its ability to constantly pass new laws and put them in effect. La Tour du Pin points out that once law has been passed, in due form, nothing can stop it from going into effect. In agreement, Tocqueville states:

> In America the authority exercised by the legislatures is supreme; nothing prevents them from accomplishing their wishes with celerity and with irresistible power, and they are supplied with new representatives each year.[169]

The "omnipotence of the majority," as it is called by Tocqueville, or the "tyranny of the majority," as it might be called by La Tour du Pin, accomplishes the "desires" of the people through rapid and inexorable legislation. Desires tend to be fickle and short-lived; this is why La Tour du Pin was interested in creating a body of men who will look after the "permanent interests" of the nation.

Continually changing the laws also causes men to lose respect for the law. This was pointed out by Aristotle over 2,000 years ago. He maintained that legislators must use great caution in changing the laws. Even small improvements in the law are better left undone, because it causes men to "abrogate laws lightheartedly."[170] He continues on by stating, "The benefit of change will be less than the loss which is likely to result if

---

[169] Ibid.

[170] Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Ernest Barker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 1269^{a}12-28, 66.

men fall into the habit of disobeying the government."[171] He then mentions that laws can only become strong by getting people to habitually obey them. This takes a long passage of time. By continually making new laws and abandoning old laws, the government creates an environment in which the law is significantly weakened.[172] Widespread disrespect for the law is the obvious result. After having discussed La Tour du Pin's critique of the Parliamentary regime, it is now apropos to examine his understanding of the State.

3. The State and the French Monarchy

Before discussing La Tour du Pin's idea of representation, it is important to understand what La Tour du Pin means by the State. As his biographer Antoine Murat observes, there are several senses in which the word State is used. He claims that La Tour du Pin uses the term "State" in the sense of the "supreme political organ of society."[173] La Tour du Pin himself asserts:

> The State, it is the ensemble of powers and forces of an organized nation in view of a common good which is called the national interest. These powers are those of the Prince in his Councils, contained by the fundamental laws consented to by the People in its Estates.[174]

The State, then, has to discharge its duties with a view to achieving the common good of

---

[171] Ibid.

[172] Ibid.

[173] Murat, *La Tour du Pin en son temps*, 270.

[174] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 387.

the nation. [175]

He continues on to point out that France is not a federation, but a nation. Consequently the "organs of government do not constitute three powers, but three distinct organisms of power."[176] These include the legislative organism, judicial organism, and the administrative organism. Each of these organisms exercises itself in its own proper sphere according to historic right, which itself has overseen their devolution and which coordinates their actions to the common good.[177]

La Tour du Pin claims "the French State is monarchical. The monarchical institution has always been seconded there by Councils and tempered by the Estates."[178] Nevertheless, he points out that these Estates are not necessarily the Estates-General. He states that the permanent meeting or even the periodic meeting of the Estates-General leads to upheavals. In his view a relationship can be fostered between the councils of the prince and the representative bodies of the people without involving the Estates-General.[179] In summing up the powers of the prince and the consent of the representatives, he states:

---

[175] Among those duties is the intervention of the State in the Worker Question. This intervention includes social legislation which is clearly aimed at providing the vulnerable industrial workers with protection. See pp. 220-223 of this dissertation. Also see: La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes,* 30-31; La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 144-145.

[176] Ibid.

[177] Ibid., 387-388.

[178] Ibid., 388.

[179] Ibid.

> Thus, the legislative power is exercised by the prince in his Council of State; the judiciary power is exercised by the prince in his high court; the administrative power by the prince in his council of ministers; furthermore, the prince is assisted by a privy council or council of government, which acts, when needed, as a council of regency. Finally, the great bodies of the State, that is to say, the magistracy and the army, are only raised up by the prince; the ambassadors speak in his name. Such are the great traits of the national constitution.
>
> As to the consent of new laws and to that of extraordinary taxes, it suffices to request it from some delegations formed for this effect when they have a place there, and according to the object, either by the Chambers of the communes or by those of the Estates.[180]

As a good Catholic, La Tour du Pin accepts that absolute sovereignty resides in God alone. This is also the belief of his master, Bonald. Nevertheless, the rulers below do share in the sovereignty of God in a limited way. In describing sovereignty, La Tour du Pin states, "The sovereignty of the prince excludes the idea of division, but not that of assistance in its exercise."[181] Furthermore, he claims that there can be a permanent delegation of some one of the prerogatives of sovereignty to special bodies. As examples, he lists the *Conseil d'état* which has legislative prerogatives; the *Cour des comptes* which has the administrative prerogatives; and finally, the *Cour de cassation* which has judicial prerogatives.[182] La Tour du Pin's claim here is that the ruler possesses sovereignty, not the people. This would follow from his view, just mentioned, on governors and governed. Even so, the ruler's sovereignty is not absolute[183] as the sovereignty of the people is for Rousseau. While it is true that this sovereignty may be

---

[180] Ibid.

[181] Ibid., 369.

[182] Ibid.

[183] For instance, La Tour du Pin admits of the indirect power of the Church over the State. See: La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 136-137.

shared, those with whom it is shared participate in the rule of the prince. The people do not share in his power.

Concerning the power of the sovereign courts in France, La Tour du Pin observes the following:

> The *Conseil d'état* ought to be charged with the preparation of the laws, and not only of their rules of application or of contentious incidents which are born of it.
>
> The *Cour de comptes* ought to know not only the use of the funds of the State, but again the establishment of the ordinary budget, in order to assure the normal pace of public services.
>
> The *Cour de Cassation* ought to be a high court of justice, to which are brought out what are called the royal cases, that is to say, those which concern the fundamental laws of the kingdom without prejudice of existing recourse.[184]

He points out that these are sovereign courts, which are surrounded by all the moral authority which is attached to the competence of the councilors and the independence of their careers. The king ought to make appointments to these bodies as he sees fit. La Tour du Pin claims that these bodies are powerful oligarchies which are columns to the monarchy by being ramparts of public liberties.[185]

La Tour du Pin also discusses what he calls "false monarchical solutions," that is, monarchies which are inspired by the republican principle and the sovereignty of the people.[186] They are both born of the Revolution.[187] By this he means cesarism and

---

[184] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 369.

[185] Ibid.

[186] Ibid., 358.

[187] Ibid., 360.

constitutional monarchy.[188] Concerning cesarism he states that the emperor holds the crown by plebiscite, that is, by the will of the sovereign people. He is responsible to the people as an agent whom it employs. To sanction his rule, from time to time he will ask the people if he still pleases it.[189] With regard to constitutional monarchy, La Tour du Pin claims that it is foreign to France. It is the importation of an English constitution into France. Although the peers of France have assisted the king in his councils, never did they share in his almighty power throughout French history.[190] Furthermore, he states that in a constitutional monarchy the king "reigns and does not govern," thereby making the "monarchy contemptible and the republic acceptable."[191] He claims that in a plebiscitary monarchy "the people only temporarily abdicate their rights" whereas in a constitutional or parliamentary monarchy "the monarch abdicates his rights forever." Summing it up, he says, "It is the subjects who command and the prince who obeys."[192]

La Tour du Pin also discusses the uniqueness of the dynasty of France. He declares, "France is the work of a family reigning in virtue of a right of succession which is proper to it and distinguishes it from all other dynasties."[193] He discusses that French

---

[188] Ibid., 358.

[189] Ibid., 359.

[190] Ibid., 360.

[191] Ibid., 361.

[192] Ibid., 360.

[193] Ibid., 389.

unity is composed of a wide range of heterogeneous elements. He attributes this uniquely to the action of the House of France.[194] Commenting on how the House of France has accomplished the national work, he states:

> It is because it incarnates perfectly the two principles of the social organism; the hearth and the workshop; the House of France is a professional family; it makes its profession to govern, that is to say, to sovereignly serve the French State,…[195]

He concludes by claiming that members of the House of France cease to belong to France when they are not resident in it. At the same time no foreigner can become a French prince.[196] After having investigated La Tour du Pin's views of the State and the French monarchy, it is time to turn to his description of the conditions for true representation.

4. Conditions for True Representation

In order to rectify the lack of representation in the contemporary French parliamentary system, La Tour du Pin lists certain criteria which must be in place in order that true representation[197] occurs. On account of the Revolution, La Tour du Pin claims

---

[194] Ibid.

[195] Ibid.

[196] Ibid.

[197] Representation does not necessarily imply a deliberative assembly which has legislative powers as in the English Parliament. True representation can also be articulated through a consultative assembly which has the power to advise the ruler or represent its interests to the ruler. This was the case with the Estates-General in France as well as the *Consulta* (Consultative Assembly) established by Pope Pius IX in the Papal States during the early months of 1847. See: Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 322-323; James B. Collins, *The State in Early Modern France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), xxiv, 258-259; E.E.Y. Hales, *Pio Nono:*

that the social elements in France are completely disorganized. Consequently, there is no true representation of rights or interests. In the current state, opinions alone are represented and law is determined by number.[198]

Accordingly, he lays out certain conditions for true representation. He notes that electors should have certain qualifications, representatives should have some notoriety, and representatives should have delimited or fixed mandates. First of all, in order to participate as an elector, he asserts that one must be the head of an established family, for the family is the organic unit in society. La Tour du Pin does, however, make some adjustment for widows. Secondly, an elector must also prove to be a useful member of society by exercising a profession. Lastly, he must also fulfill certain age and residency time requirements. Note that La Tour du Pin does not require ownership of land or property as a basis for suffrage. He mentions that each of the aforementioned criteria should be adapted to the particular social conditions of a place and its environment. One should not force procrustean equality on diverse and unequal conditions. Since representation should be based not on number, but on social function, he argues for different electoral bodies which would have different weights of representation.[199]

Next, he states that representatives should have notoriety or prominence in their

---

A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1954), 59-60; Chadwick, *A History of the Popes,* 69-70.

[198] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 387.

[199] René de La Tour du Pin, "Le régime représentatif," *L'Association catholique* 28 (Septembre 1889): 288-289.

respective fields of work. Insofar as the representatives are the result of a personal and enlightened choice by electors, this will be ensured. La Tour du Pin claims that this notoriety should be relative, not necessarily absolute. In fact, each electoral college should determine the particular criteria for their representatives' notoriety. The size of the electoral college should be such that men of the same profession really know each other well; they should not be familiar with one another by mere hear-say.[200]

Finally, he states that the imperative mandate or *cahier* (of former times) should be delimited or clearly fixed. Consequently, precise limits must be outlined on the mandate. This will ensure the competence of the particular representative. The language of the mandate should truly express the thought and will of the constituent (*mandant*). The representative (*mandataire*) is seen as a *chargé d'affaires* or responsible agent of the constituent and not as an "absolute little sovereign." Regarding particular questions within their sphere of competence, the representatives should always be sovereign judges, but regarding general questions which affect the common good, they should have only a consultative voice. The king, who coordinates the common good, should be the judge in such cases.[201] At this point, it is necessary to turn to the actual framework of representation which La Tour du Pin envisions.

---

[200] Ibid., 290.

[201] Ibid.

5. The Corporative Model of Representation

In his article "Des Institutions Représentatives,"[202] found in his book *Vers un ordre social chrétien,* La Tour du Pin discusses the genesis and degeneration of the parliamentary system, the true elements required to clearly represent the rights and interests of the social body, and finally the necessary organs in political life to bring this into realization. He firmly maintains that the individualism of the Revolution is the destroyer of the representative system in France.[203]

First of all, La Tour du Pin provides a quick historical survey of representative institutions (or the lack thereof) in France. He recognized the feudal system as truly representative and liked to describe it as, "Democracy in the town, aristocracy in the province, monarchy in the family and in the State."[204] Whereas local representative institutions existed in the feudal regime, he points out that they were not permitted by the absolutist *ancien régime.* He laments the utter political decay and ruin of French social institutions, resulting from the demagogical tyranny of the Revolution and the Caesarean absolutism of the First Empire.[205] La Tour du Pin then asks:

> But how does one endow representative institutions in a country where there is no longer anything

---

[202] It should be noted that "Des Institutions Représentatives" was written for *Association catholique* in December of 1896. Over the next ten years, La Tour du Pin made further modifications in his idea of a representative regime. See: Elbow, *French Corporative Theory,* 77-78.

[203] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 202.

[204] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 377, 197. This was one of Le Play's famous phrases to describe the feudal system of which La Tour du Pin was very fond.

[205] Ibid., 198.

> to represent? One does not know, in effect how to represent either individuals or mobs, but collectivities having a life proper and capable of formulating a mandate.[206]

He mentions that the regime of the Restoration had only the "illusion of representation."[207] It included a Chamber of Deputies representing the taxpayers and a Chamber of Peers arbitrarily made up of influential personages rendered hereditary by decree, rather than by time. This Chamber of Peers was not a truly representative body, but was just a council of the prince from whom it was derived. This led to a political structure with no foundation or plan that became chaotic after the introduction of universal suffrage.[208]

Next La Tour du Pin discusses the abuse of "ministerial responsibility," which represents an irresponsible and omnipotent power that attempts to take hold of the reins of state, but with no steady direction. In such a constitutional system it is parliament, not the head of state, with the ministry at its behest.[209] The ministry, especially the prime minister, therefore, answers to parliament not to the king. Comparing the representative system with this parliamentary system, La Tour du Pin states:

> In the country where the parliament is the representative of permanent forces or interests it creates for itself steadfast currents, in which a contest develops without abrupt incidents or surprises. But in those where parliament represents nothing other than the favor of the mob and only emanates from a suffrage more or less universal and unorganized, everything is ephemeral as are the impressions of

---

[206] Ibid.

[207] Ibid.

[208] Ibid.

[209] Ibid.

> the multitude.[210]

He refers to this situation as "pure demagogy" because it merely panders to the masses' baser instincts. Furthermore, this corrupts the whole political process as the deputies become mere conduits of the electors' whims. He draws out the lethal consequences that this has on political life because:

> …the electors corrupt the deputies by their excessive demands and the latter corrupts his electors by his complacencies, since, from being the supervisor of government he has become its participant.[211]

Consequently this political situation degenerates into "political ataxia."[212] In some fashion, those who should be ruling are ruled and those who should be ruled are ruling.

Following this, La Tour du Pin then examines the political elements which have interests tied to the State and upon which a regime of true liberty can be founded. The three categories are

> A. Taxpayers;
>
> B. Public bodies;
>
> C. Professional societies, free associations, or professional bodies.[213]

He begins with the taxpayer. The social element upon which the taxpayer should be represented is the family, not the individual. The population of a district (commune) would be enumerated by homes or families rather than by individuals. The representative

---

[210] Ibid., 199.

[211] Ibid.

[212] Ibid.

[213] Ibid., 199-200.

of the family is the head or the father. Men without families are not to be represented; nevertheless, provisions for widows are to be made.[214] According to La Tour du Pin, taxpayers, in a system of freedom, should only pay those taxes to which they consent, appoint authorized representatives, and for this reason be formed into electoral colleges.[215] These colleges are purely regional but, in addition they are generally *censitaire*, i.e., organized according to tax qualifications. People who pay small taxes, middle taxes, or large taxes are to be grouped into three large classes, each of which should pay one-third of the entire taxation. With this manner of organization, each group would be organized according to its distinct interests and, therefore, each group would have proper representation.[216]

La Tour du Pin next attends to social collectivities or moral beings, which also form the organic elements of the social body. The backbone of these social collectivities is composed of public bodies such as universities, churches, and judicial bodies whose constitutions are hierarchical. In order to preserve their constitutions, only the heads of these bodies would be allowed to represent them in the State.

Professional associations, including the liberal professions, industrial professions, and agricultural professions, should use the principle of free suffrage to designate their representatives. Trade unions, which are not technically bodies because they are not

---

[214] Ibid., 200.

[215] Ibid.

[216] Ibid.

sufficiently organized or extensive, should not be given a defined mandate.[217] Nevertheless, they should be organized in professional colleges with a right of "referendum" extended to all their members in order to form a counter-weight to the very exclusive action of associations.[218]

The three groups of professions (liberal, industrial, and agricultural) should each form consultative chambers. He then states that the personnel of the upper chambers should be composed of the prominent persons from the great bodies of the nation and the proprietors (nobles) of the hereditary domains.[219] This is the only reference which he makes of nobles forming a part of the personnel within the upper chambers. In fact, he does not provide any more information on the specific role of the nobles in this representative regime. It is clear that he understands that the role of the noble families is "hereditary devotion (self-sacrifice) to public service."[220] Consequently, it would seem fitting that they might work in the upper chambers. Nevertheless, some unanswered questions remain. In what capacity would these nobles work? What relation would they have with the other prominent people from the four main bodies? Do only nobles with the highest titles represent the nobility's interests?

What is the meaning of "the representation of rights and popular interests"? La

---

[217] Ibid., 200-201.

[218] Ibid. 201.

[219] Ibid.

[220] Ibid., 288. See: "La noblesse en France" in La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 287-300.

Tour du Pin denies that the "role of representing" involves "governing," for he claims that the direct suffrage of the people, while called democracy, is indeed demagoguery.[221] Here he makes a distinction between the role of public powers, which is to govern or control, and that of representatives, which is to consent. They are, nonetheless, two ways of participating in the governance of the State. He points out that if control and public action are in the same hands, there would be neither control nor public liberty. Unbridled tyranny would be exercised in the name of the people. This tyranny would be exercised much more irresponsibly than the tyranny of any despot since despotic tyranny is at least attached to a person.[222] For in the latter case, there is someone to blame. La Tour du Pin's analysis here has raises a very significant question. How can order be maintained in the State if the people themselves, who are to be governed, are the governors? Does the Roussellian vision of democracy work where the people are their own governors? As Edmund Burke also reflected on this question with great lucidity, it is worthwhile to recall his words here. He states:

> Society requires not only that the passions of individuals should be subjected, but that even in the mass and body as well as in the individuals, the inclinations of men should frequently be thwarted, their will controlled, and their passions brought into subjection. This can only be done *by a power out of themselves*, and not, in the exercise of its function, subject to that will and to those passions which it is its office to bridle and subdue. In this sense the restraints on men, as well as their liberties, are to be reckoned among their rights.[223]

According to both Burke and La Tour du Pin, the people need to be ruled by a power

---

[221] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 202.

[222] Ibid.

[223] Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, 52-53.

outside of them which controls them; otherwise, there will be no rule at all; the "rule" of the people will be merely the venting of their passions, inclinations, and whims on the desirable object of the moment. Both men recognize the corrupt nature of man and the effects of original sin. La Tour du Pin's vision of government comprises limits on the role of the ruled in order to prevent tyrannical excesses, which may well follow from the unchecked passions of a fallen human nature.

At the same time, it is important to make a distinction between the thought of La Tour du Pin and Burke. Burke completely accepted the settlement of the Glorious Revolution in which Parliament dominated the king and whose members clearly had the power to legislate. La Tour du Pin, as we shall see, claimed that neither the Chamber of Deputies nor the High Council (the Corporative Chamber)[224] had the power to legislate. They were not deliberative chambers, they were consultative chambers. They would represent their interests to the public power by means of *cahiers.* Yet they did not draw up laws. This was done by the Council of State, an executive council of the monarch. The laws were then presented to the Upper Chamber for its consent. If consent was withheld, then the Council of State would redraft the laws until it was found acceptable to the Upper Chamber.

Why is it that La Tour du Pin is opposed to the French people participating in political power through their representatives? What is his criterion? Tradition. As a

---

[224] This is not referring to an actual government of the time, but rather to La Tour du Pin's vision of government in the corporative system.

nobleman, influenced by such thinkers as Maistre and Bonald, tradition fully informs his thought.[225] La Tour du Pin thoughtfully addresses the meaning of "representation" in his article "La Constitution nationale." He states:

> Is the representation of professional rights and interests a sufficient political representation, that is to say, is a sufficient participation of the people in the government of the State established? No, if by this participation, you understand a share of power; yes, if you ask for it nothing other than the ancient constitution makes it, to wit, consent to legislative acts of power.[226]

While Burke clearly held that a representative body such as Parliament could share power with the monarch and legislate, La Tour du Pin, referring to the French political tradition, is opposed to representative bodies legislating. This goes against the French political tradition. Nevertheless, La Tour du Pin is not an extremist in his position. By means of historically acquired rights, La Tour du Pin is willing to admit that "the people" have been able to participate in the legislative, executive, or judiciary powers of authority throughout history. Some of this is on account of the different political evolutions in the respective countries.[227] At any rate, representation of the *États* in the tradition of French national law does not include the participation in power, whether legislative, executive, or judiciary. To claim otherwise introduces a foreign element into the French political tradition, namely, the tradition of English national law.[228] In closing, La Tour du Pin states that a regime of liberty will blossom when consent for the fixation of taxes or the

---

[225] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 377.

[226] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 365.

[227] Ibid., 203-204.

[228] Ibid., 365-366.

promulgation of laws is represented and respected.[229] He also rejects the opinion that taxpayers have any prerogatives to legislate. Taking note of their proper duties he remarks:

> The proxies of the taxpaying powers constitute the autonomous administrative organs for the commune and the province, and control those of the State in the management of public revenues.[230]

The ordinary budget should be fixed for several years in order that public services are not suspended, but an extraordinary budget should be deliberated over annually.[231]

Following this, it is important to note that La Tour du Pin does not have unique fix-all political scheme for all countries. He has no political blueprint which he believes should be fitted to all countries in a procrustean manner. He has a deep respect for tradition. In fact, tradition should be the controlling factor in determining the government of a country. His plan is for France. Nevertheless, this is why he will have difficulty accepting the Third Republic during the *ralliement.* In his view, this form of government is alien to France; it is not part of the French political tradition.

La Tour du Pin next looks at the essence of government or the possession of authority. He claims that the separation of powers is true only in the manner of distinguishing the powers. He then lists the emblems of royalty and the attributes of the crown which they signify, thus:

> The sword, signifying force placed at the service of right and of the laws,—what they have called

---

[229] Ibid., 203-204.

[230] Ibid., 203.

[231] Ibid.

> since the executive power;
>
> The scepter, which signifies the legislative power;
>
> The hand of justice, which signifies the judiciary power.[232]

According to La Tour du Pin, the executive, legislative, and judiciary powers ought to be joined together in the monarch as a rule, but not confounded in their exercise. Moreover, the union of these three powers forms the essence of every government whereas their distinction presides in its makeup.[233] As the executive, legislative, and judiciary powers do not essentially reside in the people, he notes that they pertain to authority and not to subjects. Nevertheless, in certain cases, an acquired right to exercise power by the people is a result of historic conditions.[234] La Tour du Pin is no doubt influenced by his master Bonald on the indivisibility of *pouvoir*. Regarding the nature of authority, Bonald also says that "its essence is to be one." If it is divided, it is weakened or destroyed.

La Tour du Pin indicates that the French people uniquely participated in the legislative power by means of the registration of the royal edicts through the *parlements*. The *parlements*, then, participated not just in the monarch's judicial power, but also in his legislative power. Royal edicts could be accepted or refused by the *parlements*.[235] In the hands of the legists the *parlements* began as instruments of centralizing royal power by

---

[232] Ibid.

[233] Ibid.

[234] Ibid., 203-204.

[235] Ibid., 204.

their struggle against feudal justice. Here they worked against decentralization. Later, however, the *parlements* became organs of decentralization, for they restricted the power of the *intendants* who were the administrative instruments involved in the growth the central power.[236]

La Tour du Pin advocates that the roles of the *parlements* and the provincial estates should be reconstituted today so that the representation of social collectivities plays a part in national life. Four provincial chambers should be composed of the heads of the public bodies and the delegates of the industrial, agricultural, and liberal-professional bodies. Further clarifying who should be the representatives of the public bodies, he claims that they should be representatives of "establishments of public utility, free societies of teaching, of charity and any other association dealing with the common good."[237] Does this include the proprietors of the hereditary domains? It would seem so. Would they be subsumed under the heading of "establishments of public utility"? Quite possibly, but La Tour du Pin makes no specific mention of them here. With regard to the three other chambers, these four chambers, composed of public bodies, industrial bodies, agricultural bodies, and professional bodies, should all assemble in the capital of the province to deliberate over matters of common interest. They then would truly take the place of the old provincial estates. There is a certain correspondence in principle between the ancient order of the past and the new social orders which are more pertinent

---

[236] Ibid.

[237] Ibid., 205.

to the present. The present-day "orders of social activity" would replace the three orders of the past from the greatest public bodies to the least public bodies. He stresses that representation must be at the provincial level, because at the level of the *department*, collective interests are too fragmented and, at the level of the State, local and regional interests would be ignored.[238]

At the state level, La Tour du Pin has a bicameral model in mind. The Chamber of Deputies is based on geographical circumscription and elected by taxpaying families. The Upper Chamber is based on social function and is elected by the provincial chambers. Defining the specific duties of the Chamber of Deputies and the Upper Chamber, he states:

> As well as we admit the necessity of a chamber of deputies to consent to taxation, participate in the establishment of a budget of state, and control the use of public revenues, we will admit that another branch of national representation, that which would participate by the provincial estates in the establishment of all the regulations of regional interests, ought to become incarnate at the summit of the State as a high chamber, the consent of which would be solicited for the laws of general interest.[239]

These laws would be prepared at the prompting of the government (the prince or the machinery of government) by the *Conseil d'État* (Council of State). The Upper Chamber could return the laws, accept them, or call for them to be modified after its members deliberate. La Tour du Pin insisted that the Upper Chamber should never be allowed to redraft laws, because as history[240] demonstrates, all fundamental law presupposes one

---

[238] Ibid.

[239] Ibid.

[240] He uses the examples of Moses, Solon and Lycurgus.

unique author and the consent of many. He also discusses the reciprocal play of the two chambers, which would differ from the antagonism of the two chambers in the present-day parliamentary system.[241] The Chamber of Deputies, elected by taxpayers, would represent the public opinion of the moment, and the Upper Chamber, elected by social bodies, would represent the permanent rights and interests of the nation.[242] Concerning their respective duties, the Chamber of Deputies would have the mandate to establish budgets, whereas the Upper Chamber would contribute to the laws, especially to those which govern work and property, today called the social laws.[243]

Besides the two elements of taxpayers and social bodies, La Tour du Pin designates a third necessary element in national representation. To the Chamber of Deputies and the Upper Chamber must also be added members designated by the prince in specific categories. This is the Council of State, the executive body of the prince.[244] La Tour du Pin points out that the State, the highest social body, ought to have the voice of suffrage through its servants as well. He notes that the nation is composed of the prince together with the people,[245] and furthermore, that the national edifice is composed

---

[241] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 206.

[242] Ibid.

[243] La Tour du Pin, *Aphorismes,* 100.

[244] By the word "prince," La Tour du Pin understands the whole apparatus or machinery of government. This refers to the prince (in the personal sense) in union with his councils.

[245] This is reminiscent of the government of the ancient Roman Republic as summed up by the phrase *Senatus Populusque Romanus* or “The Senate and the People of Rome.” This was initialized as SPQR.

of the prince and his councils, together with the people and their estates.[246]

Rather than producing the confusion and irresponsibility of the parliamentary system, the organs of this representative system would understand their specific interests with a good firm grasp. Each of them would demonstrate due competence in their area of expertise. In certain circumstances the Estates-General (*États généraux)* could be called together in full[247] assembly, never separately or confusedly.[248]

Finally, rounding out his program of restoration, La Tour du Pin designates a high court of justice, not at all dissimilar to the Supreme Court in the United States. In a republic it is styled a Senate, while in a monarchy, it is designated a Court of Peers. He states that it would be an

> …arbiter of conflicts breaking out between the different organs of state and guardian not only of the constitution, but of the principle even of the laws of the State.[249]

He notes that constitutions are not composed in chambers. They are not the work of time, which merely brings everything to ruins.[250] Rather they result from an ensemble

---

[246] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 206.

[247] La Tour du Pin obviously has in the mind the fragmentation of the Estates-General in mid June 1789 and its metamorphosis into the "National Assembly." On 17 June 1789 the radical Abbé Emmanuel Joseph Sièyes motioned that the Third Estate rename itself the "National Assembly." This vote passed with an overwhelming majority. On 20 June 1789 certain deputies from the clergy and nobility also joined the National Assembly, taking an oath together not to disband it. This was the famous "Tennis Court Oath." See: William Doyle, *The Oxford History of the French Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 104-105.

[248] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 206

[249] Ibid., 207.

[250] Ibid.

of institutions grafting themselves on to one another, "by the work of men following certain ideas and dominated by certain necessities."[251] Elsewhere, La Tour du Pin points out, metaphorically, that nations are living beings that evolve throughout the centuries. Therefore, those who write[252] constitutions are supremely foolish, for they wish to fix or crystallize for all future generations[253] the model of such-and-such a year.[254]

On account of the complexities of the machinery of the corporative system it is necessary to examine the social interests of La Tour du Pin's representative regime in greater detail. As mentioned before, La Tour du Pin divides all social interests into four large groupings. They are the following:

1) religious and moral interests;

2) public interests;

3) agricultural and rural interests;

4) industrial and commercial interests.[255]

---

[251] Ibid.

[252] Joseph de Maistre was also very skeptical of written constitutions. He claims, "The more that is written, the weaker the institution becomes, and the reason for this is clear. Laws are only declarations of rights, and rights are declared only when they are attacked, so that a multiplicity of written constitutional laws proves only a multiplicity of conflicts and the danger of destruction." Joseph de Maistre, *Considerations on France,* trans. and ed. Richard A. Lebrun (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 50.

[253] Edmund Burke also shows distaste for those who like to change constitutions. He remarks, "A spirit of innovation is generally the result of a selfish temper and confined views. People will not look forward to posterity, who never look backward to their ancestors." Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France,* 29.

[254] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 356.

[255] La Tour du Pin, "Le parlementarisme," 14-17.

In order to spell things out a bit more concretely, religious and moral interests would include religious ministers, teachers, professors, members of judicial bodies, and those involved in charitable works. Public interests would be constituted of those involved in public powers and public services—the liberal professions. It includes magistrates and army personnel, police, lawyers and notaries, physicians, and those devoted to letters, arts, and the sciences. Agriculture and rural interests would include farmers, husbandmen, foresters, vineyard owners, etc. Lastly, industrial and commercial interests would include manufacturers, manual workers, merchants, bankers, and those involved in the arts and trades, etc.

Each of these four groups will have a chamber at the provincial level. La Tour du Pin declares that there are four main roles which the corporative chambers have to play. They are:

> a) To fix the conditions relating to labor, and its manner of recompense and in the rates of this recompense between certain limits, in like manner to favor the establishment of good customs of trade and their successive modification in correspondence with the industrial situation in economic circumstances;
>
> b) To render justice and establish law and order in the midst of the professional body for the observation of established rules mentioned above. This notably by the institution of Councils of discipline of a composition analogous to that in usage in military tribunals, where all the ranks are represented, the chief of the least elevated rank speaking first;
>
> c) To create and administer all institutions of common interest: relief funds, retirement funds, funds for sickness, unemployment funds; insurance against accidents, societies for consumption, collective advantages of all sorts;
>
> d) To study and proclaim professional interests; to have the capacity for protecting and claiming them, that is to say, to represent the professional body every time that it has a right to appear or to be understood.[256]

---

[256] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social*, 119.

The provincial delegates (*mandataires*), chosen at the local level, will be represented in their respective provincial chambers. All four chambers, when they band together, will form an ensemble. Each of these autonomous provincial chambers will deliberate on its own. When it has approved certain items and reported the results, without further debate, it will present these results before the totality of the delegations of each of the chambers or before a general assembly.[257]

These provincial assemblies should be periodic and each of the four provincial chambers should constitute a permanent delegation before it recesses. These permanent delegations should look after the needs and interests of each of the four chambers with the "Governing Board of the Assembly" during the interval between sessions.[258]

The Governing Board of the Assembly, with each of the four permanent delegations, will constitute what La Tour du Pin calls the "provincial commission" or the "provincial delegation." These provincial delegations will be able to communicate with provincial delegations of other provinces, and if need be, they can all assemble into the Estates-General.[259] Members of the permanent provincial delegation, therefore, become the representatives of the provincial assemblies to the Estates-General.

These provincial delegations or commissions would eventually become the nation's *de facto* organs of government. Concerning the duties of the provincial

---

[257] La Tour du Pin, "Le parlementarisme," 17.

[258] Ibid., 17-18.

[259] Ibid., 18.

delegation or commission, La Tour du Pin says:

> Controlling all the legislative and administrative acts which touch on the interests of the regions, promoting all the reforms or improvements demanded by the competent men [through cahiers], managing with the disposal of the latter the news items that a permanent organ is able to collect and assemble, finally not having opposite it on the site of the province any similar institution, political or administrative, not even consultative, which is able to take offense at it and oppose a rivalry to it, the provincial delegation will be, by its sole action on opinion, the effect of an organ of government, without having its bureaucratic disadvantages.[260]

The provincial delegation, then, would become a regular organ of government. When required, it could communicate with provincial delegations of other provinces. When it was necessary, all of the provincial delegations could unite together to form an Estates-General. Concerning the particular interests of its own region, this provincial delegation would have charge of all legislation and administrative acts. Moreover, in response to calls for reforms by qualified men through *cahiers*, the provincial delegation would promote appropriate improvements within its own region.

Later, however, La Tour du Pin modified[261] his views on the workings of the Estates-General. He seems to be affected by prudent and healthy realism. In his article "La Constitution nationale," originally printed in 1900 for the royalist journal *Réveil français*, he demonstrates caution in the matter of convoking the Estates-General. He claims that the people, governing by custom, need only be consulted in extraordinary circumstances. Moreover, he points out that the Estates-General has often been

---

[260] Ibid.

[261] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 78.

accompanied by agitation and sterility when it has been reunited in the past.[262] Later he also printed two articles for the royalist journal *Action française,* in which he moved even farther from his original position. Here he indicated that he was altogether opposed to the convocation of the Estates-General for, in his view, it would create a climate of conflict. In the first of the two articles, "La Représentation professionelle," published in 1905, La Tour du Pin states:

> One unique chamber for all of the professions would be a Tower of Babel when their representatives would act in concert and would degenerate immediately into a closed field, where no common interest would appear and where particular interests would be in continual conflict.[263]

In the following year, in "De l'organisation territoriale et de la représentation," he argues that the periodic convocation of the Estates-General is not a power next to that of monarchy; therefore, it is not part of the national constitution. He ends by pointing out that it is in the essence of sovereignty to be limited,[264] but not shared. La Tour du Pin claims that when sovereignty is shared, an organized conflict ensues, whereas when sovereignty is limited, order is established.[265] Consequently, the idea of a periodic meeting[266] of the Estates-General ends up being problematic for La Tour du Pin.

---

[262] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 355.

[263] Ibid., 305.

[264] La Tour du Pin here agrees with Bonald on the nature of sovereignty. As seen earlier in this paper, Bonald maintains that only God has absolute sovereignty or supreme universal authority. It necessarily follows from this that human authority or sovereignty is limited. La Tour du Pin says as much. It is the essence of sovereignty to be limited. See page 55 of this dissertation. Also, see: Bonald, « Du gouvernement représentatif », 2:891.

[265] La Tour du Pin, *Vers un ordre social,* 321-322.

[266] This "conciliarism" was also a problem for the papacy in the fifteenth century. Prior to the

According to him, the periodicity of the Estates-General would lead to the sharing of sovereignty between the monarch and the Estates-General, thereby leading to continuous conflict between the two institutions.

In concluding this section, it is worthwhile to consider how a monarch fits into La Tour du Pin's program. A king forms the apex of La Tour du Pin's corporative regime. His conception of kingship is grounded in the limited monarchy of the Middle Ages—not the absolutist pretensions of Louis XIV's monarchy. At the same time, this king would not be the parliamentary king of the Restoration, whose power is divided, thereby subjecting him to the legislative body known as Parliament. La Tour du Pin's ideal king would reflect the ideas of his friend, the Comte de Chambord, who also believed in the indivisibility of power. This ideal king, like Chambord, should be socially conscious, protecting the lower classes in particular. According to La Tour du Pin's social vision, this king is

> [the] sole power, who is placed outside them [*mandataires*] by the fact of his exercise and above them by right of his origin, to coordinate them to the common good—the representative regime is essentially a consultative regime in which *the law is made with the consent of the people and the*

---

convocation of the Council of Constance and the even after the closing of the Council of Basle, the locus of supreme authority within the Church was debated. Did it reside in the papacy or in general councils, or is it to be shared? The decree *Haec Sancta* of 1415 asserted that a general council is superior to the pope and it must be obeyed by him. In 1417 the decree *Frequens* asserted that general councils were to be eventually held at regular ten year periods. There would always be a time, then, when a council was either in session or expected within a short period of time. Popes, of course, never approved these decrees following the Council of Constance. It was clear that the latter decree was seen as a major encroachment on the fullness of papal authority or sovereignty. The very fact that a general council might become an ordinary locus of ecclesiastical authority would despoil the pope of his authority. One wonders if La Tour du Pin was himself influenced by this historical precedent. He certainly concluded that the sovereignty of the monarch would be assailed by a periodic convocation of the Estates-General. See: Francis Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979), 64-70.

order of the king.[267]

According to La Tour du Pin, then, the competent[268] representatives of the people represent their interests to the king in a consultative manner. The king, beyond faction or party, as well as not beholden to any special interests, coordinates all to the common good of the nation. He makes the law and the people consent to it through their competent representatives. By this route La Tour du Pin sees the people participating in a real, but effective manner in the political process. It is now opportune to examine how La Tour du Pin would practically implement the representative regime in a society ravaged by the fall out of the Revolution.

6. The Implementation of the Representative Regime

La Tour du Pin claims that he has sufficiently established two key premises of his thought concerning the question of the representative regime.[269] They are the following:

> First of all, the impotence of the current electoral regime to represent the rights and the interests of society, and consequently to contribute to its reorganization;
>
> Secondly, the existence of the principles of a really representative regime and the diverse forms that it is able to assume.[270]

---

[267] La Tour du Pin, "Le régime représentatif," 290. The italicized section at the end of the quote was written in Latin. La Tour du Pin's original was *lex fit consensu populi ac constitutione regis.* The translation from the Latin is my own.

[268] That is, organized by social function and having prominence and expertise in their specific vocational fields.

[269] La Tour du Pin, "Le régime représentatif," 293.

[270] Ibid.

Nevertheless, a very important question remains on the table. How can La Tour du Pin implement his representative regime while the *de facto* regime of parliamentarianism continues to hold sway? Commenting on one very seducing possibility, he states that one might proceed by way of decree or stroke of the pen to remove all the current bases of law and political institutions and, by force, implement the new system in all its purity.[271] He rejects this approach for it smacks of an individualist, egalitarian, and leveling spirit—this is in stark contrast to the whole concept of the representative regime. He wants to substitute an organism (representative regime) for a mechanism (parliamentary regime).[272] He refuses to countenance implementation of his program by decree or by force.[273] Claiming that this is the way of the Jacobins, he concludes that such a plan will end up as a stillborn child, which fails to please and gives way to another constitution.[274]

La Tour du Pin points out that, contrary to the ways of the Revolution,

---

[271] Ibid.

[272] Ibid., 294.

[273] The refusal to use violence or decree to implement the representative regime is extremely important in La Tour du Pin's thought. Corporatism, in its twentieth century manifestations, is sometimes linked with fascism, especially the Italian brand, i.e. "Mussolini's state or subordinate corporatism." Fascism and its violent methods, however, are completely alien to the thought of La Tour du Pin. La Tour du Pin's corporatism would be considered a "pure corporatism" in the view of the influential Romanian corporatist Mihail Manoilescu—it was not despotic or centralized, it allowed a certain amount of pluralism, and it underscored the importance of decentralization. See: Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 279. Although fascism is difficult to label, Payne defines fascism as "a form of revolutionary ultranationalism for national rebirth that is based on a primarily vitalist philosophy, is structured on extreme elitism, mass mobilization, and the *Führerprinzip*, positively values violence as end as well as means and tends to normatize war and/or the military virtues." Payne, *A History of Fascism*, 14. La Tour du Pin's brand of corporatism fails to meet any of this criteria for fascism.

[274] La Tour du Pin, "Le régime représentatif," 295.

progressive work must be carefully undertaken to activate "the natural and historic social organs which have been perverted or sacrificed to the omnipotence of the State."[275] He carefully lays out his plan for realizing the representative regime, that is, a truly representative political order in which the prince and the people share the reins of government, the prince exercising power, the people exercising consent.

For the fulfillment of the representative regime, a thorough foundation must be laid out first. This foundation, for La Tour du Pin, is the corporative regime. According to La Tour du Pin, the representative regime is the crown whereas the corporative regime is the base; one might also refer to the latter as the life and the former as the movement.[276] Even so, the spirit of association is the principle which animates the corporate regime. As mentioned earlier, true professional association incorporates "all the agents of one same profession, each according to his condition."[277] Because it is most in accordance with good sense, justice, and morality, he asserts that the mixed syndicate or corporation is the best means of professional association. Yet, he asks, how can the whole of France be covered with these mixed syndicates?[278]

La Tour du Pin opts for gradual and peaceful means to implement his plan. When people understand that a new plan is not being imposed on them, they will be more open

---

[275] Ibid., 295-296.

[276] Ibid., 296.

[277] Ibid.

[278] Ibid.

to influence. He also notes that every society is led by a small number of active men who are hidden within its midst. He celebrates the example of the freemasons, even though they have created a Satanic city to impede the Christian city. They have done a fine job at undermining the social orders and replacing them with themselves.[279] Their means should be imitated. All surroundings and all natural groups must be overrun by supporters of the representative regime who should implement their own social principles in opposition to the freemasons.[280] Consequently, professional associations based on the mixed corporation should be hatched throughout France and men should be prepared to practice the representative regime. Then these associations should formulate *cahiers* of grievances, desires, and remonstrances to the public power. They shall then group together to strengthen their desires, at first locally, then later regionally, and as a consequence these groups will in effect become the defunct provincial assemblies.[281] La Tour du Pin then says:

> Little by little,…the provincial chambers or regional syndicates thus formed will habituate public opinion to consider them as their genuine organs and to force upon the public powers, …the obligation of hearing them and of taking their sentiments into consideration.[282]

This then is how La Tour du Pin would implement his representative regime. His plan of implementation, however, is strikingly idealistic and unempirical. With the

---

[279] Ibid., 297.

[280] Ibid.

[281] Ibid., 298-299.

[282] Ibid., 299.

current regime well entrenched in power, it seems that it would take an all-out assault to dislodge it from power. Yet violent and militant means were abhorrent to La Tour du Pin. One might ask how many people, in the working world, have sufficient time to devote themselves to realizing the representative regime in the various social bodies throughout France. Earlier Albert de Mun had been unsuccessful in getting the Chamber of Deputies to imbue Law of 1884 (on associations) with a corporative spirit. He failed in his endeavor. Mixed syndicates were not attractive to workers. Given this state of affairs at this time, there was not a large enough critical mass in France to support corporations, let alone the corporative and representative regimes.

7. –Comparative Analysis

In Rousseau's *On the Social Contract,* he clearly rejects the idea of political representation. He is firmly opposed to the idea that anyone can represent another person in the legislative power of the State, but he does make allowances for representation in the executive power of the State. He states:

> Since the law is merely the declaration of the general will, it is clear that the people cannot be represented in the legislative power. But it can and should be represented in the executive power, which is merely force applied to the law.[283]

A representative regime, therefore, would be anathema to him. Although the people may have deputies, according to Rousseau, the deputies do not represent them. They are mere instruments or conduits of the "general will." He states:

---

[283] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 3, ch. 15, 199.

> Sovereignty cannot be represented for the same reason that it cannot be alienated. It consists essentially in the general will, and the will does not allow of being represented. It is either itself or something else; there is nothing in between. *The deputies of the people, therefore, neither are nor can be its representatives; they are merely its agents.* They cannot conclude anything definitively. Any law that the populace has not ratified in person is null; it is not a law at all. The English people believes itself to be free. It is greatly mistaken; it is free only during the election of the members of Parliament. Once they are elected, the populace is enslaved; it is nothing….
>
> The idea of representatives is modern. It comes to us from feudal government, that iniquitous and absurd government in which the human race is degraded and the name of man is in dishonor. In the ancient republics and even in monarchies, the people never had representatives. The word itself was unknown.[284]

In the interest of clarifying Rousseau's thought here, it is important to distinguish among the terms trustee, delegate, and agent. As will become apparent, Rousseau's "deputy" or "agent" is not even remotely a delegate. A delegate is a representative who merely follows his constituents' preferences with regard to a particular course of action. On the contrary, a trustee is a representative who follows his own judgment with respect to a particular course of action. Rousseau, however, altogether denies that his "agent" is a representative in any way. In his view, it would be incorrect to say that his agent follows his constituents' preferences. The word "constituent" implies a representative, for it refers to "someone who is being represented." Furthermore, the word "follows" implies that the "deputy" has a mind of his own, but he is led along by his constituents' wishes or demands. Not so, according to Rousseau. The agent is a mere channel, instrument, or conduit of the general will. It is an unthinking role. He is not supposed to think about what the people want, rather he is to do want they want. This is apparent in Rousseau's choice of word, agent, which derives from the Latin, *agere*, i.e., to do.

---

[284] Ibid., 198. The italicization is my own.

Rousseau's agent, then, is neither a trustee, nor a delegate, but something wholly different altogether. One might think of the Roussellian lawmaking process as a sort of continuous referendum or plebiscite by the "assembled sovereign people" on various matters of legislation. The government, made up of deputies, does not deliberate, it executes the general will. Rousseau, however, is inconsistent and often unclear. As Claes Ryn states:

> Curiously, Rousseau drops his emphatic opposition to representation in his discussion of the executive function of the state: 'There may and should be such representation in the executive power, which is only the instrument for applying the law.'[285]

Rousseau is clearly open to different forms of government. Generally speaking, he believes democracies to be better fitted to smaller states, aristocracies to intermediate states, and monarchies to large states.[286] In the end it really does not matter, because the government or the executive power is subject to the sovereign or legislative power, i.e., the assembled people. In Rousseau's version of direct democracy, he recognizes that the State has to be small or the sovereign will not be able to protect its rights.[287]

In the view of Rousseau, the sovereign has absolute power. He is providing fallible human beings with absolute power to make and unmake governments and to make and unmake leaders at will. Rousseau declares:

> Just as nature gives each man an absolute power over all his members, the social compact gives the

---

[285] Claes Ryn, *Democracy and the Ethical Life: A Philosophy of Politics and Community* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1990), 121-122.

[286] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 3, ch. 3, 179.

[287] Ibid., bk. 3, ch. 15, 199.

> body politic an absolute power over all its members, and it is the same power which, as I have said, is directed by the general will and bears the name sovereignty.[288]

Rousseau's failure to assess human nature correctly leads him to endow the sovereign with this absolute power over the body politic. Commenting on this, Claes Ryn remarks:

> Proceeding on the premise that man is naturally good, neither is he held back by a recognition that the ability of the state to play a moral role is severely circumscribed by the inherent weakness of human nature.[289]

For Rousseau, the State, reflecting the general will, is always right, because "the general will is always right and always tends towards public utility."[290] He denies that human nature is fallen and, as a consequence, he refuses to accept that the general will is enacted by fallen human beings. If one accepts Rousseau's premises, it is sensible not to allow any intermediate bodies within society. If the State is always right, why allow other social bodies to compete with it for the allegiance of men. In what is probably the most infamous passage in his book, Rousseau states:

> --that whoever refuses to obey the general will will be forced to do so by the entire body. This means merely that he will be forced to be free.[291]

As the general will is always right, when an individual disobeys the general will, he is disobeying an entity which is always right. For Rousseau, it is similar to disobeying God, because in some way the State is god. In short, the disobedient one does not know what is best for himself. Therefore, he must be "forced to be free." Over the course of the last

---

[288] Ibid., bk. 2, ch. 4, 156.

[289] Ryn, *Democracy and the Ethical Life*, 126.

[290] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 2, ch. 3, 155.

[291] Ibid., bk. 1, ch. 7, 150.

two hundred and twenty years, this phrase has led to widespread property confiscation, imprisonment, and even murder, all of them carried out by the zealous minions of the Rousseau's general will. This is why some have seen Rousseau as the "Father of Totalitarianism."

In Rousseau's scheme the sovereign certainly participates in the government. The sovereign legislates and the sovereign decides on who the executive power will be. The sovereign has the power to institute the form of government it wishes and it has the power to preserve or destroy the current form of government. In addition, the sovereign names the leaders who will make up the government or executive power and the sovereign has the right to change the membership of the administration or executive power at its pleasure.[292] This is somewhat analogous to no-fault divorce at the level of the State. Of course, it is unilateral political divorce. The "assembled people" or sovereign decides whether or not it wants a certain form of government or certain leaders. After the divorce, it can take up with another form of government or new leaders.

This is clearly going much farther than Locke, who did not envision a change of the form of government itself, but only a change of the legislative power or the executive power when either of them breaks their trust. According to Locke, the legislative power breaks its trust

> whenever the legislators endeavor to take away, and destroy the property of the people, or to reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they put themselves into a state of war with the people, who

---

[292] Ibid., bk. 3, ch. 18, 201, 203.

> are thereupon absolved from any farther obedience.[293]

In addition, Locke states that the executive power has a double trust, participating in the legislative branch and also executing the law. The executive power acts contrary to his trust

> when he either employs the force, treasure, and offices of the society, to corrupt the representatives, and gain them to his purposes; or openly pre-engages the electors, and prescribes to their choice, such, whom he has, by solicitations, threats, promises, or otherwise, won to his designs; and employs them to bring in such, who have promised beforehand what to vote, and what to enact.[294]

While both Locke and Rousseau believe in political divorce, Locke maintains that the legislative or the executive power must be at fault in some way as can be seen in the examples which he enumerates.

According to Rousseau, deputies are required to respond immediately to the general will as it is made manifest by the "people." One can clearly see that the permanent interests of the nation will not be secured by this form of government. The assembled people, the sovereign, are often fickle and their whims, opinions, and views are constantly in flux. There will be complete instability as the sovereign makes this law, makes that law, repeals this law, alters that law. The fundamental law of the State is also immediately subject to the general will. Not only will laws themselves be constantly changing, but the forms of government will also be subject to change, albeit not as often as the changing of the laws. Most people will begin to lose respect for the law—they will not take it seriously. It is very difficult for people to form the habit of obeying the laws if

---

[293] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, para. 222, 111.

[294] Ibid., 111-112.

they are not stable and unchanging. Aristotle pointed this out over two thousand years ago.[295] One cannot build a stable form of government on the "changing sand" of the general will.

In discussing the nature of the social compact, Rousseau also asserts that one can "obey oneself." He is interested in finding a means by which "each one [individual], while uniting with all, nevertheless obeys only himself and remains as free as before."[296] This is accomplished by each individual completely alienating himself and all of his rights to the entire community.[297] Rousseau continues on by claiming, "Finally, in giving himself to all, each person gives himself to no one."[298] Distilling the essential elements of the social compact, he states:

> Each of us places his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will; and as one we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole.[299]

In the view of La Tour du Pin, this idea of "obeying oneself" would be considered absurd. He might ask how one can exercise obedience by obeying oneself? The one giving the order and the one obeying the order are correlative. There is a complementary relationship between the governor and the governed. As mentioned earlier, La Tour du

---

[295] Aristotle, *Politics,* trans. Ernest Barker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 1269a12-28, 66.

[296] Rousseau, "On the Social Contract," bk. 1, ch. 6, 148.

[297] Ibid.

[298] Ibid.

[299] Ibid.

Pin distinguishes between the role of public powers, which is to govern or control, and that of representatives, which is to consent. He points out that if control and public action are in the same hands, there would be neither control nor public liberty. Unbridled tyranny would be exercised in the name of the people. The governed, at least from time to time, need their passions controlled or thwarted. Are we to trust them to control their own passions? Not only does Rousseau's optimistic view of human nature blind him in this matter, but his "celebration of equality" prevents him from assenting to the ideas of superior/inferior or governor/governed in political society. Rousseau's vision of democracy has no place for true obedience.[300] This virtue is discountenanced and rejected.

In describing the origins of the political power in his encyclical *Diuturnum illud*, Leo XIII establishes that all power comes from God and "that the right to rule is from God, as from a natural and necessary principle."[301] In contrast to the eighteenth century philosophes, Leo denies that power originates from the people. He also rejects the idea

---

[300] Obedience is not one of the most highly regarded virtues of the modern democratic age which places such a premium on equality. Nevertheless, the most perceptive Christian spiritual writers all agree that it is one of the key virtues in the growth of perfection. Christ, who was God, was Himself obedient to mere humans. He showed men by his own example how important this virtue was to him. See: John 4:34. He demonstrated this by subjecting himself to his mother Mary and foster father Joseph. Moreover, he also subjected himself to the Mosaic Law. Furthermore, he subjected himself even to the unjust decisions of the envious chief priests and the Sanhedrin as well the cowardly Pilate. Obedience is mentioned as the condition for entering heaven. See: Matt. 7:21. In addition, St. Paul also says, "Let everyone be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment." See: Rom. 13:1-2. With such a clear emphasis on obedience, modern man places himself in serious peril by overstressing the values of equality and freedom vis-à-vis obedience.

[301] Leo XIII, "Diuturnum illud," nos. 5, 8, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 52.

that power is delegated to rulers by the people.[302] Nevertheless, the pope does remark:

> It is of importance, however, to remark in this place that those who may be placed over the State may in certain cases be chosen by the will and decision of the multitude, without opposition to or impugning of the Catholic doctrine. And by this choice, in truth, the ruler is designated, but the rights of ruling are not thereby conferred. Nor is the authority delegated to him, but the person by whom it is to be exercised is determined upon.[303]

The people can choose their rulers in a democratic fashion, but they do not confer political power on their leaders. This clearly condemns the "sovereignty of the people."

In his encyclical *Pacem in Terris,* Pope John XXIII underscores the importance of individuals participating in the government. The pope notes:

> A natural consequence of men's dignity is unquestionably their right to take an active part in government, though their degree of participation will necessarily depend on the stage of development reached by the political community of which they are members.[304]

The pope goes on to point out that intercommunication between the leaders of a country and the people is an important ingredient in pursuing the common good. The people, who are in a position to know their needs, need to represent their reasonable desires to the authorities. By more extensive contacts and discussion with the citizens of a country the civic authorities will gain a better idea of what policies are most in the interest of the common good.[305]

John Paul II, in his encyclical *Centesimus Annus,* also highlights the importance

---

[302] Ibid., no. 5, 52.

[303] Ibid., no. 6, 52.

[304] John XXIII, "Pacem in Terris," no. 73, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1958-1981*, vol. 5, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 115.

[305] Ibid., no. 74, 115.

of the people participating in the government. He maintains that it is necessary to create structures of participation and shared responsibility.[306] The pope does not go into details, for that is beyond the competency of the Church. Nevertheless, he establishes that something must be done to create institutions or structures whereby people are better able to participate in the government. The pope states:

> The Church values the democratic system inasmuch as it insures the participation of citizens in making political choices, guarantees the possibility of electing and holding accountable those who govern them, and of replacing them by peaceful means when appropriate. Thus she cannot encourage the formation of narrow ruling groups which usurp the power of the State for individual interests or for ideological ends.[307]

John Paul appears to be giving the Church's blessing to the democratic system for the specific reason that it allows the people to participate in the government. That is the key criterion. With this understanding, it would seem that any government which allows participation by the people can be considered "democratic." La Tour du Pin's representative regime, although technically a monarchy, also allows valid democratic aspirations to be fulfilled by a realistic, yet proportionate representation. This is why it might be titled an "organic democracy."

The Church accepts many different forms of government. It is not wedded to any particular form of government.[308] Nevertheless, according to Leo XIII, the rulers of the

---

[306] John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, no. 46, 65.

[307] Ibid.

[308] Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," no. 4, 108.

State should always rule as fathers[309] rather than as masters. This is more in keeping with the way in which God Himself rules over people. Government should be "administered for the benefit of the citizens" and it should serve the common good, not the good of any particular part.[310] In his encyclical *Sollicitudo rei socialis,* John Paul II clarifies that the Church does not offer "technical solutions" to the problems in the world. Commenting on this further, the pope observes:

> For the Church does not propose economic and political systems or programs, nor does she show preference for one or the other, provided that human dignity is properly respected and promoted, and provided she herself is allowed the room she needs to exercise her ministry in the world.[311]

As long as human dignity is respected and as long as the Church herself is allowed to freely exercise her mission, the Church does not show any preferences for forms of government. Nevertheless, Pius XI does condemn communism absolutely, stating, "Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever."[312] Other forms of government, though widely varied, such as monarchy and democracy, are permissible. Even so,

---

[309] In the Christian understanding of kingship, the king was always recognized as the "Father of his People." Pagan conceptions of kingship often regard the king as "Master of his People." This is often seen in the Old Testament where the Egyptian pharaoh, the Assyrian kings, and the Chaldean kings (such as Nebuchadnezzar) are treated like a master. The same could be said for the Persian Xerxes, the Hellenistic kings, and the pre-Christian Roman emperors. For a discussion of the patriarchal aspects of European Christian monarchy, see: Kuehnelt-Leddihn, *Liberty or Equality*, 137-139, 144-145.

[310] Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," no. 5, 108.

[311] John Paul II, *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, no. 41, trans. Vatican Polyglot Press (Boston, MA: St. Paul Books & Media, 1987), 77.

[312] Pius XI, "Divini Redemptoris," no. 58, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1903-1939*, vol. 3, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 549.

neither one of these is the "true political religion." There are some who believe that monarchy is the only legitimate form of government. This is denied by the Church. There are also those who think that democracy is the only legitimate form of government—they almost make of democracy a religion. This is democratism. This too is denied by the Church. In his encyclical Immortale Dei, Leo XIII states:

> This, then, is the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the constitution and government of the State. By the words and decrees just cited, if judged dispassionately, no one of the several forms of government is in itself condemned, inasmuch as none of them contains anything contrary to Catholic doctrine, and all of them are capable, if wisely and justly managed, to insure the welfare of the State. Neither is it blameworthy in itself, in any manner, for the people to have a share greater or less, in the government: for at certain times, and under certain laws, such participation may not only be of benefit to the citizens, but may even be of obligation.[313]

In his representative regime, the political fruit of his corporative regime, La Tour du Pin would claim that all people would participate in some meaningful way in the government. Not all would have equal representation for it would be proportional representation. Their social function would determine their weight in representation. Through their professional expertise, they would specifically contribute through the organs of representation. This idea appears to concur with the thought of Leo XIII in Immortale Dei, for the pope declares that it is not blameworthy that the people may, at times, have more or less participation in the government.

It needs to be stressed that La Tour du Pin's idea of a *delegate* is much more nuanced than that of the modern politician who merely obeys the desires of his constituents. It is certainly not the same as Rousseau's unthinking agent who is a mere

---

[313] Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," no. 36, 115.

conduit of the general will. La Tour du Pin's "corporative" representatives are chosen by their colleagues because of their expertise and their notoriety within their profession. Before the interests of a corporation are represented, there is a process of enlightened discussion within the concerned corporation beforehand, drawing on the skill, knowledge and needs, of its own members, who are particularly knowledgeable within their own sphere. By this means, the corporation is "enlarged and refined" by the prudence, reflection, and the wisdom of the members prior to the representative or *mandataire* carrying out the corporation's mandate.

All in all, La Tour du Pin was wedded to one form of government, viz. monarchy. Although he may have been open to other forms of government in other countries, based on their traditions, he refused to countenance any other form of government in France. To be specific, he was a legitimist.[314] In 1890 Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical called *Sapientiae Christianae.* This encyclical addressed the topic of Christian citizenship. In this work, Leo made it clear that the Church will never will never tie itself down to a particular political party, to a specific form of government, or to the exigencies of the shifting landscape of politics. He says:

> And since she not only is a perfect society in herself, but superior to every other society of human growth, she resolutely refuses, promoted alike by right and by duty, to link herself to any mere party and to subject herself to the fleeting exigencies of politics. On like grounds, the Church, the guardian always of her own right and most observant of that of others, holds that it is not her province to decide which is the best amongst many diverse forms of government and the civil

---

[314] A legitimist (in France) is a royalist who believes that the kings of France should be chosen by hereditary right according to the Salic Law. In the nineteenth century, a French legitimist is typically defined as one who is an adherent to the Bourbon family and advocates absolutist monarchy. Legitimists reject the French Revolution, constitutional monarchy, and the republican form of government.

> institutions of Christian States, and amid the various kinds of State rule she does not disapprove of any, provided the respect due to religion and the observance of good morals be upheld.[315]

It is clear from this that the Church would never hitch its wagon to any earthly political community. In laying this groundwork clearly, *Sapientiae Christianae* was the perfect predecessor to *Au milieu des sollicitudes.*

Two years later, Leo XIII issued his encyclical, *Au milieu des solicitudes*, which treated of the situation of Church and State in France. While not giving approbation to the anti-Catholic laws of the Third Republic, this encyclical called on French Catholics to unite together, rally to the Third Republic, and bring their Catholic influence to bear on it. La Tour du Pin refused to rally. The pope makes a very important observation on the form of temporal governments in this encyclical. He states:

> However, here it must be carefully observed that whatever be the form of civil power in a nation, it cannot be considered so definitive as to have the right to remain immutable, even though such were the intention of those who, in the beginning, determined it.... Only the Church of Jesus Christ has been able to preserve, and surely will preserve unto the consummation of time, her form of government…. But, in regard to purely human societies, it is an oft-repeated historical fact that time, that great transformer of all things here below, operates great changes in their political institutions. On some occasions it limits itself to modifying something in the form of the established government; or, again, it will go so far as to substitute other forms for the primitive ones—forms totally different, even as regards the mode of transmitting sovereign power.[316]

La Tour du Pin ultimately refused to accept this teaching. He believed the pope had no business telling Frenchmen that they should support a government which had shown itself to be irresponsible, corrupt, and anti-clerical. Perhaps, La Tour du Pin and other

---

[315] Leo XIII, "Sapientiae Christianae," no. 28, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 217-218.

[316] Leo XIII, "Au milieu des sollicitudes," no. 17, in *The Papal Encyclicals, 1878-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Claudia Carlen (Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990), 280.

monarchists saw the ralliement as a situation in which the Leo was acting disingenuously, i.e. attempting to pressure the French people to accept a particular form of government, the Republic. The Third Republic was a government which had made war on the Church and society with a vengeance. From a human perspective, one can understand why it was so difficult for La Tour du Pin and many of his like-minded colleagues to rally to the Republic. Nevertheless, as the pope stated, no government of any state is absolutely definitive. La Tour du Pin found it very difficult to be at one with the teaching of the Church in this matter.

CHAPTER 7.

THE INFLUENCE OF LA TOUR DU PIN

A. Internecine Controversies

Since *Association catholique* was the leading social Catholic journal in the late nineteenth century, La Tour du Pin was able to wield considerable international influence in the area of Catholic social thought. As mentioned earlier, he was the leader of the School of Liège, which advocated, among other things, a positive role for state intervention. These social Catholics, on the whole, also defended a "family wage" as the "just wage" for the worker. For them, the Worker Question essentially dealt with the centrality of justice, rather than of charity. Other issues adopted by them included the social function of property, the importance of corporations as intermediate bodies between the individual and the State, and finally the corporative regime as the only socio-political system that would allow for true freedom and representation. They felt that corporatism, which allowed corporations to regulate contracts between owners and workers would provide a regulated freedom for all and prevent the absolute liberty of work that would lead to an abuse of the weak by the strong.

Catholic economic liberals such as Charles Périn, Msgr. Freppel, and Claudio Jannet were their great opponents. These men were adherents to the School of Angers. Because they were proponents of the "liberty of work," they only advocated state

intervention in a very limited sense, such as curbing manifest abuses in the industrial environment. They claimed that a "just wage" or "fair wage" was that which was generally paid by the employers within a specific region. It was a modification of the "iron wage" which was determined by the "law of supply and demand"; the "iron wage" approached the natural salary and tended toward the level of bare subsistence. According to the members of the School of Angers, everything paid to the worker over and above the "fair wage" was considered the work of charity.[1] To them, the Worker Question was primarily the work of charity, rather than of justice. These liberals undoubtedly also stressed the right of property, because of the vigorous growth of socialism. Although they supported associations for workers, they did not advocate obligatory associations because this would restrict industrial liberty.[2] Lastly, the Catholic economic liberals believed that capitalism was here to stay and could be reformed by charity rather than replaced by corporatism. In fact, some such as Charles Périn thought that capitalism was truly Christian, because it allowed more freedom for workers and owners than did the highly regulated corporative society of the past.

B. The Fribourg Union

In 1884, Bishop Gaspard Mermillod, the socially conscious bishop of Lausanne

---

[1] Rupert J. Ederer, ed. and trans., *Heinrich Pesch on Solidarist Economics: Excerpts from the Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998), 46; Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 17-18.

[2] Moon, *The Labor Problem*, 155.

and Geneva, invited a small contingent[3] of European social Catholics to Fribourg to establish an international body of Catholic social thinkers.[4] La Tour du Pin was designated the secretary of the group.[5] Concerning La Tour du Pin's sketch of the goals of this Union, Normand Paulhus relates:

> Their common goal is to make clear the nature of the social ill that confronts them and to seek out the means of creating a society in which all citizens may find satisfaction, even the poor. This search is animated by a common spirit of trust in the truths of the faith and of intense loyalty to their leader, the pope. All…pursue their studies with a common method, drawing on the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas to shed light on their work which, based on an historical analysis of the past, seeks to make concrete proposals for the present.[6]

These men were animated by the spirit of both study and action. Their studies focused primarily on the principles of a Christian society that would usher in a more just social order as well as the critique of the foundations of modern society which had led to the erosion of these principles. In addition, these leaders looked into the possibility of setting up international agreements to stem the tide of the worst abuses in society.[7]

In October of 1885 the *L'Union catholique d'études sociales et économiques* held its first meeting. Participants[8] came from France, Switzerland, Germany, Austria,

---

[3] Normand J. Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals of the Fribourg Union" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1983), 40, 44. This work is the most exhaustive inquiry into the accomplishments of the Fribourg Union. This initial group included Mgr. Gaspard Mermillod (Bishop of Lausanne), René de La Tour du Pin, Louis Milcent, Prince Karl von Löwenstein, and Count Franz Kuefstein. Later on, at one point, this group would include up to sixty members.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 40-41.

[7] Ibid., 41-42

[8] Besides the five already mentioned, others included Count von Blôme, Albert de Mun, Henri

Hungary, and Italy. Later a contingent also came from Belgium. The members of the French, German, and Austrian schools of social reform were heavily influenced by Ketteler's thought.[9] Although Karl von Vogelsang was one of the inspirations[10] behind the Union and was the mentor of a large number of participants, he was never present at any of the meetings. Mermillod was named the president of the Union, Count von Blôme vice-president, and La Tour du Pin secretary of the board.[11] The members of the Union decided to choose only like-minded thinkers to join their ranks so as to facilitate a development of a coherent social doctrine. In addition, secrecy was demanded of all members so as not to exacerbate conflicts with the members of the Catholic economic liberal school.[12]

La Tour du Pin's organizational skills led to a very structured format for the discussion of the most pressing topics.[13] The members of the Union considered such topics as the following: the just wage; the social function of property; the origin, nature

---

Lorin, Gaspard Decurtins, and Georges Python. Python was the President of the recently established University of Fribourg. The three theologians who exerted an influence on the Union were Georges Pascal, Augustin Lehmkuhl, S.J., and Albert Maria Weiss, O.P. See: Alcide de Gasperi, *I Tempi e gli uomini che prepararono la "Rerum Novarum"* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1984), 84; Talmy, *Aux sources*, 53-54; Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals," 42-44; Misner, *Social Catholicism*, 202-205.

[9] Lillian Parker Wallace, *Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1966), 264.

[10] Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals," 40.

[11] Ibid.,46.

[12] Ibid., 47.

[13] Ibid., 44, 51.

and unity of the political community; the common good and the individual good; the origin, nature, and specific finality of intermediate bodies; the role of the State; social justice and charity; and finally, the corporative system as an ideal socio-political system.[14] Normand Paulhus underscores some of the more far-seeing ideas that the Union of Fribourg produced such as profit-sharing and joint ownership of the means of production.[15] Many of the conclusions reached by the Fribourg Union were similar to those reached by the *Conseil d'Études* of the OCCO.[16] Robert Talmy remarks:

> The fact, moreover, is not surprising: in his capacity as secretary of correspondence, La Tour du Pin is in constant communication with the different groups, and remains abreast of the conduct of their studies; he gives a detailed report of them in the *Association catholique*, and he draws inspiration from them in his articles. [17]

In October 1887 the members of the Union asked the pope to intervene in the Worker Question. Following this, in January of 1888 an assemblage from the Union of Fribourg had a forty-five-minute interview with Leo XIII in which the pope stated his interest in the Worker Question and his willingness to address it in a forthcoming encyclical. The pope then asked that the works of the Union be sent to him. Lorin, Mermillod, and Kuefstein quickly prepared a document outlining the positions of the Fribourg Union on the issues of "work, property, and the reorganization of society."[18]

---

[14] See: Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals."

[15] Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals," 324.

[16] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 54.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Paulhus, "The Theological and Political Ideals," 72-73.

Although Msgr. Mermillod was a major inspiration of the Fribourg Union, La Tour du Pin was highly regarded as the moving spirit behind it. In the last session of the 1891 meeting, Count de Blôme lauded the work of La Tour du Pin thus:

> He is…the true founder of this Union; it is he who conceived the idea of it; it is he who has organized it;…He is the soul of it by the universal sympathy that he inspires and as the link between the various national groups of which our society is composed. [19]

Robert Talmy argues that the Catholic social doctrine elaborated at the Union of Fribourg was in large part sanctioned by Leo XIII in *Rerum novarum*.[20] Paul Misner, however, drawing on Alcide de Gasperi's *I tempi e gli uomini che prepararono la "Rerum Novarum"* (1931) contends that the Fribourg Union did not have such an influential role in the construction of *Rerum novarum* as historians such as Talmy and Henri Rollet maintain. In fact, Misner states, "De Gasperi, naturally anxious in 1931 not to allow Mussolini to bask undeservedly in the reflection of Catholic social teaching, pointed out that the most distinctive theses of the Catholic corporatist school did not find their way into *Rerum novarum*."[21] Nevertheless, it should be underscored that the same year in which de Gasperi's book was published, Pius XI issued *Quadragesimo anno,* which did, in fact, underscore some of the most notable corporatist ideas of both La Tour du Pin and the Fribourg Union.

Leo XIII had maintained close contacts with the various leaders of Catholic social

---

[19] Baussan, *La Tour du Pin*, 101-102.

[20] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 54-55.

[21] Misner, "The Predecessors of *Rerum Novarum* within Catholicism," 447.

thought in Europe and in America. With some of them he met personally, with others he established communication though Mgr. Jacobini, for a time, his secretary of state.[22] In my opinion, Leo XIII maintained a cautious balance among the different groups devoted to the advancement of Catholic social thought. He tried to accept what rang true in each of them. Rather than alienating any of these zealous Catholics through condemnation or support of a particular school of social thought, he laid down general principles which could be further developed by subsequent popes. Taking a comprehensive view of what was good for the whole Church as well as society at large, Leo was very careful not to hitch his wagon to any particular school of thought. Whereas Bishop von Ketteler laid down general principles for guidance in socio-economic matters, the Fribourg Union and La Tour du Pin, as well as Périn, all took strong doctrinal positions on certain matters. It appears that Leo "wanted to be all things to all men." He demonstrated that there was room in Catholicism for more than one school of social thought as long as each of these schools accepted the general principles of society and morality in guiding their economic thought. Hence, his lack of unqualified support for certain aspects of La Tour du Pin's thought should not necessarily be considered a condemnation of them.

---

[22] Jean-Yves Calvez and Jacques Perrin, *The Church and Social Justice: The Social Teachings of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1958*, trans. J.R Kirwan (Chicago: H. Regnery, 1961), 79.

C. Papal Social Encyclicals

1. Rerum Novarum

On 15 May 1891 Pope Leo XIII issued *Rerum novarum,*[23] his encyclical *On the Condition of the Workers*. His successor, Pius XI, referred to it "as the Magna Charta" of the social order.[24] Some of the ideas of La Tour du Pin and the members of the Fribourg Union were included in this encyclical, but not all of their ideas were given full approbation; at the same time, neither were they condemned. Still, as earlier mentioned, some of the ideas of La Tour du Pin and of the Fribourg Union's that were not officially endorsed by Leo XIII would be accepted by Pius XI.

Rerum novarum struck something of a balance between the views of the School of Angers and the School of Liège. It even incorporated some of the more democratic ideas (such as trade unions) which were unacceptable to both of these schools. La Tour du Pin stressed the social function of property because he focused on the dissolving influence of liberalism on the social body. On the other hand, on account of the vigorous growth of

---

[23] For a comprehensive history and examination of Catholic social thought, see: Rodger Charles, S.J., *Christian Social Witness and Teaching: The Catholic Tradition from Genesis to Centesimus Annus*, 2 vols. (Leominster, England: Gracewing, 1998). For another fine treatment of the Church's social thought, see: Jean-Yves Calvez and Jacques Perrin, ed., *The Church and Social Justice: The Social Teachings of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1958*, trans. J.R. Kirwan (Chicago: H. Regnery, 1961). For two useful studies of the historical development of papal social thought, see: Joe Holland, *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: The Popes Confront the Industrial Age, 1740-1958* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2003); Michael J. Schuck, *That They Be One: The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991). For a good commentary on the seven of the chief papal social encyclicals by a notable Catholic economist, see: Rupert J. Ederer, *Economics as if God Matters: A Century of Papal Teaching Addressed to the Economic Order*. South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 1995.

[24] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 39, 421.

socialism, Leo XIII stressed the individual rights of property. It is not that the pope denied that property has social function or duties connected with it, but rather that he saw the destruction of private property as one of the greatest threats of that time. Hence he states, "For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own"[25] and "…private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable."[26]

As for wages, Leo XIII denies the liberal school's position that wages of the worker should reflect the law of supply and demand. Rather, he pointed out that economics should be subjected to morality, for in justice a man deserves a "minimum wage." He comments, "…that wages ought not to be insufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage earner."[27] A little bit further on, however, Leo XIII adds, "If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him comfortably to support himself, his wife, and his children,…"[28] This seems to imply that Leo was hinting at a wage that supported the family. Nevertheless, Leo is not as patent as is La Tour du Pin in his call for a "family wage," nor does he mandate that a "family wage" must be paid according to justice.[29]

Leo XIII's unconditional advocacy of state intervention in the Worker Question is

---

[25] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 6, 242.

[26] Ibid., no. 46, 253.

[27] Ibid., no. 45, 253.

[28] Ibid., no. 46, 253.

[29] See pages 218-219 of this paper in which the meaning of Leo XIII's "just wage" is treated.

a disavowal of the liberal school's minimalist position. Leo says, "…that the object of the government of the State should be, not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he is placed."[30] Thus he advocates a positive supervisory role of the State in promoting the common good, which is opposed by the liberals. He also remarks, "Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with harm, which can in no other way be met or prevented, the public authority must step in to deal with it."[31]

He then adds if strikes might disturb the public peace, if morals might be endangered in the workshop, if religion suffers because workers have no time for it, if unjust burdens are laid on workers, if health is endangered by excessive labor, or if women and children were forced to do unsuitable labor, then "…there can be no question but that, within certain limits, it would be right to invoke the aid and the authority of the law."[32] Hence, if peace and good order in society can be maintained only by the intervention of the State, then the State has the right to intervene. Nevertheless, the "State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammeled action so far as it is consistent with the common good and the interests of others."[33] Leo seems to hint vaguely at what would later be referred to as the "principle

---

[30] Ibid., no. 35, 250.

[31] Ibid., no. 36, 250.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid., no. 35, 250.

of subsidiarity." Like La Tour du Pin, he does not, like the socialists, advocate indiscriminate intervention by the State, but rather proposes limits on state intervention. He claims:

> 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, nor proceed further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the mischief. [34]

One of La Tour du Pin's main criticisms of the modern Caesarean and parliamentary systems included their tendency to "administer" the nation in a centralized fashion rather than to "govern" it in a decentralized manner. Although La Tour du Pin advocated state intervention, like Leo, he felt it should be restricted to its proper sphere.

This leads us to a consideration of associations, especially of workers. Leo points out that the individual man is too weak on his own and needs aid from his fellow man. By associating with his fellow man within a society or an association, solidarity is built up and the man, now supported, becomes stronger.[35] He adds that it is a natural right of man to enter into a society and the State cannot prohibit it absolutely. Only when associations are "bad, unlawful, or dangerous to the State" does the State have a right to forbid them or dissolve them.[36]

Although Leo XIII advocates guilds or corporations in article thirty-five of

---

[34] Ibid., no. 36, 250-251.

[35] Ibid., no. 50, 254.

[36] Ibid., no. 52, 254.

Humanum genus[37] and recognizes the evils that have multiplied since workingmens' guilds were abolished in the eighteenth century,[38] he does not promote them solely in *Rerum novarum.* Leo upholds the usefulness of workingmens' associations whether of workmen alone or workmen joined by employers.[39] La Tour du Pin would distinguish syndicates (trade unions) from corporations. Both social Catholics as well as economic liberals, like Périn, were opposed to trade unions, because they saw them as engines of the class struggle. Hence, Leo XIII is making Catholic teaching more palatable to the socialists who are big supporters of trade unions. Other more progressive social Catholics, like Léon Harmel, became more and more advocates of trade unions and associations of workers alone. Harmel felt that such associations taught the workers to be self-sufficient and gave them pride and dignity in managing their own affairs. Leo XIII probably felt that workers were more inclined to trade unions than to corporations and he would be able to attract them by advocating associations of workmen alone. He may also have seen that trade unions were one component of corporations and could be the first step toward corporations of both employers and workers.

Whereas La Tour du Pin regards workers' associations principally as professional bodies within civil society, Leo XIII views these workers' associations or guilds primarily as confessional bodies or confraternities made up of workers. Although he

---

[37] Leo XIII "Humanum genus," no. 35, 100.

[38] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 3, 241.

[39] Ibid., no. 49, 254.

does not consider these associations as purely religious societies, he does underscore their religious character. He remarks:

> It is clear that they must pay special and chief attention to the duties of religion and morality, and that social betterment should have this chiefly in view; otherwise they would lose wholly their special character, and end by becoming little better than those societies which take no account whatever of religion.…Let our associations, then, look first and before all things to God. [40]

Fr. Liberatore's first draft of *Rerum novarum* took a stricter corporatist position when referring to professional associations. Cardinal Zigliara, in his later draft, insisted on the more confessional aspects of these associations[41] and this understanding of workers' associations made its way into the final draft of *Rerum novarum.* On account of this, Georges Jarlot points out that the defenders of the corporative regime are mistaken if they think that the whole of their ideas are found in *Rerum novarum*.[42] La Tour du Pin's emphasis on the religiously neutral, professional aspects of workers' associations was avant-garde.

2. Quadragesimo Anno

Although Leo XIII stressed the individual character of property rather than its social character, he did not deny its social character. Rather, he focused on the individual character mainly because that was heavily under attack by the socialists of the time.

---

[40] Ibid., no. 57, 255-256.

[41] Georges Jarlot, S.J, "Les avant-projects de '*Rerum Novarum*' et les 'Anciennes Corporations'," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 81 (1959): 66.

[42] Ibid., 72.

They wished to make individual possessions the common property of all.[43] When discussing the two-fold character of property, Pope Pius XI defends his predecessor from these false charges by saying:

> First, then, let it be considered as certain and established that neither Leo nor those theologians who have taught under the guidance and authority of the Church have ever denied or questioned the twofold character of ownership, called usually individual or social according as it regards either separate persons or the common good.[44]

Pius XI then proceeds to underscore the necessity of safeguarding both the individual and social characters of property. He states:

> Accordingly, twin rocks of shipwreck must be carefully avoided. For, as one is wrecked upon, or comes close to, what is known as "individualism" by denying or minimizing the social and public character of the right of property, so by rejecting or minimizing the private and individual character of this same right, one inevitably runs into "collectivism" or at least closely approaches its tenets.[45]

The liberals are attacking the social character of property, because they do not view the ownership of private property as attended by duties to others in society. On the other hand, the socialists are attacking the individual character of private property, because they envy the rich and they claim that possessions should be the common property of all administered by the State.[46] The pope navigates well between the Scylla of individualism and the Charybdis of socialism, finding a happy mean between the two extremes.

La Tour du Pin is a strong advocate of the "family wage" and his viewpoint is overtly supported by Pius XI. In *Quadragesimo anno*, the pope states, "…the worker

---

[43] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 4, 242.

[44] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 45, 422.

[45] Ibid., no. 46, 422.

[46] Leo XIII, "Rerum novarum," no. 4, 242.

must be paid a wage sufficient to support him and his family."[47] Whereas this idea was found in *Rerum novarum* in veiled from, the idea of a "family wage" is quite explicit in Pius XI's encyclical. He is mandating it.

Pius XI further develops Leo XIII's thought on the role of the State in society in such a way that it captures the essence of La Tour du Pin's decentralized state. In discussing the principle of subsidiarity, Pius asserts:

> Still, that most weighty principle, which cannot be set aside or changed, remains fixed and unshaken in social philosophy: Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do. For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help to the members of the body social, and never destroy and absorb them.
>
> The supreme authority of the State ought, therefore, to let subordinate groups handle matters and concerns of lesser importance which would otherwise dissipate its efforts greatly. Thereby the State will more freely, powerfully, and effectively do all those things that belong to it alone because it alone can so them: directing, watching, urging, restraining, as occasion requires and necessity demands. Therefore, those in power should be sure that the more perfectly a graduated order is kept among the various associations, in observance of the principle of "subsidiarity function," the stronger social authority and effectiveness will be the happier and more prosperous the condition of the State. [48]

By Pius XI's time, matters had changed drastically and trade unions, through the syndicalist movement, had resorted to violence and had aggravated the class struggle. In order to preclude the class struggle, Pius advocated corporations that were composed of delegates from both worker syndicates and owner syndicates. They would be able to reconcile their interests and work toward a common end.[49] Like La Tour du Pin, Pius

---

[47] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 71, 426.

[48] Ibid., nos. 79 & 80, 428.

[49] Ibid., no. 93, 430.

also advocated corporations. Their ideas of a corporation do differ. Unlike La Tour du Pin's corporations which were composed of both workers and owners, Pius' "corporation" was a mixed council of delegates from both workers' syndicates and owners' syndicates. Still, both types of corporations were considered safeguards against the class struggle. Like La Tour du Pin, Pius also wished for the syndicates to be given a "juridical personality" so that they could govern their members as well as conduct labor agreements for them.[50]

Whereas Leo XIII says nothing about a corporative regime in *Rerum novarum*, Pius XI does broach the topic. While discussing the reconstruction of the social order, he states:

> But complete cure will not come until this opposition has been abolished and well-ordered members of the social body are constituted in which men may have their place, not according to the position each has in the labor market but according to the respective social functions which each performs. [51]

His thought on the reorganization of the social order very closely resembles La Tour du Pin's idea of the corporative system. Pius comes close to utilizing the term "representation of interests." He says:

> It is easily deduced from what has been said that the *interests* common to the whole Industry or Profession should hold first place in these guilds. The most important among these *interests* is to promote the cooperation in the highest degree of each industry and profession for the sake of the common good of the country. [52]

For Pius XI, these guilds are not principally confessional bodies. Like La Tour du Pin,

---

[50] Ibid., no. 92, 430.

[51] Ibid., no. 83, 428.

[52] Ibid., no. 85, 428.

Pius XI makes it clear that these guilds are fundamentally professional bodies holding a place in civil society, and hence, the interests of the profession are the main reason for their existence.

Finally, Pius XI seems to advocate not only a social role for corporations, but a political role as well. He refers to the corporations "as true and proper organs and institutions of the State."[53] Is this a vindication of La Tour du Pin's corporative regime? Some believed that this phrase of Pius XI supported the corporative system itself. In the 1930's both Chancellor Dollfuss of Austria and Prime Minister Salazar of Portugal took *Quadragesimo anno* as the blueprint for the corporative constitutions of their two countries. They felt that Pius had grounded the reconstruction of the social order on the political role of corporations within the State.[54] Although it appears that *Quadragesimo anno* supports the idea of a corporative regime, Pius XI is somewhat vague in describing exactly what the political role of these corporations should be, and hence, leaves this idea undeveloped. His reticence appears appropriate. For Pius XI, reaffirming the teaching of his predecessor Leo XIII, in *Immortale Dei* states:

> The teaching of Leo XIII on the form of political government, namely, that men are free to choose whatever form they please, provided that proper regard is had for the requirements of justice and of the common good, is equally applicable in due proportion, it is hardly necessary to say, to the guilds of the various industries and professions.[55]

Although a number of La Tour du Pin's ideas were not formerly adopted by Leo

---

[53] Ibid., no. 93, 430.

[54] Ehler and Morrall, *Church and State*, 496-497.

[55] Pius XI, "Quadragesimo anno," no. 86, 429.

XIII in *Rerum novarum*, after forty years of evolving papal thought, some of them were recognized by Pius XI in *Quadragesimo anno*. Nevertheless, I believe that it would be an unwarranted assumption to claim that La Tour du Pin's ideas directly influenced Pius XI in *Quadragesimo anno.* There were clearly other obvious influences on Pius XI's thought, particularly that of the German solidarist, Heinrich Pesch, S.J.[56] Concerning *Quadragesimo anno*, the Sulpician social ethicist John Cronin also states, "The industry-council [joint employer-worker council] idea was based on the solidarism of Heinrich Pesch, whose pupils, Oswald von Nell-Breuning and Gustav Gundlach, were generally considered the redactors of the encyclical."[57] In fact, many years later Nell-Breuning himself went on record to state that even the Austrian corporatist school had no influence on the development of *Quadragesimo anno.* Nell-Breuning comments:

> In Austria it is still presumed (occasionally even the determined assertion emerges) that the section on the 'occupational order' goes back to the influence of the Vogelsang school or may lead back to Chancellor Ignaz Seipel. No Austrian cooperated on the development of QA. In my work, no article coming from Austria came to my attention. However surprising it may sound, these QA thoughts arose exclusively from the Monchengladbach instituted Konigswinter group, chiefly—as Erich Streissler recently determined—from the 'extremely liberal' thinking of Gustav Gundlach.[58]

At the same time, although there was no corporatist influence in the drafting of the encyclical, this does not mean that the principles and the teaching of the encyclical

---

[56] Rupert J. Ederer, *Economics as if God Matters: A Century of Papal Teaching Addressed to the Economic Order* (South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 1995), 44.

[57] John F. Cronin, S.S, "Forty Years Later: Reflections and Reminiscences," in *Official Catholic Social Teaching: Readings in Moral Theology, No. 5,* ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, S.J. (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986), 71.

[58] Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J, "The Drafting of Quadragesimo Anno," in *Official Catholic Social Teaching: Readings in Moral Theology, No. 5,* ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, S.J (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986), 64.

are not amenable to corporatism. Much to Nell-Breuning's dismay, he states that "three years later, Pius XI expressed high appreciation of the 'QA state'[59] allegedly established in Austria through the Constitution of May, 1934."[60] From this comment, it is abundantly clear that the pope felt that *Quadragesimo anno* was certainly supportive of "corporatist principles," whether or not they had influenced the encyclical's chief redactor, Nell-Breuning. I would argue, then, that although *Quadragesimo anno* does not advocate any particular form of State, the encyclical is certainly amenable to the corporatist system. It may be that the thought of La Tour du Pin had no clear influence on the drafting of the encyclical, but much of his corporatist thought appears to be in line with the principles enunciated in *Quadragesimo anno.*

As *Rerum novarum* did not advocate La Tour du Pin's essential ideas on corporatism, some critics saw this as a disavowal of his brand of social Catholic thought. It would be more just to state that Leo XIII wished to allow more latitude to Catholic social thought early on. After further problems, especially socialism, developed at the beginning of the twentieth century Pius XI advocated more particular solutions. La Tour du Pin, however, could be seen as a "prophet crying in the wilderness." For the men of

---

[59] Nell-Breuning was clearly disconcerted with this comment by the pope. He pointed out that the Church has enunciated that the citizens have the right to choose their mode of government (*Immortale Dei*, no. 4 and *Quadragesimo anno*, no. 86). How, therefore, can the pope refer to a "QA" State? In my opinion, it is certainly conceivable that Pope Pius' comment merely meant that he felt that the principles enunciated in QA were incarnated well in the Austrian "corporatist State." It does not necessarily follow that he was advocating a particular form of State. See: Nell-Breuning, "The Drafting of Quadragesimo Anno," 64.

[60] Nell-Breuning, "The Drafting of Quadragesimo Anno," 64.

his time were unfamiliar with the nature of corporations and the corporate reorganization of society. Yet, after forty years of the development of papal social thought, many of La Tour du Pin's social ideas of the 1880's and 1890's demonstrated the remarkable prescience of this thinker. Thus, I believe that many of La Tour du Pin's own ideas superseded those found within *Rerum novarum* insofar as they were compatible with principles enunciated in *Quadragesimo anno.*

D. The Practical Implementation of the Representative Regime

In 1887 La Tour du Pin saw the perfect opportunity to oppose the individualism resulting from the Revolution by opposing the celebration of the centenary of the Revolution with a counter-centenary[61] denoted by corporative solidarity. Albert de Mun, however, saw this as an opportunity to enlarge and rejuvenate the membership of the OCCO. This would become a major source of disagreement between the two men.[62]

Research and studies were prepared for the counter-centenary by members of the OCCO. The grievances in the *cahiers* (lists) of 1789 were studied and compared with the programs of the contemporary parties in the parliamentary system in order to demonstrate the bankruptcy of the Revolution.[63] This preparatory work led to the rough drafts of

---

[61] A full description of La Tour du Pin's attempt to institute a corporative regime through provincial assemblies in the late 1880's and early 1990's is described in Talmy, *Aux sources*, 210-295.

[62] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 219.

[63] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 24.

modern *cahiers* that would be sent to various provincial assemblies convoked in early 1889 by professional bodies. Following this, extracts from the provincial assemblies would be submitted for ratification at the "Estates-General" in Paris and the results would be publicly proclaimed.[64]

In France, on the 10 and 11 November 1888 the États du Dauphiné[65] assembled in Romans under the auspices of the OCCO. René de La Tour du Pin had recently completed his theoretical work for the reconstruction of a Christian social order. A few months earlier, in 1888, the French government had celebrated the centenary of the États de Vizille (July 1788).[66] This government-sponsored event symbolized defiance to the absolutism of the *ancien régime*, for this assembly of one hundred years past was seen as a prelude to the French Revolution which the contemporary French government lionized, along with Revolution's legacy of universal suffrage and parliamentary regime.

The États du Dauphiné at Romans (1888) was a response to this vaunted legacy of the Revolution and it, instead, promoted professional rights and corporative interests. Therefore, it symbolized opposition to the inheritance of the Revolution, viz. the absolutism of the parliamentary regime.[67] The États du Dauphiné (1888) also reasserted

---

[64] Ibid., 25.

[65] The Provincial Assembly of Dauphiné.

[66] For an overview of the defiance of King Louis XVI and his ministers by the États de Vizille, see: Doyle, *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*, 88-89; François Furet and Denis Richet, *The French Revolution*, trans. Stephen Hardman (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), 52-54; Alfred Cobban, *History of Modern France*, vol. 1, 129-130.

[67] Adrien Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, vol. 2, trans. John Dingle (New York:

their provincial rights and interests vis-à-vis the absolutist central government in Paris; this appealed greatly to the social Catholics of 1888, who saw the contemporary parliamentary regime as guilty of absolutist abuses as well. At the États du Dauphiné, Hyacinthe de Gailhard-Bancel, a close friend of La Tour du Pin, made a plea to draft *cahiers* of grievances, needs, and demands for the *États généraux* (Estates-General) as their forebears did in 1789.[68] The États du Dauphiné inspired seventeen other provincial assemblies, which culminated in the Estates-General of 1889. The other assemblies were held between spring and summer of 1889.[69] In chronological order they included the following: "Montpellier, Poitiers, Orléans, Lyon, Toulouse, Dijon, Aix, Besançon, Bourges, Limoges, Caen, Cahors, Troyes, Angers, Versailles, Lille, et Rennes."[70] Nevertheless, this was the high point of right-wing social Catholicism, for from now on it would begin to fizzle as it lost support.[71]

Albert de Mun saw these assemblies as vehicles for Catholic action whereas La Tour du Pin acknowledged them as manifestations of neutral social politics, although of a Christian inspiration.[72] Unlike many other members of the *Oeuvre* and their supporters

---

Herder and Herder, 1961), 116.

[68] Jarlot, *Le régime corporatif*, 147-148.

[69] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 251.

[70] Ibid., 251.

[71] Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France*, vol. 2, 116-117.

[72] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 259.

he makes a perceptive distinction between the religious society and the civil society without confounding them. In a letter to his friend Gailhard-Bancel, he comments:

> These courageous people, and there have been many of them like that, even in the direction of the *Oeuvre*, have never known how to distinguish between the religious society which is composed of confraternities and the civil society which only comprises groups of the natural order. They have believed that the latter would be forcibly antagonistic to the former, whereas both are of the providential order, and that the first ought simply, by its very nature, tend to wholly penetrate the second without claiming to substitute itself for it.[73]

La Tour du Pin had further refined his idea of a corporation since the time of the disagreement between the followers of Maignen and Harmel within the OCCO. At the Assembly at Romans not all the members of the professional body were Catholic; some were socialists.[74] Nevertheless, La Tour du Pin believed in a Christian social order. He thought that Catholics should act on the masses in the manner that leaven acts on dough.[75] He maintains:

> In the provincial Assemblies which unite all elements of the social body, Catholics intervene with their program, without, however, endeavoring to seize the movement of social politics and diverting it from the direction of its proper concerns.[76]

For hadn't Leo XIII, commenting on the proper spheres of the ecclesiastical and civil powers, stated, "Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of

---

[73] La Tour du Pin, *Lettre à Gailhard-Bancel*, 21 Juillet 1889, quoted in Talmy, *Aux sources*, 256-257.

[74] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 25.

[75] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 249.

[76] Ibid.

each.…”[77] La Tour du Pin had shifted his thought from advocating ecclesiastical control over corporations to maintaining that corporations should be autonomous. He thus asserted the autonomy of the temporal and rejected the medieval conception of temporal society. He saw that the Christian era had come and gone and he was now living in the modern era.[78] This demonstrates, once again, against the critics of La Tour du Pin, that he did not have romantic theories of the Middle Ages, nor did he wish to bring distinctly medieval institutions into the modern age.

Concerning the religious associations and the confraternities supported by the OCCO, La Tour du Pin viewed them as not primarily devoted to the social reform movement, but principally to their confessional character. Real professional associations needed to be formed, and the conception of the *Oeuvre* needed to be revised or abandoned.[79]

After being opposed by both the bishops of Dauphiné and Albert de Mun, La Tour du Pin and Gailhard-Bancel convoked the provincial estates of Dauphiné two more times, once at Romans (1891) and once at Voiron (1893).[80] Like most avant-garde thinkers, La Tour du Pin was not fully appreciated by many of his collaborators.[81]

---

[77] Leo XIII, “Immortale Dei,” no. 13, 110.

[78] Talmy, *Aux sources*, 257.

[79] Ibid., 256.

[80] Ibid., 278.

[81] Ibid., 286.

Eventually, Albert de Mun, as Secretary-General of the OCCO, separated *Association catholique* from the OCCO so as not to compromise the latter by the social politics of the former.[82] In 1893, after six years of work, the program of social reconstruction by means of the provincial assemblies was ended.[83] Commenting on La Tour du Pin's prescience in social matters, Robert Talmy remarks:

> An evolution of ideas was necessary; numerous years will pass again before La Tour du Pin had the joy of seeing his program integrally taken up again by social Catholics and confirmed by pontifical documents.[84]

This demonstrates that La Tour du Pin was not solely a man of theory, but also a man of action. Nevertheless, he wanted to distill a pure social doctrine before implementing it on the practical level.

E. La Tour du Pin's Further Influences

La Tour du Pin had a great influence over a few leaders in the earlier part of the twentieth century. He clearly had a direct influence over Charles Maurras and Maréchal Henri Philippe Pétain. It also appears that he may have had an indirect influence over Antonio Oliveira Salazar, the Prime Minister of Portugal. Although there is currently no evidence to show that he had any influence on the sociologist Émile Durkheim, the latter had some corporative ideas in common with La Tour du Pin.

---

[82] Ibid., 276.

[83] Ibid., 293.

[84] Ibid.

Charles Maurras, the agnostic Comtean positivist turned monarchist, who was the intrepid leader of the *Action Française*,[85] referred to La Tour du Pin as "my direct master"[86] in his book *Enquête de la Monarchie.* Later, in one of the issues of the *Action française,* Maurras referred to La Tour du Pin as "my direct master, master, I repeat it, of our social politics, master in the same degree in general and pure politics."[87] Exhibiting the influence of La Tour du Pin on Maurras, Robert Talmy states:

> Maurras recovers in effect all of the theses of the master: monarchical nationalism, antiparliamentarianism, decentralization, the restoration of local liberties and that of intermediate bodies; with him, as with La Tour du Pin, one finds the same submission to the *Syllabus,* the same hostility to democratic principles, the same respect of social hierarchies, the same willingness to restore the corporative regime and the representative regime.[88]

For a period of time La Tour du Pin himself was a contributor to *Action française.* Three of his articles[89] in this journal became part of the compilation known as *Vers un ordre social chrétien: Jalons de route, 1882-1907.* In 1905 he formally became a member[90] of

---

[85] For the most recent work treating of the Action Française, see: Oscar L. Arnal, *Ambivalent Alliance: The Catholic Church and the Action Française, 1899-1939* (Pittburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985). Older studies of the Action Française include the following: Lucien Thomas, *L'Action française devant l'Église de Pie X à Pie XII* (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1965); Eugen Weber, *Action Française: Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth Century France* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1962); Edward R. Tannenbaum, *The Action Française: Die-Hard Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century France* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962).

[86] Charles Maurras, *Enquête sur la monarchie* (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1925), 7.

[87] Charles Maurras, *Action française,* April 15, 1934, quoted in Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 79.

[88] Talmy, *Réne de La Tour du Pin*, 54.

[89] *La Noblesse en France* (1 décembre 1904); *La Représentation professionnelle* (1 août 1905); *De l'Organisation territoriale et de la représentation* (15 septembre 1906).

[90] Eugen Weber, *Action Française: Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth Century France* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1962), 68.

the *Action Française*, but he withdrew his support in 1912 as the *Action Française* flirted with the syndicalism of Georges Sorel.[91] Summing up La Tour du Pin's later view of the *Action Française*, Matthew Elbow comments, "La Tour disliked the violence employed by the *Action Française* and Maurras' paganism and emphasis upon politics."[92] Also indicating some of the acute differences between the *Action Française* and La Tour du Pin, Talmy says:

> However, it is not without interest to emphasize it, the *Action Française* has severed from its roots the tree planted by the Christian gentleman: the almost systematic recourse to violence, or even to calumny, the contempt of absolute metaphysics, the affirmation of "Politics first," as much as fundamental attitudes that La Tour du Pin would have without any doubt disavowed.[93]

All in all, Matthew Elbow argues that the *Action française* only paid "lip service" to corporatism prior to World War I. The group's main interest was in "political royalism." Nevertheless, between the two World wars, Firmin Bacconier,[94] the leading economic expert of the *Action française*, guided the *Action française* in developing a coherent corporative doctrine based on the ideas of La Tour du Pin. [95]

Maréchal Henri Philippe Pétain, who became the leader of Vichy Regime in France, was also a corporatist disciple of La Tour du Pin.[96] In particular, Pétain was

---

[91] Edward R. Tannenbaum, *The Action Française: Die-Hard Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century France* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), 160.

[92] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 119.

[93] Talmy, *Réne de La Tour du Pin*, 54.

[94] Bacconier was the author of *Le Salut par la Corporation: un nouvel ordre professionel.*

[95] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 79, 120.

[96] Ibid., 80, 171. For more on the corporatism of Pétain's government, see: Elbow, *French*

taken by corporatism's ability to satisfy certain demands of labor. The corporations would bring workers into personal contact with their employers "to discuss and manage the interests of the profession."[97] Through corporatism, a *possession d'etat* or "ownership of one's trade" would be established. This "property" both provided the laborer with steady work and aided him in advancement.[98] Lastly, security for the worker would be provided by the corporative patrimony, some of which was taken from the company's profits, some from the worker's paycheck. In this way the worker could participate in "profit-sharing."[99] It should be noted that the corporatism of the Vichy regime was not the brand which La Tour du Pin promoted. He promoted decentralization. He wanted corporatism to naturally and organically develop on its own within society without strong state support. Matthew Elbow claims that the Vichy government fell short of the corporatist vision in practice. He states, "While it preached anti-étatisme, in reality the strong arm of the Vichy government was omnipresent."[100]

Outside of France, corporatism found a home in Portugal during the second third of the twentieth century under Antonio Oliveira Salazar, Prime Minister of Portugal. It is not clear that Salazar was a direct disciple of La Tour du Pin. We do know that Maurras

---

Corporative Theory, 168-196.

[97] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 176.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Ibid., 194.

was an ardent disciple of La Tour du Pin. In addition, we also know that Salazar was a disciple of Maurras. Salazar's most recent biographer, Filipe Ribeiro de Menezes, notes the influence of the "French masters" over the thought of Salazar. He notes:

> As we have seen, his views were a distillation of Catholic and counter-Revolutionary politics, mostly taken from the Papal Encyclicals and from French thinkers such as Gustave Le Bon and Charles Maurras; there [sic] would be updated later by Henri Massis and Jacques Bainville.[101]

Although I have found no direct proof that Salazar studied La Tour du Pin's works, there is circumstantial evidence to suppose that he did. Both he and La Tour du Pin were corporatist thinkers. Moreover, Maurras may have been a link between the two men. Maurras was heavily influenced by "his master" La Tour du Pin and Salazar was certainly influenced by one of his "French masters," Maurras. Maurras also communicated with both men. Is it conceivable that Salazar learned of La Tour du Pin from the writings of Maurras? I believe so. Nevertheless, we will have to wait until more research is done on "all the intellectual influences of Salazar" to demonstrate a direct connection. In any case, there are clear similarities between the thought of the two men. Jacques Ploncard d'Assac claims that Salazar's constitution corresponds with the principles outlined in the corporative definition of the Catholic Union of Fribourg of 1884.[102] This also hints at a likely influence wielded by La Tour du Pin on Salazar. For La Tour du Pin was the secretary of Union of Fribourg and one of the most influential

---

[101] Filipe Ribeiro de Menezes, *Salazar: A Political Biography* (New York: Enigma Books, 2009), 83.

[102] Jacques Ploncard d'Assac, *Salazar*, 2nd ed. (Bouère, France: Dominique Martin Morin, 1983), 100-101.

members of it. Salazar instituted the *Estado Novo* with the corporation as one of its "fundamental principles." His idea was to eradicate "individualism," "socialism," "parliamentarism," and the "partisan spirit."[103]

One other "corporatist friendly" thinker ought to be noted, although it is not clear that he was a disciple of La Tour du Pin. Nevertheless, he certainly sympathized with many of the ideas of the corporatist movement. This is the noted sociologist Émile Durkheim. Both he and La Tour du Pin were contemporaries. Durkheim comments at great length on the many benefits of the corporative system. At one point he remarks:

> …may we not legitimately think that the corporation should also undergo a corresponding transformation and become the elementary division of the state, the basic political unit? Society, instead of remaining what it is today—a conglomerate of land masses juxtaposed together—would become a vast system of national corporations. *The demand is raised in various quarters for electoral colleges to be constituted by professions and not by territorial constituencies.* Certainly in this way political assemblies would more accurately reflect the diversity of social interests and their interconnections. They would more exactly epitomise social life as a whole. Yet if we state that the country, in order to become conscious of itself, should be grouped by professions, is not this to acknowledge that the organized profession or the corporation should become the essential organ of public life?[104]

Durkheim had studied suicide and concluded that it was a sociological rather than a psychological problem. He claimed that suicide was the result of the purposelessness that many individuals felt in modern society. As he realized that the nation, the churches, and families of the modern era were becoming more ineffective in their hold on individuals, he thought that the corporations were the natural solution to arrest the isolation of the

---

[103] Philippe C. Schmitter, *Corporatism and Public Policy in Authoritarian Portugal* (London: Sage Publications, Ltd, 1975), 15.

[104] Émile Durkheim, preface to the second edition of *The Division of Labor in Society*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: The Free Press, 1997), liii-liv.

individual. He believed that corporations had the ability to build strong social ties among men, thereby creating a greater sense of purpose in the life of individuals.[105]

As a fundamental principle of his corporative system La Tour du Pin always wanted the role of the State limited to its proper sphere of action. Corporations, by their existence as "states within a state," would naturally exert a decentralizing role on society by means of governing the specific matters within their own proper ambit. La Tour du Pin would not have supported leaders like Mussolini, who absorbed the corporations into his centralized state. He also would disagree with the implementation of the corporative system by raw force and authority or by dictatorial decrees as Mussolini had realized it.[106] Unfortunately, the fascist example of Mussolini, who was a follower of Georges Sorel and his theories of violence, vitiated the corporative regime in the minds of many political thinkers of the twentieth century. La Tour du Pin felt that the corporative system must slowly and organically take hold in the minds of the people such that they eventually would regard the corporative chambers in their provinces as the true representatives bodies entrusted with their interests and rights.

Not only had La Tour du Pin influenced famous statesmen of the twentieth century to carry on his legacy, but a club was also set up in Paris to teach and promote his social thought. This was the *Cercle La Tour du Pin* with its headquarters at 10 Rue de

---

[105] John Clarke Adams, "Some Antecedents of the Theory of the Corporative System," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3, no. 2 (April 1942): 185-186.

[106] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 56.

Havre. This club was founded by Roger Semichon[107] and was carried on by Robert Guillerman[108] after Semichon's death. Lectures and courses on La Tour du Pin's social thought were regularly held at the club.[109]

---

[107] Semichon is the author of *Les Idées sociales et politiques de La Tour du Pin* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936).

[108] Guillerman is the author of *La Doctrine sociale de La Tour du Pin*, (Paris: Cercle de La Tour du Pin, 1937).

[109] Elbow, *French Corporative Theory*, 80.

CONCLUSION

René de La Tour du Pin was a voracious student and only the most significant intellectual influences on his thought were addressed in this paper. The most important of them will be briefly recognized here. The *Mémoire* of Levacher-Duplessis aided in convincing La Tour du Pin of the need for the restoration of corporations. Like Bonald, La Tour du Pin also was opposed to the prevalent individualism of the nineteenth century. Bonald and La Tour du Pin were also in accord over the primacy of society over the individual and the indivisibility of authority. In addition, La Tour du Pin imbibed Bonald's view that authority needs to be dispersed throughout society so that its decentralization could be realized. Yet again La Tour du Pin was in agreement with Bonald concerning the corrosive dangers of divorce to the constitution of the family, the need to reestablish strong paternal authority once again, and the necessity to protect the rural family from destruction, caused by the forced division of property. Bonald also affected La Tour du Pin in his view that corporations are great agencies of social control. Finally, he agreed with Bonald about reconstituting true political representation through social professions.

Frédéric Le Play convinced him of the importance of strong social hierarchies, the importance of the family as the elemental unit of society, and the freedom of testation.[1]

---

[1] For a description of the "freedom of testation," see note 108 on page 71 of this dissertation.

In addition, he agreed with Le Play's stress on the Decalogue as a means of moral regeneration. Nevertheless, with Charles Périn, La Tour du Pin agreed that the Catholic Church, with the New Law, grace, and its social teaching, superseded the Decalogue as the preeminent moral force for the regeneration of society.[2] La Tour du Pin also concurred with both Le Play and Périn in seeing individualism as the main scourge of modern society.

In agreement with Émile Keller, La Tour du Pin was opposed to economic liberalism as well as political liberalism. Like Keller, he saw that social reform must not only be moral, but also economic. There needed to be institutional reform; personal charity alone was not enough to solve the predominant social problems, justice was also necessary. The workers needed to reconstitute a corporative patrimony, which would offer them social liberty. In addition, Keller influenced him with his idea of a representative regime, i.e., one that allows some participation by all the citizens and allows political liberty to blossom.

The positive role of state intervention, advocated by Ketteler, aided La Tour du Pin in removing the *Conseil d'Études* from the controlling influences of Catholic economic liberal thought. This also demonstrated that remedies must proceed not only from the domain of charity, but from that of justice as well. Ketteler clearly provided guidance to avoid the extremes of liberalism and socialism. His views on the organic

---

[2] See note 117 on p. 172 of this dissertation.

structure of society as well as the view that corporations are fundamentally professional bodies rather than confessional bodies also appears to have shaped the thought of La Tour du Pin as well.

The Comte de Chambord's idea of a monarchy limited externally by intermediate bodies, but not internally divided, was a dominant influence on La Tour du Pin. Both men were opposed to the absolutist monarchy of the *ancien régime* as well as that of the parliamentary monarchy of the Restoration. In addition, both understood that a true monarch must be a socially conscious king. Karl von Vogelsang planted the seed of the corporative regime in La Tour du Pin's mind. In addition, his harsh views on capitalism and usury also cast their spell on La Tour du Pin. Finally, it should be mentioned that Léon Harmel's "Christian corporation" of Val-des-Bois helped La Tour du Pin concretely understand the nature and purpose of corporations, even though he later concluded that Harmel's corporation was not a true corporation.

La Tour du Pin wielded considerable authority over the social Catholic thought of his time through the review *Association catholique.* He was considered the moving spirit behind the international body of social scholars called the Fribourg Union. Although his own distinctive thought did not wield considerable influence over *Rerum novarum,* his corporative vision did find some support in *Quadragesimo anno.* Lastly, the persuasiveness of his corporatist vision held considerable weight in the minds of certain twentieth-century intellectual political leaders such as Charles Maurras and Maréchal Philippe Pétain. In addition, his corporatist vision had similarities with that of Antonio

Salazar, although no direct influence over Salazar has yet been proven.

La Tour du Pin saw individualism as the great threat to the social body in the modern era. He saw it infect religious society, the family, political society, and economic society. Since man was by nature a social animal, this individualism proceeding from the French Revolutions was unnatural. It recognized no bonds or ties between men, but rather asserted the rights of the "abstract individual."

The truth about the nature of man was also integral to the thought of La Tour du Pin. Following the Church's guidance, he believed that man's nature was corrupted by original sin. This doctrine informed his views on society and the State. The absolutist State, run by fallen men, was inclined to an abuse of power. On the other hand, the isolated individual from below, also fallen, was inclined to an abuse of freedom. Consequently, authority needed to be decentralized and society needed to be permeated by varied and numerous intermediate bodies to act as buffers on abuses of power from above and abuses of freedom from below. This arrangement would help offset the effects of fallen man in society.

Men are generally more conscious of duties than rights when they see themselves as members of a group. Individuals are generally more aware of the limitations placed on their liberty within a group setting, because it is more apparent that other people's rights need to be respected. In a like manner, it seems that the State also demonstrates a greater awareness of its duties than its rights when it sees itself as one group among many within society; although it may be the chief body in society, over time it becomes habituated to

respect other associations which carry out their duties in their proper spheres of influence. If the State is allowed to absorb and destroy other subordinate social bodies so that it alone is recognized as the only group within society, then men will pass down the path of absolutism and possibly even totalitarianism. Furthermore, the State will dissipate all of its energies and fail to do its own proper duties well.[3]

Concerning religion, La Tour du Pin states that the Church is a perfect society[4] and cannot be hindered from freely developing itself. La Tour du Pin maintained that it was the duty of the State not just to respect the Church, but to actively protect it. In particular, he underscored the importance of the Church's teaching office, especially in the area of its social teachings.

La Tour du Pin's critique of the parliamentary regime also rings true, especially with regard to the deputies' irresponsibility and incompetence. Similar to many politicians today, the deputies were often only concerned with making promises to their constituents during election time. After election time, they ignored their constituents and did as they pleased until the next election. Because of this, the people were not really being represented. In effect, they had given up their sovereignty to their representatives after they voted for them. La Tour du Pin's ideas of a prescribed mandate for their representatives would limit their irresponsible behavior because their powers would not

---

[3] See Pius XI, *Quadragesimo anno*, nos. 79-80.

[4] See note 170 on page 251 of this dissertation for an explanation of the Church as a "perfect society."

extend beyond what they were precisely qualified to do.

He also censured the deputies' incompetence for they did not speak in the name of their peers, but in the name of "France." "Hence, they were considered proper to all, good for nothing."[5] As La Tour du Pin states, many of the deputies were lawyers, and lawyers involved in politics may be familiar with political maneuvering, but they do not generally understand the common people's needs. To judge today's politicians by La Tour du Pin's standards, many of them are also incompetent because they are out of touch with most of their constituents' needs. Unlike nineteenth-century French politicians, a number of today's insincere politicians hire pollsters to sound out public opinion. However, like their nineteenth-century predecessors, many of them show no real concern with their constituents' needs and interests, but they merely want to be re-elected.

A corporative patrimony was essential to La Tour du Pin's idea of a corporation. It was a common fund that could be used for unemployment, pensions, security, and professional schooling, etc. It was similar to the types of insurance which workers have today, such as unemployment benefits, workers' compensation and retirement pensions. Although this insurance is not a "corporative patrimony," it shows how far-seeing La Tour du Pin was in many of his ideas on social insurance. Ideas similar to his have been put into practice today. As in La Tour du Pin's day, both employee and employer

---

[5] La Tour du Pin, "Le parlementarisme," 7.

contribute to these funds together and those who have not worked for a company long enough are not always eligible for such benefits. Today, if the company has good benefits, it secures the loyalty of its employees as Harmel's factories did in the late nineteenth century. La Tour du Pin's version of profit-sharing, where a percentage of the company's profits would be put into a common fund for employees, would also encourage them to work hard. This would provide them with the incentive to do things more efficiently. They themselves would personally benefit from the success of their companies; and, at the same time, they would increase the profits for their company. This enabled the workers to own property, even though it was collective property. It provided the workers with both security and the opportunity to better their lot.

As mentioned earlier, La Tour du Pin demonstrates his originality as he extends the meaning of what might be considered property. A man might own a *possession d'état,* or a mastery of the trade, which, if it is guaranteed by law, has the character of property. Consequently, this is yet another means by which the worker can own property. The mastery of the trade must be determined by a *brevet* or certificate of professional capacity. The certificates of professional capacity or *brevets* were a concrete means by which to encourage the manual worker to learn a skill and move up the social ladder. One of the uses of the corporative patrimony was for professional schooling so that workers could afford to acquire skills. By good training, the worker would acquire skills that he then owned. He also would not be pushed out of his work by an invasion of machines which would be able to do the work faster than him. The *brevet* also

encouraged the worker to learn a skill and use his reason, rather than just his brute force.

La Tour du Pin keenly observed that each "concerned element" should be represented in the whole corporation. Rather than advocate separate corporations for workers and owners, he proposed the mixed corporation, which would prevent class warfare between workers and owners. It would also prevent the long strikes that occur so often today because of the distinct trade unions (workers) and trade associations (owners). In the case of mixed corporations, the two groups would form social bonds with one another and learn how to work together. Unfortunately, mixed unions did not flourish, for most industrial workers saw them as paternalistic. Therefore, they formed their own unions. Nevertheless, it must be said that La Tour du Pin's mixed union was a democratic step by this monarchist; for he really wanted the workers to be represented and not remain the neglected Fourth Estate of the past.

La Tour du Pin's monarchical leanings were not those of Louis XIV's absolutist state. He was outspoken in his criticism of the *ancien régime* as he was of the parliamentary regime for its regimented statism. His political ideas, therefore, were not a throwback to the absolutist past. La Tour du Pin saw corporations acting as intermediate buffer-bodies between the powerful state and the atomized individual. He promoted the "freedom of groups." John McManners captures the political and social tone of the association-phobic Third Republic thus:

> Popular sovereignty was one pillar of republican political theory, and individual liberty was the other. Since the Revolution, Frenchmen had been more adept at ensuring the liberty of the isolated citizen than of the individual as a member of free associations within the State. Something of Rousseau's distrust of independent groups distorting the expression of the general will had lived on in the minds of the legislators, along with their bourgeois fear of combinations of the

> underprivileged. This prejudice was dangerous; as Tocqueville had shown, it favored dictatorship, the machine of power moving forward easily over a dust of atomized uncompacted individuals.[6]

Much criticism has been leveled at La Tour du Pin because he was a doctrinaire thinker wrapped up in pure theory. De Mun himself at one point said that he had had enough of theory, but then again de Mun was a man of action and sought immediate incremental solutions to problems. It is true that La Tour du Pin wanted to distill the Church's pure social doctrine before implementing it. His program, although gaining some initial momentum, failed to get off the ground in the 1890's. Since his corporations were composed of both owners and workers, they did not attract many industrial workers, who found them too hierarchical and not democratic enough.

At the same time, La Tour du Pin's vision of a corporative state was not just a product of his fertile imagination. It was not a chimera; it was rooted in the concrete past. Many medieval towns in Europe had governments in which there was a strong guild representation. Anthony Black states:

> A guild constitution means that the guilds are represented in the city council and that civic offices are open to guild members. But it also refers to a specific way of ruling that is open, enabling all citizens to participate, and based upon general consensus with fair elections to all posts, so that one achieves the basic moral idea of 'commonalty' (*gmaind)*, namely, mutual respect and 'friendliness' both between classes and between rulers and ruled.[7]

There is, therefore, an historical basis for guilds being represented in municipal governments. Here we have a case of social function as a basis of representation at the

---

[6] McManners, *Church and State in France*, 153-154.

[7] Anthony Black, *Guilds and Civil Society in European Political Thought from the 12th Century to the Present* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984), 117.

level of the town or city. Nonetheless, this type of government prevailed only in commercially based communes—the government of no major state was ever based on guilds or corporations. Nevertheless, there were larger states like France in which representation was based on social function, i.e., those who pray, those who fight, and those who work.[8] La Tour du Pin blended the idea of medieval guilds with that of the French Estates before the Revolution. It was a new twist on two very traditional, historical, and organic systems of representation. For La Tour du Pin's system was a hybrid of two practically realized social structures of the past, one being at the municipal level of the town, the other at the political level of the province and the State. By melding two different ideas from the past, he attempted to establish a representative system more conducive to political life in the modern world. Representation would begin at the local or regional level and extend itself to the national level, when necessary. "Those who work" would have much more representation than in the past. They would be grouped into four corporations, viz. moral, liberal, industrial, and agricultural professions. La Tour du Pin organized society according to social functions rather than class because social function would better represent permanent interests and unity, whereas a class organization would further heighten the class struggle. Although it was a new concept, La Tour du Pin felt that the corporative regime would better yield genuine representation in modern society than the outmoded forms of the past. It would be a truly

---

[8] The First Estate was the clergy—those who pray; the Second Estate was the nobility—those who fight; and the Third Estate was the commoners—those who work. All three together were represented in the Estates-General.

"representative regime."

Antonio Oliveira Salazar refers to the framework of the State, organized along the lines of the corporative regime, as an "organic democracy."[9] The authors Arnaud de Lassus and Michel Berger outline some of the reasonable democratic aspirations which can be realized through an organic democracy. They state:

> Aspirations which are said to be democratic manifest evil tendencies (rejection of social hierarchies, egalitarianism, democratic envy); but also comprise reasonable elements which may be legitimately satisfied.
>
> Let us recall these:
>
> --the aspirations of man to be able to voice his concerns on certain decisions which affect him directly.
>
> --the more general concern of being effectively represented in Government.
>
> --the aspiration to have access to the leaders of social bodies in which he plays a part (community, workplace, etc.) and to be able to participate in their decisions.
>
> We call organic democracies those regimes which enable these aspirations to be met as least in part, and which afford adequate representation by these bodies at State level.[10]

I myself have used the term "organic democracy" in the title of this dissertation because the term "corporatism" today often has a pejorative meaning attached to it. This view has largely arisen on account of Mussolini's fascist "corporatist state". Furthermore, today we live in a culture which is permeated by "democracy." It might even be said that we live in a "democratic age." In fact, many forms of government are condemned precisely because they are not "democratic" or "democratic enough." By utilizing the term

---

[9] Ploncard d'Assac, *Salazar*, 101.

[10] Arnaud de Lassus and Michel Berger, "Fundamentals of Democracy," trans. A.S. Fraser and Peter McEnerny, *Apropos*, no. 19/20 (Pentecost 1999): 250-251.

"organic democracy" to describe La Tour du Pin's corporative political system, some of the more truly positive elements of democracy may be placed in greater relief. Because professional interests are organized before they are represented, because men are able to realistically air their concerns and views on matters which especially concern them, because they can communicate effectively with the leaders of social bodies of which they are a part and even participate in making decisions, La Tour du Pin's democracy is truly "organic." The system is organic, because it is organized as are the parts of a living organism. Just as parts of a living organism communicate back and forth with one another, this system, with interests well organized, allows men to effectively communicate with their leaders vertically and it allows corporations in one region to communicate horizontally with corporations from a different region. It is also truly democratic because it allows men to both practically and effectively participate in the political process through the realizable channel of representation by social function.

This organic democracy is also decentralized. The State has a role to play, but only on matters within its proper sphere. The various corporations attend to all of their specific needs within their territorial region, pertinent to their social function. If they are incapable of accomplishing these things, higher level bodies, including the State itself, if necessary, will be drawn into the situation. Even at the family level, La Tour du Pin promotes decentralization. The authority of the father would be strengthened; he would be empowered to make those decisions which he is best able to make, especially matters regarding testation. Overall, this plan concretely realizes Pope Pius XI's plan for

decentralization as guided by the principle of the subsidiary function.

Among the advantages of the corporative state, it appears that the sectarianism and factionalism of political parties would be avoided. Political parties would cease to exist in the corporative regime as would professional politicians. There would be no need for them. Since people would know the most prominent men in their own line of work and these men would be familiar with their colleagues' needs, they would not have to campaign to make themselves well known so as to introduce prospective electors to their particular platforms. In addition, the special interests of various socially functioning groups would not be sacrificed as often happens with political parties which, while seeking a majority vote, sacrifice their special interests. Monies would not be wasted on campaigning, and the venal lobbying of special interest groups would probably cease. These groups would have their interests represented through the corporation by its representatives. As the mandates would precisely delimit the power of the *mandataires,* it would not allow them to act as little irresponsible sovereigns. Consequently, lobbying, campaign finance abuse, and pork barreling would be severely restricted, if not eliminated, in a corporative state.

After examining some of the positive aspects of La Tour du Pin's corporative and representative system, one must consider some of the defects of La Tour du Pin's corporative vision as well. As previously mentioned, no state before had been based on the corporative model. The corporative system was planned out in La Tour du Pin's mind beforehand and then an attempt was made to realize it. At first glance this

resembles the attempts of certain French political thinkers in the eighteenth century to come up with blueprints for society and, in a doctrinaire manner, attempt to fit society into their predetermined plan. However, to be fair to La Tour du Pin, he bases his model on a fusion of certain types of representation which occurred in the past. Nevertheless, this was a new type of system. One might also ask whether it was truly organic. Did it develop historically over time on account of the temperament of the people and the traditions of the land? Or was it the product of the imagination of one man, albeit a man with his principles rooted in the traditions of the past?

Another very practical question also remains. In the late nineteenth century, was the socio-political temper of the French people conducive to the corporative system, and would it take root in their midst? Even in the twentieth century, the corporative regime never really developed on the grass roots level; it only seemed to work if it was installed by the strong hand of the State, using force at its behest. The examples of Austria under Chancellor Dollfuss and that of Portugal under Prime Minister Salazar followed this authoritarian pattern.[11] This was something to which La Tour du Pin was adamantly opposed. With both a strong centralized state overshadowing society and individualistic liberty bursting at the seams, the likelihood of the corporative system taking root in society voluntarily appears to be extremely unlikely. With the modern welfare State so intimately involved in so many facets of their lives, people have been habituated to the

---

[11] Ehler and Morrall, *Church and State*, 497, 499.

gentle, omnicompetent hand of the paternalistic State taking care of them "from cradle to grave." It would take an incredible amount of societal momentum to overcome the inertia of State control and for people to form corporations voluntarily. In my own assessment, only in the case of a complete societal breakdown, where people practically realized the importance of strong social bonds and are willing to make sacrifices, might people be susceptible to accept voluntarily the corporative regime.

In La Tour du Pin's vision, a king was necessary as well. Above all, a king was above parties. In some sense he could oversee the needs of the common good with Olympian detachment. He had some interesting reasons for requiring a king. Nevertheless, monarchies were practically on the way out. La Tour du Pin refused to submit to Leo XIII's *Au Milieu des sollicitudes* and rally to the French Republic. He continued a diehard monarchist to the day he died. Oddly, the two nations in which corporatism blossomed and flourished in the twentieth century were no longer monarchies. Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss and Prime Minister Antonio Oliveira Salazar were responsible for establishing corporatist states in Austria and Portugal, respectively. Neither of them were monarchs. Would La Tour du Pin have accepted the "republican" corporative systems realized in these two states?

La Tour du Pin also criticized the capitalist system with its foundation on usury and unrestricted competition. He did not want to reform this system, but wished to abolish it and replace it with the corporative system. Amazingly, however, he never really censured industrialism as such. Nevertheless, without large concentrations of

capital, huge industries would not be able to be set up in the first place. La Tour du Pin, however, did wish to restructure the *sociétés anonymes*. He would make them more responsible by requiring them to have unlimited liability. Furthermore, La Tour du Pin wanted the workers themselves to participate in the ownership of the industries. Consequently, he wanted industries to be transformed to allow the workers to become co-proprietors. This is yet another way of providing property for the workers. No doubt this would ensure that the workers all gave their best effort and bettered their efficiency. This idea shows the range of La Tour du Pin's vision. In the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, profit-sharing has become more widespread. La Tour du Pin also wanted to see usurious speculation legally outlawed by the government. Furthermore, he also believed that both mutual aid associations and charity could aid workers in avoiding usurious loans of consumption.

As I close, it is worthwhile to examine the work of one of the most neglected[12] historians of the French Revolution, Augustin Cochin.[13] His work helps elucidate the differences between the corporative and parliamentary structures of society. He was both

---

[12] François Furet, *Interpreting the French Revolution*, trans. Elborg Forster (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 165.

[13] Cochin was born in 1876 and died in World War I in 1916. Most of his work centers on the phenomenon of revolution and its quintessential manifestation in Jacobinsm. He examines the machinery of Jacobinism and its ascendancy through the mechanism of consensus-societies. For an excellent summary of his thought, see: Furet, *Interpreting the French Revolution*, 164-204. For the key works of Cochin, see: Augustin Cochin, *La révolution et la libre-pensée* (Paris: Copernic, 1979); Augustin Cochin, *Les sociétés de pensée et la démocratie moderne* (Paris: Copernic, 1978). For selections of his writings which have been translated into English, see: Augustin Cochin, *Organizing the Revolution: Selections from Augustin Cochin*, trans. Nancy Derr Polin (Rockford, IL: Chronicles Press, 2007).

a sociologist and an historian "with a very philosophical cast of mind."[14] His work helps to clearly illustrate La Tour du Pin's disavowal of the parliamentary system and his support for the corporative system. Commenting on Cochin's description of the two structures of society, François Furet notes:

> The centre-piece of Cochin's analysis was the opposition between two notions of society and of its political action. The first can be called, for lack of a better term, the 'corporative' or Ancien-Régime notion, which entitles power to call upon a nation composed of '*corps*' to express its opinion. The second is the 'democratic' notion, which Cochin sometimes also calls the 'English' notion, and which entitles power to seek advice from a people of voters consisting of the entire society atomized into equal individuals. In the first type, society preserves its actual state, its hierarchy, its long-standing decisions and rights, its network of leadership and the diversity of its values and its history. It therefore has no need to create a 'professional' political personnel, since politics is merely an extension of its activity as a society. Moreover it has its natural leaders, whose mandates are binding.
>
> In the second type, society must revamp itself to accede to politics; it must become an abstract society made up of equal individuals, in other words, a people of voters. In such a society, power addresses itself to each individual, regardless of his milieu, his activities and his values, since only by his vote does this abstract individual become a real individual. Hence the need to invent a field for this new reality, politics, with its specialists, the politicians, who will act as mediators. For once the people has been reduced to its democratic definition as the sum of equal individuals, it is no longer capable of autonomous activity. On the one hand, it has been stripped of its real ties to the social world, and so it no longer has either particular interests or the competence to debate the issues; on the other hand, the act that constitutes it, the vote, is prepared and determined elsewhere, so that the people is only asked to express consent. 'Professional politicians must propose catch-phrases and leaders to the people.' Politics is thus presented as a corollary of democracy and as a special characteristic of consensus at the stage when it has been mythically freed from social constraints. It therefore demands substitutes for the 'natural' conduct of public affairs by organized bodies, a role that will be played by politicians, parties and ideologies.[15]

In the corporative structure, politics or the representative regime is an extension of the corporative regime into political life. In neither of these structures of society do the people truly deliberate. They merely give their consent, but in the one they give their consent to a prince who is, by his office, concerned with the common good, whereas in

---

[14] Furet, *Interpreting the French Revolution*, 165.

[15] Ibid., 175-176.

the other they give their consent to politicians who may often be more concerned with their individual selfish motives or party interests. Moreover, the citizens are all treated as abstract individuals, apart from any concrete social context. As Furet points out, the act of voting "incarnates" the individual into someone real. But even here, he is really treated as a mere number or a quantity. After he votes, he returns back to being one among many equal individuals in an abstract society. Furthermore, it can be said that in the second notion of society, the people do not even pick their leaders as in the first. In the second structure, the media and the political parties manipulate the political machinery behind the scenes to offer the people the choice of "their men"; since the media have control over the public exposure of candidates, the people are merely informed of two to three choices which have been presented to them. As can be seen, this type of democracy is not really democratic, but truly oligarchic. Consequently, false social authorities fill in the vacuum that has been emptied by the true social authorities. As Furet, echoing Cochin, notes, "In every democratic power, all the more so in every 'pure' (i.e., undelegated) democratic power, there is a hidden oligarchy that is contrary to its principle yet indispensable to its functioning."[16] This explains La Tour du Pin's disgust with the parliamentary system, because it does not reflect the permanent interests of people organized into coherent groups. It is not truly representative. The complete atomization of society into elements of individuals makes it fall prey to the manipulations

---

[16] Ibid., 188.

of partisan interests.

René de La Tour du Pin had attempted to usher in a new Christian social order with his schema for a corporative regime. He was unable to fulfill his vision in his own time. In my opinion, there are a number of reasons for this. First of all, the industrial workers whom he tried to attract were not interested in his mixed corporations, because they were constituted on a hierarchical basis and, therefore, considered paternalistic. Second, in 1891, Pope Leo XIII did not overtly sanction his corporative regime in *Rerum Novarum*. Third, Pope Leo XIII issued *Au milieu des sollicitudes*, which urged Frenchmen to rally to the Republic, the very Republic that La Tour du Pin censured as absolutist, irresponsible, and incompetent. He was a diehard monarchist. He refused to rally to the republic for he utterly detested it. The Third Republic was the antithesis of his own vision of a Christian social order—his own view necessitated a limited monarchy. The Third Republic was there to stay. It would not give way to a monarchy. His plan necessitated a monarchy. Fourth, because of disagreements with Albert de Mun and the bishops of Dauphiné, he lost critical support from within the social Catholic fold. Fifth, most people were completely unfamiliar with how the corporative regime operated. It should be remembered that De Mun could not convince his fellow parliamentarians to espouse the corporative system, because it was something with which they were totally unacquainted. La Tour du Pin, therefore, could not overcome the inertia of substituting the notoriously disreputable parliamentary system with his unknown, but truly representative corporative system. The high point of his career was at Romans in 1888,

after which eighteen other provincial assemblies and an Estates-General were held. His movement was eventually superseded by Christian Democracy[17] in the mid to late 1890s, because this movement dovetailed better with Leo XIII's policy of *ralliement*, at least temporarily.

To return a society or societies back to a corporate order is going to be an extremely arduous task. The inertia is incredible. La Tour du Pin himself was fighting against the powerful current of individualism. Other thinkers have come to recognize the unique difficulty of implementing a corporate order in society. The sociologist Marcel Clément commented that the attempt to restore the social order to normalcy by means of professional corporations appears very strange and alien to modern man. Clément declares:

> The whole process we are considering is a task of restoration—the restoration of a social order which was so utterly shattered by individualism that the very concept of what must be done has

---

[17] Christian Democracy is difficult to define in a narrow sense as there were many strains of it. Nevertheless, there was some commonality among Christian democrats. The movement began with a series of congresses held at Reims in 1893, 1894, and 1896. Later, a few congresses were also held in Lyon. These congresses were composed of Christian workers and initially membership was restricted to current or former workers. Eventually, membership included not just workers, but ecclesiatics and intellectuals as well. In the strict sense, therefore, members of the ruling class were kept out of it. The origins of Christian democracy stem from *Rerum Novarum*, especially that encyclical's stress on the rights of the workers. Christian democrats promoted trade unions rather than mixed corporations because, in the unions, the workers did not have an "inferior status" and they also allowed the workers to control their own affairs. The movement stressed that the government should promote "true equality," which in the view of Christian democrats, meant social equality. Furthermore, Christian democracy took its cue from the *ralliement.* All of the congresses of Christian democracy demonstrated their loyalty to the French Republic. Nevertheless, Christian democrats wanted a Catholic Republic, not a Masonic Republic. See: McManners, *Church and State in France*, 94-99. For the classic work on Christian Democracy, see: Michael P. Fogarty, *Christian Democracy in Western Europe, 1820-1953* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1957. For more recent works on Christian Democracy, see: Stathis N. Kalyvas, *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996); Thomas Kselman and Joseph A. Buttigieg, eds, *European Christian Democracy: Historical Legacies and Comparative Perspectives* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

> become utterly alien to the thinking of men of our time; and it is the very fact of the strangeness of the concept of the normal social order, as it appears to a diseased society, which prompts critics of corporative concept to argue that the popes are taking us back to the Middle Ages when they speak of professional corporations! This is the measure of the extent to which are minds have been conditioned by individualism.[18]

According to Clément, individualism is the culprit. It is very difficult for modern man to extricate himself from the bonds of individualism and accept a corporate order. Among other things, to do so would require that his freedom would be further limited by the rules of the corporation.

La Tour du Pin was completely forthright in his views, completely wanting in human respect. He also did not fit into an easily identifiable category. He had a message which challenged a variety of viewpoints. Robert Talmy recounts:

> La Tour du Pin, however, had humored neither men nor parties. To the conservatives, he had recalled the eminent dignity of man, his imprescriptible right to an honest and decent existence and the injustice of usurious capitalism; to the democrats, he had wished to prove the bankruptcy of the republican regime, incapable of settling the problem of the origin of power; to the socialists, finally, he had emphasized the dangers of statism, and he had demanded the reestablishment of intermediate bodies and that of all liberties, familial, professional, and regional.[19]

It cannot be denied, however, that La Tour du Pin strove earnestly to develop a Christian social order which promoted justice in the moral, political, economic, and social realms. He wished to see strong ties of solidarity formed among men by participation in a wide range of intermediate bodies, especially corporations. Furthermore, he also wanted to see all men, no matter what their class or social function, realistically participate in the government through true representation. Although that

---

[18] Clément, *The Social Programme of the Church*, vol.4, 175.

[19] Talmy, *René de La Tour du Pin*, 56.

representation might be weighted differently according to their social function, they would still be able to participate in a meaningful way on matters that pertained directly to them.

Although he was considered a "paternalistic noble" who was not in tune with the progress of modern democracy, La Tour du Pin still honored his commitment to what it meant to be a true noble. For him, to be a noble in the modern era meant dedicating himself to his less-fortunate brethren in the working classes and raising them up by his moral influence over them. He showed particular interest in the welfare of the "Fourth Estate" or industrial working class. As a matter of fact, La Tour du Pin thought that his corporative regime was really the only the possible way for the Fourth Estate to be enfranchised. It may also be the only way for universal male suffrage to be realistically implemented in the modern era.

La Tour du Pin, with the spirit of a true nobleman, sacrificed his time and devoted the better part of his life to ameliorating the lot of the worker. He understood that men held authority for the purpose of serving others and he personally served the disenfranchised "Fourth Estate." He well knew that a nation could not become spiritually and materially strengthened by ignoring their plight. His fellow countryman, Alexis de Tocqueville, also saw the problem of the modern industrial state and pointed toward a solution. No doubt, La Tour du Pin would have agreed with the following:

> It would seem as if the rulers of our time sought only to use men in order to make things great; I wish that they would try a little more to make great men; that they would set less value on the work and more upon the workman; that they would never forget that a nation cannot long remain strong when every man belonging to it is individually weak; and that no form or combination of social polity has yet been devised to make an energetic people out of a community of pusillanimous and

enfeebled citizens.[20]

His most recent biographer, Antoine Murat, declares that La Tour du Pin "called all Frenchmen to serve, to live and work, their utmost, in honor."[21]

---

[20] Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, 347.

[21] Murat, *La Tour du Pin en son temps*, 375.

WORKS CITED

Adams, John Clarke. "Some Antecedents of the Theory of the Corporative System." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3, no. 2 (April 1942): 182-189.

Alexander, Edgar. "Church and Society in Germany." In *Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements, 1789-1950*, edited by Joseph N. Moody, 325-583. New York: Arts, Inc, 1953.

Aristotle. "Nicomachean Ethics." In *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon, 927-1112. New York: Random House, 1941.

----------. *Politics*. Translated by Ernest Barker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Arnal, Oscar L. *Ambivalent Alliance: The Catholic Church and the Action Française, 1899-1939.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985.

Aston, Nigel. *Religion and Revolution in France, 1780-1804*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000.

Aubert, Roger. *The Church in a Secularized Society*. Vol. 5 of *The Christian Centuries.* New York: Paulist Press; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1978.

Azpiazu, Joaquin, S.J. *The Corporative State*. Translated by William Bresnahan, O.S.B. St. Louis, MO: B. Herder Book Co, 1951.

Balmes, Jaime. *European Civilization: Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in Their Effects on the Civilization of Europe*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co, 1850.

Bassot, Jacques. *Travail et proprieté: Actualité révolutionnaire de La Tour du Pin*. Paris: Éditions de l'institut d'études corporatives et sociales, 1943.

Baussan, Charles. *La Tour du Pin*. Paris: E. Flammarion, 1931.

Berry, Wendell. *What Are People For?*. New York: North Point Press, 1990.

Bihlmeyer, Karl and Hermann Tüchle. *Church History*. Translated by Victor E. Mills, O.F.M. and Francis J. Mueller, O.F.M. 3 vols. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1966.

Black, Anthony. *Guilds and Civil Society in European Political Thought from the Twelfth Century to the Present*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Blinkhorn, Martin, ed. *Fascists and Conservatives: The Radical Right and the Establishment in Twentieth-Century Europe.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Blum, Christopher O., ed. *Critics of the Enlightenment: Readings in the French Counter-Revolutionary Tradition*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2004.

Bock, Edward C. *Wilhelm von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz: His Life, Times and Ideas*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1977.

Bonald, Louis de. *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*. Edited by Abbé Migne. 3 vols. Paris: J.P. Migne, 1859.

----------. *On Divorce*. Translated by Nicholas Davidson. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1992.

----------. *The True & Only Wealth of Nations: Essays on Family, Economy & Society*. Edited by Christopher O. Blum. Naples, FL: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University, 2006.

Bonney, Richard. *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Bossan de Garagnol, Élisabeth. *Le Colonel de La Tour du Pin d'après lui-même*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1934.

Bossy, John. *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Boyer, John W. *Political Radicals in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Brants, Victor. *Charles Périn: Notice sur sa vie et ses travaux*. Louvain: Van Linthout, 1906.

Brauer, T. *The Catholic Social Movement in Germany*. Oxford: The Catholic Social Guild, 1932.

Brook-Shepherd, Gordon. *Dollfuss*. London: MacMillan, 1961.

Brooke, Michael Z. *Le Play, Engineer and Social Scientist*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1998.

Brown, Marvin L., Jr. *The Comte de Chambord: The Third Republic's Uncompromising King*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1967.

----------. *Louis Veuillot: French Ultramontane Catholic Journalist and Layman, 1813-1883*. Durham, NC: Moore Publishing Company, 1977.

Buchanan, Tom, and Martin Conway, eds. *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1918-1965*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 1987.

Burleigh, Michael. *Earthly Powers: The Clash of Religion and Politics in Europe from the French Revolution to the Great War*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2005.

Bury, J.P.T. *France, 1814-1940*. 6th ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2003.

Calvez, Jean-Yves, and Jacques Perrin. *The Church and Social Justice: The Social Teachings of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1958*. Translated by J.R Kirwan. Chicago: H. Regnery, 1961.

Camp, Richard L. *The Papal Ideology of Social Reform: A Study in Historical Development, 1878-1967*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969.

Carlen, Claudia, ed. *The Papal Encyclicals*. 5 vols. Ypsilanti, MI: Pierian Press, 1990.

Carlson, Allan C. *From Cottage to Work Station: The Family's Search for Social Harmony in the Industrial Age*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1993.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co, 1994.

Catta, Étienne. *La doctrine politique et sociale du Cardinal Pie*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1991.

Chadwick, Owen. *A History of the Popes, 1830-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

----------. *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, G.B.: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Chambord, Comte de, Comte de Paris, and Duc D'Orléans. *La Monarchie française: lettres et documents politiques [1844-1907]*. Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1907.

Charles, Rodger, S.J. *Christian Social Witness and Teaching: The Catholic Tradition from Genesis to Centesimus Annus*. 2 vols. Leominster, England: Gracewing, 1998.

Chase, Allan. *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism*. New York: Knopf, 1977.

Chinigo, Michael, ed. and trans. *The Pope Speaks: The Teachings of Pope Pius XII*. New York: Pantheon, 1957.

Cholvy, Gérard and Yves-Marie Hilaire. *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine*,

1800-1930. 2 vols. Toulouse: Bibliothèque historique Privat, 1985.

Clément, Marcel. *La Corporation professionelle*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1958.

----------. *The Social Programme of the Church.* 4 vols. trans. Frank Macmillan. Saltcoats, Scotland: Approaches, 1984.

Cobban, Alfred. *History of Modern France.* 3 vols. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1961.

Cochin, August. *Organizing the Revolution: Selections from Augustin Cochin*. Translated by Nancy Derr Polin. Rockford, IL: Chronicles Press, 2007.

----------. *La révolution et la libre-pensée*. Paris: Copernic, 1979.

----------. *Les sociétés de pensée et la démocratie moderne*. Paris: Copernic, 1978.

Coffey, Joan L. *Léon Harmel: Entrepreneur as Catholic Social Reformer*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003.

Cohen, D. K. "The Vicomte de Bonald's Critique of Industrialism." *Journal of Modern History* 41 (1969): 475-484.

Collins, James B. *The State in Early Modern France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Coppa, Frank. *The Modern Papacy Since 1789*. New York: Longman, 1998.

Cort, John. *Christian Socialism: An Informal History*. Marynoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988.

Creasy, Edward S. *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World: From Marathon to Waterloo*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1994.

Creuzet, Michel. *Les corps intermédiaires*. Martigny, Suisse: Édition des Cercles Saint-Joseph, 1963. Reprint, Paris: Club du livre civique, 1964.

Cronin, John F., S.S. "Forty Years Later: Reflections and Reminiscences." In *Official Catholic Social Teaching: Readings in Moral Theology, No. 5*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, S.J, 69-76. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.

Cronin, John F., S.S. and Harry W. Flannery. *The Church and the Workingman*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1965.

Dansette, Adrien. *Religious History of Modern France.* Translated by John Dingle. 2 vols. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.

Dawson, Christopher. *The Gods of Revolution*. New York: Minerva Press, 1975.

----------. *Religion and the Modern State*. New York: Sheed & Ward, Inc, 1937.

Denzinger, Henr., Clem. Bannwart, S.J., and Ioannes Bapt Umberg, S.J., eds. *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1922.

Doyle, William. *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Dru, Alexander. *The Contribution of German Catholicism.* New York: Hawthorn, 1963.

Dunoyer, Charles. *De la liberté du travail, ou simple exposé des conditions dans lesquelles les forces humaines s'exercent avec le plus de puissance*. 2 vols. Paris: Chez Guillaumin, Libraire, 1845.

Durkheim, Émile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Translated by W. D. Halls. New York: The Free Press, 1997.

Duroselle, J. B. *Les débuts du catholicisme social en France, 1822-1870*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951.

Ederer, Rupert J. *Economics as if God Matters: A Century of Papal Teaching Addressed to the Economic Order*. South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 1995.

Ederer, Rupert J., ed. and trans. *Heinrich Pesch on Solidarist Economics: Excerpts from the Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998.

Ehler, Sidney Z., and John B. Morrall, eds. and trans. *Church and State Through the Centuries*. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1954.

Elbow, Matthew H. *French Corporative Theory, 1789-1948*. New York: Octagon Books, Inc, 1966.

Fanfani, Amintore. *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*. Norfolk, VA: IHS Press, 2003.

Flannery, Austin, O.P., ed. *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Vol. 1. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984.

Furet, François, and Denis Richet. *The French Revolution*. Translated by Stephen Hardman. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970.

Furet, François. *Interpreting the French Revolution*. Translated by Elborg Forster. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gasperi, Alcide de. *I Tempi e gli uomini che prepararono la "Rerum Novarum"*. Milan:

Vita e Pensiero, 1984.

Gautherot, Gustave. *Un demi-siècle de défense nationale et religeuse: Émile Keller, 1828-1909*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1922.

Gershoy, Leo. *The Era of the French Revolution, 1789-1799: Ten Years That Shook the World*. New York: D. van Nostrand Company, 1957.

----------. *The French Revolution and Napoleon*. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1964.

Giordani, Igino. *The Social Message of Jesus*. Translated by Alba I. Zizzamia. Paterson, N.J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1943. Reprint, Boston, MA: Daughters of St. Paul, 1977.

----------. *The Social Message of the Early Church Fathers*. Translated by Alba I. Zizzamia. Paterson, N.J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1944. Reprint, Boston, MA: Daughters of St. Paul, 1977.

Goyau, Georges. *L'Allemagne religieuse : Le Catholicisme (1800-1870)*. 4 vols. Paris: Perrin, 1905-1909.

----------. *Autour du catholicisme social*. 5 vols. Paris: Perrin, 1897-1912.

Grebing, Helga. *The History of the German Labor Movement*. London: Oswald Wolff, 1969.

Gritti, Jules. *Bonald, la révolution française et le réveil religieux*. [Paris]: Bloud & Gay, [1962].

Guitton, Georges. *La Vie ardente et féconde de Léon Harmel*. Paris: Action-Populaire, 1929.

----------. *Léon Harmel, 1825-1915*. 2 vols. Paris: Spes, 1927.

Hales, E.E.Y. *Pio Nono: A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1954.

Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison, and John Jay. *The Federalist Papers*. Edited by Clinton Rossiter. New York: New American Library, Inc, 1961.

Heilbroner, Robert L. *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*. 6th ed. A Touchstone Book. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc, 1986.

Herbertson, Dorothy. *The Life of Frédéric Le Play*. Edited by Victor Branford and Alexander Farquharson. Ledbury, England: Le Play House Press, 1950.

Hogan, William Edward. *The Development of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler's Interpretation of the Social Problem*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947.

Holland, Joe. *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: The Popes Confront the Industrial Age, 1740-1958*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2003.

Holmes, J. Derek. *The Triumph of the Holy See: A Short History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Burns & Oates; Shepherdstown, W.V.: Patmos Press, 1978.

Hoog, Georges. *Histoire du catholicisme social en France, 1871-1931*. Paris: Dumat, 1946.

Howard, Michael. *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Invasion of France*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962.

Jarlot, Georges, S.J. "Les avant-projects de 'Rerum Novarum' et les 'Anciennes Corporations'." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 81 (1959): 60-77.

----------. *Le régime corporatif et les catholiques sociaux: Histoire d'une doctrine*. Paris: Flammarion, 1938.

Jedin, Hubert and John Dolan, eds. *History of the Church*. 10 vols. London: Burns & Oates, 1981.

John Paul II. *Centesimus Annus*. Translated by the Vatican Polyglot Press. Boston, MA: St. Paul Books & Media, 1991.

----------. *Letter to Families from Pope John Paul II*. Translated by the Vatican Polyglot Press. Boston, MA: St. Paul Books and Media, 1994.

----------. *Redemptor Hominis*. Translated by the Vatican Polyglot Press. Boston, MA: Daughters of St. Paul, 1979.

----------. *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Translated by the Vatican Polyglot Press. Boston, MA: St. Paul Books & Media, 1987.

Keller, Émile. *L'Encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Église, l'État et la liberté*. Paris: Poussielgue et Fils, 1865.

Kempeneers, Joseph. *Charles Périn (1815-1905) de l'école libérale d'inspiration chrétienne*. Liège: La pensée catholique, 1930.

Ketteler, Wilhelm Emmanuel von. *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*. 11 vols. Edited by Erwin Iserloh. Mainz: von Hase und Koehler, 1977-2001.

----------. *The Social Teachings of Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz (1811 - 1877)*. Translated by Rupert J. Ederer. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981.

Klinck, David. *The French Counterrevolutionary Theorist Louis de Bonald, 1754-1840*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

Klopp, Wiard. *Die sozialen Lehren des Freiherrn Karl von Vogelsang*. Wien-Leipzig: Reinhold Verlag, 1938.

----------. *Leben und Wirken des Sozialpolitikers Karl Freiherrn von Vogelsang*. Vienna: Typographische Anstalt, 1930.

Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Erik von. *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of Our Time*. Front Royal, VA: Christendom Press, 1993.

Lassus, Arnaud de and Michel Berger. "Fundamentals of Democracy." Translated by A.S. Fraser and Peter McEnerny. *Apropos*, no. 19/20 (Pentecost 1999): 182-288.

La Tour du Pin, René de. *Aphorismes de politique sociale*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1930.

----------. *Feuillets de la vie militaire sous le Second Empire, 1855-1870*. Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1911.

----------. “Individualisme.” *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*. Fourth edition, 1915. vol. 2.

----------. "Le parlementarisme, voilà l’ennemi!." *L'Association catholique* 27 (15 Janvier 1889): 3-19.

----------. "Le régime représentatif." *L'Association catholique* 28 (Septembre 1889): 283-300.

----------. *Vers un ordre social chrétien: Jalons de route, 1882-1907*. Paris: La Librarie Français, 1987.

Le Bon, Gustave. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1896. Reprint, Mineola, N.Y: Dover Publications Inc, 2002.

----------. *Gustave Le Bon: The Man and His Works*. Translated and edited by Alice Widener. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Press, 1979.

Lebrun, Richard A. Introduction to *Against Rousseau: "On the State of Nature" and "on the Sovereignty of the People"*, by Joseph de Maistre. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

Le Play, Frédéric. *La réforme sociale en France, déduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens*. 3e éd. 3 vols. Paris: E. Dentu, Éditeur, 1867.

----------. *Les ouvriers européens*. 2e ed. 6 vols. Tours, France: Alfred Mame et Fils, 1877-1879.

----------. *Frédéric Le Play on Family, Work and Social Change*. Edited, translated, and with an introduction by Catherine Bodard Silver. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Levacher-Duplessis, Antoine. "Requête au roi et mémoire sur la nécessité de rétablir les corps de marchands et les communautés des arts et de métiers, présentés à sa majesté le 16 septembre 1817 par les marchands et artisans de la ville de Paris." *Association catholique* XVI (August 15 1883): 174-208.

Levillain, Philippe. *Albert de Mun: Catholicisme français et catholicisme romain du syllabus au ralliement*. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1983.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. London: Thomas Tegg, 1828.

----------. *A Letter Concerning Toleration and Other Writings*. Edited by Mark Goldie. Indianopolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2010.

----------. *The Reasonableness of Christianity, and A Discourse of Miracles*. Edited by Ian T. Ramsey. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958.

----------. *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 1980.

Lynch, Katherine A. *Family, Class, and Ideology in Early Industrial France: Social Policy and the Working-Class Family, 1825-1848*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Macpherson, C. B. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Maistre, Joseph de. *Considerations on France*. Translated and edited by Richard A. Lebrun. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

----------. *Du Pape*, 25e éd. Lyon: H. Pélegaud, 1878.

Manent, Pierre. *Tocqueville and the Nature of Democracy*. Translated by John Waggoner. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 1996.

Martin, Benjamin. *Count Albert de Mun: Paladin of the Third Republic*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. Translated by Samuel Moore. London: Penguin Books, 1985.

Maurras, Charles. *Enquête sur la monarchie*. Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1925.

Mayeur, Jean-Marie. *Catholicisme social et démocratie chrétienne: principes romains, expériences françaises*. Paris: Cerf, 1986.

Mayeur, Jean-Marie et al. *Histoire du christianisme: Des origines à nos jours.* 14 vols. Paris: Desclée, 1990-2001.

Mayeur, Jean-Marie, and Madeleine Rebérioux. *The Third Republic from its Origins to the Great War, 1871-1914*. Vol. 2 of *The Cambridge History of Modern France.* Translated by J.R Foster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1984.

McCool, Gerard. *Nineteenth Century Scholasticism*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1989.

McManners, John. *Church and State in France, 1870-1914*. London: SPCK, 1972.

----------. *The French Revolution and the Church*. London: SPCK, 1969).

Menczer, Bela, ed. and trans. *Catholic Political Thought, 1789-1848*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962.

Menezes, Filipe Ribeiro de. *Salazar: A Political Biography*. New York: Enigma Books, 2009.

Metlake, George. *Christian Social Reform*. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press, 1912.

Misner, Paul. "The Predecessors of Rerum Novarum within Catholicism." *Review of Social Economy* 49 (Winter 1991): 444-464.

----------. *Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War*. New York: Crossroad, 1991.

Molette, Charles. *Albert de Mun, 1872-1890: Exigence doctrinale et préoccupations sociales chez un laïc catholique*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1970.

Montesquiou, Léon de. *L'Oeuvre de Frédéric Le Play: Suivie de pensées choisies de nos maîtres: Joseph de Maistre, Bonald, Auguste Comte, Balzac, Taine, Renan*. Paris: Nouvelle Libraire Nationale, 1912.

Moody, Joseph. "The Dechristianization of the French Working Class." *Review of Politics* 20, no. 1 (1958): 46-69.

Moon, Parker Thomas. *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France:*

A Study in the History of Social Politics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.

Moulinié, Henri. *De Bonald: la vie, la carrière politique, la doctrine*. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1916.

Mueller, Franz H. *The Church and the Social Question*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1984.

Mun, Albert de. *Ma vocation sociale: Souvenirs de la fondation de l'Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1908.

Murat, Antoine. *Le Catholicisme social en France: justice et charité*. Bordeaux: Éditions Ulysse, 1980.

----------. *La Tour du Pin en son temps*. Versailles: Via Romana, 2008.

Muret, Charlotte T. *French Royalist Doctrines Since the Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Nell-Breuning, Oswald von, S.J. "The Drafting of Quadragesimo Anno." In *Official Catholic Social Teaching*: *Readings in Moral Theology, No. 5,* ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, S.J, 60-68. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.

----------. *Reorganization of Social Economy; The Social Encyclical Developed and Explained*. Translated by Bernard W. Dempsey. Milwaukee, WI: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1936.

Nisbet, Robert. *The Quest for Community: A Study in the Ethics of Order & Freedom*. San Francisco, CA: ICS Press, 1990.

----------. *The Social Group in French Thought*. New York: Arno Press, 1980.

Nitti, Francesco S. *Catholic Socialism*. Translated by Mary MacIntosh. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co, 1895.

Oakley, Francis. *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979.

O'Brien, George. *An Essay on the Economic Effects of the Reformation*. Norfolk, VA: IHS Press, 2003.

O'Connell, Marvin R. *The Counter Reformation, 1560-1610*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974.

Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers, Conseil d'Études, *Questions sociales et*

ouvrières: Régime du travail, Vol. 1. Paris : V. Lecoffre, 1883.

Payne, Stanley G. *A History of Fascism*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.

Paulhus, Normand J. "The Theological and Political Ideals of the Fribourg Union." Ph.D. diss., Boston College, Boston, MA, 1983.

Périn, Charles. *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*. 2 vols. 2d éd. Paris: Jacques Lecoffre, 1868.

----------. *Premiers principes d'économie politique*. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1896.

----------. *Le socialisme chrétien*. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1879.

Pierrard, Pierre. *L'Église et les ouvriers en France, 1840-1940*. Paris: Hachette, 1984.

Ploncard d'Assac, Jacques. *Salazar*. 2nd ed. Bouère, France: Dominique Martin Morin, 1983.

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2001.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. Washington, DC: USCCB Publishing, 2004.

Rémond, René. *Religion and Society in Modern Europe*. Translated by Antonia Nevill. Oxford; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

----------. *The Right Wing in France from 1815 to De Gaulle*. Translated by James M. Laux. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1966.

Ribbe, Charles de. *Le Play, après sa correspondance.* Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1884.

Ricardo, David. *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1987.

Ring, Sister Mary Ignatius. *Villeneuve-Bargemont, Precursor of Modern Social Catholicism, 1784-1850*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1935.

Rivain, Jean. *Une programme de restauration sociale: L'École de La Tour du Pin*. Paris: Le Livre, 1926.

Roberts, William. "Napoleon, the Concordat of 1801, and Its Consequences." In *Controversial Concordats: The Vatican's Relations with Napoleon, Mussolini, and Hitler*, ed. Frank J. Coppa, 34-80. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

Rollet, Henri. *L'action sociale des catholiques en France (1871-1914)*. 2 vols. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1947-1958.

Rommen, Heinrich A. *The State in Catholic Thought: A Treatise in Political Philosophy*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co, 1945. Reprint, New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1969.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. "Discourse on the Origin of Inequality." In *The Basic Political Writings*, translated by Donald A. Cress, 25-109. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987.

----------. *Émile*. Translated by Barbara Foxley. 1911. Reprint, London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1989.

----------. "On the Social Contract." In *Basic Political Writings*, translated by Donald A. Cress, 139-227. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 1987.

Ryn, Claes. *Democracy and the Ethical Life: A Philosophy of Politics and Community*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1990.

Sabine, George H. *A History of Political Theory*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1956.

Saint-Just, Théotime de. *La Royauté sociale de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ: d'après le cardinal Pie*. Chiré-en-Montreuil: Éditions de Chiré; Villegenon: Éditions Sainte Jeanne d'Arc, 1988.

Schmitter, Philippe C. *Corporatism and Public Policy in Authoritarian Portugal*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd, 1975.

Schom, Alan. *Napoleon Bonaparte*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc, 1997.

Schuck, Michael J. *That They Be One: The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991.

Schumacher, E. F. *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1989.

Sedgwick, Alexander. *The Third French Republic*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co, 1970.

Ségur, Louis Gaston de. *Confession: A Little Book for the Reluctant.* Translated by the Sisters of Charity of New Haven, Connecticut. New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher, 1875; Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1989.

Semichon, Roger. *Les idées sociales et politiques de La Tour du Pin*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1936.

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc, 1998.

Somerville, Henry. *Studies in the Catholic Social Movement*. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1933. Reprint, Norfolk, VA: IHS Press, 2010.

Spencer, Herbert. *The Principles of Biology*. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1875.

----------. *Social Statics: or, The Conditions essential to Happiness specified, and the First of them Developed.* London: John Chapman, 1851.

Stewart, John Hall. *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Storck, Thomas. *Foundations of a Catholic Political Order*. Beltsville, MD: Four Faces Press, 1998.

Talmy, Robert. *Aux sources du catholicisme social: L'École de La Tour du Pin*. Tournai, Belgium: Desclée, 1963.

----------. *René de La Tour du Pin*. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1964.

Tannenbaum, Edward R. *The Action Française: Die-Hard Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century France*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Tawney, R. H. *The Acquisitive Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1920. Reprint, Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc, 2004.

Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press in association with the Medieval Academy of America, 1988.

Thomas, Lucien. *L'Action française devant l'Église de Pie X à Pie XII*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1965.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Henry Reeve. 2 vols. New York: Vintage Books, 1945.

----------. *The Old Régime and the French Revolution*. Translated by Stuart Gilbert. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc, 1955.

Toda, Michel. *Louis de Bonald: Théoricien de la contre-révolution*. Étampes, France: Clovis, 1997.

Tombs, Robert. *France, 1814-1914*. London; New York: Longman, 1996.

Vidler, Alec R. *A Century of Social Catholicism, 1820-1920*. London: SPCK, 1964.

Wallace, Lillian Parker. *Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1966.

Wawro, Geoffrey. *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Weber, Eugen. *Action Française: Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth Century France*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Wilhelmsen, Frederick D. "Donoso Cortés and the Meaning of Political Power." *Intercollegiate Review* 3 (Jan.-Feb 1967): 109-127.

Windell, George. *The Catholics and German Unity*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Wiser, James L. *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1983.

Wright, Gordon. *France in Modern Times*. 3rd ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981.