
Pro Rege

Volume 8 | Number 4

Article 3

June 1980

God and Liberty: The Catholic Quest for Democratic Pluralism from Lamennais to Vatican II

McKendree R. Langley
Dordt College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Political Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Langley, McKendree R. (1980) "God and Liberty: The Catholic Quest for Democratic Pluralism from Lamennais to Vatican II," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 8: No. 4, 12 - 23.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol8/iss4/3

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

God and Liberty

The Catholic Quest for Democratic Pluralism From Lamennais to Vatican II

McKendree R. Langley
Associate Professor



McKendree R. Langley holds the Abraham Kuyper Chair in the Lectureship Center of Dordt College. He is a Ph.D. candidate in history at the Free University of Amsterdam and formerly taught at Barrington College (R.I.), the Free University, Gordon College (Mass.) and Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, Miss.

In less than half a century we have seen the fall of the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV, the republican Convention, the Directory, the Consulate, the Empire and the Constitutional monarchy. What is stable in all of this flux? In this frantic movement which carries away the people and their laws, institutions and opinions, what remains? What survives in the hearts of men? Two things and two things alone: God and liberty. Unite them and all the basic and permanent needs of human nature are satisfied. Thus calmness reigns in the region of intelligence which occupies a

special place in temporal affairs. Separate God and liberty and the trouble begins immediately and grows until their union takes place again.¹

This prophetic appeal for the integration of Christian values with democracy was published in the French newspaper *L'Avenir* on October 16, 1830, having come from the pen of the first major Roman Catholic apologist for the union of "God and Liberty," the Abbé Felicite Lamennais (1782-1854). The controversy within the Catholic Church caused by the issues raised by Lamennais was not formally resolved until Vatican II in the promulgation of the *Declaration on Religious Freedom* in 1965:

The struggle to relate Catholicism to democratic pluralism was both sustained and painful. But the results have included, in the twentieth century, the rise of Christian Democratic parties of Catholic inspiration in France and many other countries in Europe and Latin America. European Christian Democracy initially inspired by Lamennais finally led to the creation of the Common Market which is based upon economic integration and social pluralism and is of world significance.

All during the eighteenth century France had experienced the erosion of traditional values and the shaking of the foundations of the institutions of privilege in church and state. Voltaire, author of the *English Letters*, Rousseau, famous for his *Social Contract*, and Diderot, editor of the rationalist *Encyclopedia*, were the most famous spokesmen for the new critical secular world view. The wide-spread acceptance in France and Europe of the notions of scepticism, popular sovereignty, and the denunciation of oppression led to the discrediting of Catholicism and the absolutist French monarchy. Then came the decade of destruction, 1789-99, in which France experienced first the moderate phase of the Revolution personified by the Marquis de Lafayette and then the radicalism of the Reign of Terror directed by Robespierre. This revolutionary instability ended with the Napoleonic *coup d'état* in 1799. Employing a mixture of traditional royalism and revolutionary radicalism, the Emperor Napoleon brought a strongly centralized secular state to power in France. Both Robespierre and Napoleon exported the revolution to other countries in liberating much of Europe from the Old Regime. Domestically from 1790 on, the French Church was split by the passage of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy requiring all priests to take an oath of allegiance to the new secular state. The

revolutionary forces carried on a dechristianization campaign especially between 1793 and 1795. Anti-clericalism became firmly established in French society as a permanent and often determinative factor in public life. With the coming of Napoleon, the Concordat of 1802 provided for the French Catholic Church to be recognized as a privileged cult but not as the state religion. The emperor and his successors then exploited the Church to maintain social stability and to legitimize the status quo. It was a secularization of Gallicanism—the control of the altar by the throne. Without the theocratic framework of the Old Regime this secularized Gallicanism robbed the French Church of its spiritual independence.²

The Early Lamennais

Lamennais was born in 1782 at Saint-Malo, Brittany, France, into an upper middle-class family. As a youth he experienced the uncertainties of Enlightenment doubt but in 1804 he was restored to faith in the truth of Catholicism. Having grown up during the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods when all the seminaries were closed, Lamennais studied theology, church history, languages and secular Enlightenment thought on his own. With the help and encouragement of his older brother Jean, a priest, Lamennais embarked on the career of a publicist. During this initial phase of his career he was a champion of ultramontanism in affirming that the French Church should be under the complete control of the Pope and not the French Government. At the same time Lamennais was also a theocratic traditionalist and a royalist in opposing the rise of the new revolutionary democracy. In 1816 he was ordained as a Roman Catholic priest.

The nature and task of educational institutions was a burning issue that caught the attention of the Breton publicist between 1814 and 1818. A strong attack on the Napoleonic university system was published in 1814 during the Emperor's first exile on the island of Elba. Louis XVIII, the restored Bourbon monarch, was on the throne during his first "term" (April, 1814-March, 1815). There was a wide-spread hatred towards the deposed Emperor, so Lamennais felt free to unburden his soul in print. It was stated that Napoleon's most anti-social act was the creation of the secular university. This "modern Attila" turned France into a vast military camp, based on an idolatrous political cult with the secular university system providing military leadership to march in lock-step with the Leader. Educational indifference towards religion, in the Breton's opinion, was a disguised atheism and an imperial school religion. In this imperial system the only application of science was in the preparation for war. The university also encouraged an undisciplined and immoral life style which was termed the fruit of irreligion. Lamennais forcefully made the point that in education, as in life, there is neither unity nor stability without religious faith, and that parents should have the proper rights over the education of their children. Parents should not be forced to sacrifice their children to the French educational Moloch. So strong was the mennaisian criticism of Napoleon that the Breton publicist was forced to flee to England during the Emperor's final one hundred days in power (March - June, 1815).

With Louis XVIII again in power, Lamennais continued his attack on the public educational system in 1818. One of the most dangerous errors of the age, in his view, was to embrace a humanistic horizontalism in denying the

transcendental relationship of God to man. Divorced from this transcendental relationship, society moved haphazardly from revolution to revolution because it was foolish enough to eliminate the Lord from its laws and political institutions. Sensing the pernicious impact of this horizontalism for education, Lamennais pointed out that true learning encompassed the whole person and had a social function. Christian education taught that social duties were based upon the plan of the Creator. Such instruction had to prepare people to live in both religious and civil societies. It was vitally important to teach from the perspective that

Lamennais forcefully made the point that in education, as in life, there is neither unity nor stability without religious faith, and that parents should have the proper rights over the education of their children. Parents should not be forced to sacrifice their children to the French educational Moloch.

man does not live by bread alone and that he should seek to live up to God's standards. Christ wanted the children to have such an education. Lamennais strongly protested the banishment of religion from the schools because he recognized that morality required the basis of faith. The reader was urged to choose between Christianity and learning based upon practical materialism. For the Breton priest this choice was between anarchy and an orderly society. Thus it was natural for Lamennais to protest when the government of Louis

XVIII in 1818 attempted to bring Catholic schools under the control of the centralized educational system.³

Mennaisian Social Apologetic

One of the distinguishing marks of the thought of Lamennais during the turbulent years of the Restoration was the recognition that the secular attack on traditional faith was not limited to education but touched every area of life. The fruit of his reflection on secularization was the articulation of a comprehensive new social apologetic in his *Essay on Indifference in Matters of Religion* published in four volumes and in his *Defense of the Essay* which appeared between 1817 and 1823. Much of the fame of Lamennais was due to this important work, especially the first volume, which was a best-seller in France. It was on the strength of this work that the Abbé Lamennais was recognized as the most creative Catholic thinker in more than a century. In an age when the French Church was on the defensive intellectually because of the vigorous attack of Enlightenment secularism on all fronts, many sensitive Catholics, especially the younger priests, looked to Lamennais for intellectual and spiritual leadership.

"The most unfortunate age is not the one which is passionately fond of error but the age which neglects and disdains the truth."⁴ This is the opening thought of the *Essay on Indifference*. In bringing attention to secular indifference to truth that is basic to the modern humanistic mind-set, the Abbé Lamennais began to articulate his comprehensive defense of Christianity. At the center of his attack was the social contract of Jean-Jacques Rousseau with its relativistic, horizontalistic world-view which had captured the minds of thinking Europeans since the previous century. In contrast to a pragmatic view

of truth, Lamennais sought to root human truth in the transcendent truth of God. This struggle between truth and error was taking place within each man. Due to the apparent supremacy of indifference, European society was seen as approaching its own destruction since the Christian foundations of religion, morals, honor, and duty had evaporated. When Christian truth was denied, the obligation to fulfill one's duty vanished. That both Christianity and morality were being attacked at the foundations was a mennaisian insight of fundamental importance for the social apologetic. Thus indifference to truth was seen as a pernicious moral blindness with disastrous social consequences.

Basic to the mennaisian apologetic was the affirmation that man is by nature a believer:

Man acts only because he believes. The masses of mankind always act in conformity to what they believe because the passions of the multitude are themselves determined by its belief. If the belief is pure and true, the general tendency of its action is just and in harmony with order. But if the belief is erroneous, its actions are corrupting. Error pollutes while truth perfects.⁵

Man believes naturally and advances to absolute unbelief only by degrees. The three systems of unbelief based on indifference were then examined: heresy, natural religion, and deism. Heresy is the slide from Protestantism to rationalism, natural religion rejects revelation, and deism accepts revelation only in a very limited way.

Turning his attention to the public realm, Lamennais wrote that religion is socially beneficial while the attempt to recreate a state overnight like a

manufactured item is impossible. Societies are not manufactured but develop over the centuries. When destroyed, societies take a long time to be re-established. The rights of groups were an essential component of the mennaisian perspective:

In order for social unity to exist, it is necessary that each part should be arranged in relation to the whole: each individual in relation to the family, each family in relation to the locality of which it is a member, each locality in relation to the greater society of humanity. Humanity is itself to be in relation to the universal society of understanding of which God is the supreme monarch.⁶

Lamennais emphasized the truth that man must first be in relation with God in order to be in the proper relation to his fellow men. Social relations develop slowly and are based on laws and customs to form a society. When God and His truth are denied as the foundation of society then God is replaced by arbitrary force and man tries to be his own absolute master. Force replaces authority and the result is destruction. Lamennais emphasized that European cabinet politics in his own day (presumably including King Louis XVIII of France) was mostly dominated by, an anti-religious Enlightenment philosophy leading to the pagan use of force. "A notion of law," he argued, "is intimately tied to a notion of authority. Every doctrine that destroys the notion of authority likewise demolishes the notion of law."⁷ Without God society can be constituted only by the artificial authority of the special interests or the passions of the moment.

Then Lamennais declared flatly that Rousseau's concept of a horizon-

talistic social contract as that basis for public life was social atheism. In the previous generation, France was the queen of Christian civilization but then she ate the forbidden fruit of unbelieving philosophy and suffered destruction. Philosophy became the basis of both religion and society, thus introducing civic religion as the new

Social relations develop slowly and are based on laws and customs to form a society. When God and His truth are denied as the foundation of society then God is replaced by arbitrary force and man tries to be his own absolute master.

cult. France became a cemetery. Mennaisian insight into the integrality of life can be seen in the following statement:

There are truths and errors that are both religious and political because religion and society have the same principle which is God and the same end which is man. Thus a fundamental error in religion is also a fundamental error in politics and vice versa. If a destructive error exists in religious society, this most general error imaginable ought to be equally destructive in political society. In effect this (relationship) finds verification in the history of the French Revolution.⁸

The attempt was then made to relate the concepts of authority and law

to a normative certitude. While Lamennais strongly adhered to the Bible as divinely inspired and historically accurate, as well as to Christ as God incarnate, he attempted to find a normative foundation in what he termed "general reason." This general reason was based on God's original revelation to man, which is universally recognized and therefore infallible. It was also related to creation, Scripture, and tradition. General reason as a principle of certitude clashed with the Enlightenment principle of individual reason. Stated briefly, "Authority or general reason which is common consent, is the rule for individual human judgment."⁹ General reason was seen as the only proper apologetic defense against Enlightenment scepticism. The objective character of general reason was contrasted with the subjective character of individual reason. This infallible tradition of humanity was seen as the natural counterpart to the infallible church tradition in the realm of grace: "Man believes in the infallible authority of humanity just as the Christian believes in the infallible authority of the Church."¹⁰ Lamennais made brief but helpful references to the importance of creation for his social philosophy. The creation order was interconnected from God's original acts leading to modern society. Stress was put upon the socially interdependent character of human life from God's communication with the first man and the subsequent growth of faith and certitude. Thus human society was able to exist only in virtue of the society first established between God and man as well as with the truths or laws given primitively by His Word. The loss of these verities leads to social destruction; thus they are found in all societies. Authority exists only in society and is essential for public life. Social groups play an important part in the trans-

mission of these verities. With social authority based upon infallible general reason, Lamennais thought that he had a water-tight argument against unbelieving individual reason.¹¹

Mennaisian Democracy

A new phase of mennaisian thought began with the publication in 1829 of *On the Progress of the Revolution and the War Against the Church*. This book was an important inspiration for Catholics in Belgium to join with the Liberals to secure Belgian independence from the Netherlands in 1830. It sold a significant number of copies and went through two French and four Belgian editions in one year. *On the Progress of the Revolution* was written in criticism of the autocratic policy of King Charles X in expelling the Jesuits from their junior seminaries in 1828. Lamennais saw this education policy as an enforcement of the secular principle that children belong to the state before they belong to their parents. By this time Lamennais was no longer a theocrat. The 1829 book clearly affirmed a critical acceptance of democracy. As such, *On the Progress of the Revolution* was one of the earliest major Christian Democratic manifestos. Lamennais argued that the twenty-five million French Catholics and their Church should be included in the Constitutional liberties enjoyed by everyone else. A simple mennaisian declaration was made in favor of full freedoms of conscience, education, and the press. Renouncing the threat of theocratic force, the Abbé called for the government to end religious persecution in these areas. The example of Belgian Catholics opposing the religious persecution of the Dutch King Willem I was cited as an additional success of the new mennaisian program. A strong polemic was then made against Gallicanism as the doctrine that the

French state controlled the French Church in the interest of royalist selfishness. While rejecting secular Liberalism, the Abbe courageously declared, "Separated from its false theories and their consequences, Liberalism is the attitude that lifts up a portion of the people in the name of liberty whenever the religion of Christ reigns."¹² But this idea of liberty must be based upon the liberating truth of Jesus Christ (John 8:32 and Galatians 4:31). At the same time the anti-Christian character of contemporary Liberalism was clearly repudiated. Thus Catholics could honestly embrace democracy on the same religious basis from which they could reject absolutism. Lamennais urged his readers to have faith in the power of truth in rejecting oppression. To the laity he pointed out that liberty properly understood was the invincible desire of the Christian nations that needed to be realized in the various aspects of life. To the clergy Lamennais emphasized the obligation to separate the Church completely from atheist political society in order to save the faith and give the Church true independence. No civic function bestowed on the bishops, he warned, was compatible with the realization of the freedom of a spiritual ministry.¹³ The intent of this suggestion was for the French bishops to give up their traditional Gallican church-state alliance.

With the coming to power of the July Monarchy of Louis-Philippe—the result of the Revolution of 1830—, mennaisians had high hopes that in the more democratic atmosphere their call for "God and Liberty" would be heard. Lamennais and his associates rushed to establish a Christian Democratic newspaper in Paris. The name chosen for the paper was *L'Avenir* (The Future) and its motto was "God and Liberty." *L'Avenir* was in existence between Oc-

tober, 1830 and November, 1831. At the beginning of this period concern was expressed because only atomized individuals existed in France since all the traditionally influential groups had been swept away by royalist despotism and the Revolution. The royalist principle was constantly clashing with the democratic principle and in the July Revolution of 1830 the democratic view was victorious. Yet the Abbé emphasized that three basic reforms still needed to be fully realized, viz., liberty of conscience, education, and association. The intention of Louis-Philippe to separate church and state completely was encouraged. The other needed reforms were also advocated. As the months went on Lamennais clarified the position of *L'Avenir* to strengthen order and liberty. While recognizing the constitutional basis of the July Monarchy, the following reforms were requested: 1) the liberty of conscience including the complete

It should be pointed out that in the mennaisian system the most prominent associations were family, school, church, commune, province, and society. The violation of the integrity of these associations by the centralized state was seen as a transgression of their own internal laws of self-administration.

separation of church and state, 2) educational liberty based upon the rights of the family and in opposition to the state monopoly over the university, 3) freedom of the press, including an

end to heavy taxes on periodicals, 4) freedom of association to strengthen non-governmental social vitality, 5) the widening of the electorate, and 6) the abolition of the pernicious system of governmental centralization in order to create more social space for communes and provinces. It should be pointed out that in the mennaisian system the most prominent associations were family, school, church, commune, province, and society. The violation of the integrity of these associations by the centralized state was seen as a transgression of their own internal laws of self-administration. Lamennais hoped that in the society of the future the Catholic Church, including the papacy, would divest itself of any political jurisdiction in order to further public liberty on a spiritual basis. At the same time the Abbé pointed out that the serious problem of the poverty of the masses required a solution. When forced by the Pope and reactionary monarchs to cease publication of *L'Avenir*, Lamennais noted on November 15, 1831 that Catholics had been engaged in a great struggle for a year to introduce true liberty based upon God's order and that they would be successful if they persevered.¹⁴ How prophetic these words were!

Lamennais was also busy in his L'Abri-like study center at his estate in Brittany, called the Congregation of St. Peter, with the work of the General Agency for the Defense of Religious Liberty (an anti-defamation league of the day) and with the favoring of a bank system to lend credit to the poor. For all his efforts, the ideas of Lamennais, especially liberty of conscience and of the press, the separation of church and state, and democracy in general were condemned by the Pope Gregory XVI in "*Mirari vos*" of August 15, 1832 and in "*Singulari nos*" of July 7, 1834. The Catholic hierarchy was not ready to em-

brace Christian Democracy. Lamennais left the Catholic Church in 1837 a very bitter man.¹⁵

Mennaisian System

The main elements of the mennaisian system were reflected in various forms in the later Christian Democratic history. These mennaisian elements include:

1. An Open (Catholic-humanitarian) Position: a non-confessional, general Christian-humanitarian basis for political parties and various social organizations. Such organizations are open to all men of good will who agree with the general program of the group.
2. Theology of History: the affirmation that human history is the arena in which the truths of revelation are transmitted from one generation to another. Error in history can aid the believer to discover the truth by means of the process of value clarification. This theology of history is organic in character with historicist overtones and is oriented toward change. Creation, the fall into sin, and redemption play a role in this concept. Events are the incarnation of ideas.
3. Normativity of General Reason: a traditionalist alternative to philosophical scepticism. General reason or common consent is rooted in creation, Scripture, and tradition. General reason norms liberty and implies the traditional Catholic nature/grace synthesis as basic to the open position.
4. Social Apologetic: the defense of the religious basis of society against the secular currents of the day in a structurally non-Christian society. The goal is to reverse, restore, and return society to God in a pluralistic framework. There is a plurality of

derived sovereignties under God such as family, church, school, commune, state, and society. Catholics can maintain their full integrity only by competing with other groups for the attention and approval of the nation. This is predicated on the rejection of the theocratic absolutism of the Old Regime and the establishment of a pluralistic society.

5. Christian Democratic Political Spirituality: a spiritual attitude about life and public affairs. Not only is there a powerful critique of the inadequacy of secular political humanism, but also the articulation of an alternative Christian Democratic perspective.

Leo XIII

A new phase in the history of Catholic social thought was begun on May 15, 1891 with the promulgation of the encyclical "*Rerum Novarum*" by Pope Leo XIII. A frank recognition was made that the poverty of the working classes was the pressing problem of the age. Due to revolutions, industrialization, and the spirit of change the rich elite were opposed by the poor masses. Leo XIII firmly denounced socialism in vindicating the right of private ownership of property, the reaffirmation of marriage, the rights of the father for his family which cannot be usurped by the state, and the social task of the Catholic Church. While stating that complete social equality was impossible because of human diversity, he did articulate a social harmony model of capital and labor working together for mutual benefit. He called for the introduction of a living wage for workers as a Christian virtue and he warned that religion taught that workers were not to be enslaved by capital. Such social harmony between classes, in the pontiff's view, was found in the Gospel of

Christ. Leo XIII stressed that a solution to the social question could be found in Church charity, reform legislation by the state, governments guided by the moral law (especially its implications for protection of family life, moderate taxation, respect for religion, and the furtherance of just economic progress) and by Catholic social organizations such as labor unions. The pontiff urged the faithful to join such Catholic social organizations while forbidding them to join humanistic labor unions.¹⁶ The way was now open for Christian Democratic politics to develop with papal approval.

Popular Republican Movement

The next important stage in the quest for "God and Liberty" was seen in the publication of *Christianity and Democracy* by Jacques Maritain in 1943 and the formation of the French Christian Democratic Party, the Popular Republican Movement, in 1944. *Christianity and Democracy* was an important manifesto for post-war Christian

... Maritain emphasized that democracy was a temporal manifestation of Christianity. But in such a democratic order the primacy of spiritual values (including the freedom of conscience) must be emphasized.

Democracy. Central to Maritain's argument was the vital need to create an alternative to liberal individualism, fascism, and Marxism. This alternative was a new democracy with a Christian inspiration. The pre-war public egotisms of Left and Right were rejected in favor of a Christian basis for democracy. The secular republic was fully accepted and the democratic order

was affirmed as related to respect for human dignity and human rights. Thus Maritain emphasized that democracy was a temporal manifestation of Christianity. But in such a democratic order the primacy of spiritual values (including the freedom of conscience) must be emphasized. The norm for the state is found in God's authority (Romans 13) and the state is to work for social justice in order to make life more humane. Individuals are more than citizens; they are persons who are members of various groups. People are not to be exploited as political pawns. "Democracy needs the evangelical dynamic to be true to itself,"¹⁷ Maritain added. "The democratic ideal," in his view, "is the secular name for the Christian ideal."¹⁸ Maritain ended his book by calling for a spiritual and social renewal. France was seen as the key nation to bring about this historic task with a recognition of the need for domestic organic pluralism, the realization of all liberties as the highest task of civilization and the quest for true international cooperation.

After the liberation of France in 1944, the Popular Republican Movement attempted to realize these goals as it became a powerful Christian Democratic party for more than a decade. The leaders of this party who served in top governmental posts were firmly committed to freedom of conscience, parliamentary democracy, social pluralism, and international cooperation. On May 9, 1950 Foreign Minister Robert Schuman unveiled the innovative plan for the establishment of a Coal and Steel Community under the control of a common high authority between France and West Germany and open to other European countries. Premier Georges Bidault, another Popular Republican, strongly supported this plan for European integration. The Schuman Plan was designed to

eliminate the nationalistic antagonisms between the two historic enemies by creating practical cooperation, economic interdependence, and material improvement. Such free trade in coal and steel assured that neither power would be able to rearm in secret. Thus a climate of mutual trust could be created. The "Schuman Plan" was based upon a pluralist perspective and led in 1957 to the creation of the European Common Market which is having a great impact on the entire world. Schuman felt economic integration would also lead to the political integration of Western Europe.

On the French domestic scene, the Popular Republican Movement urged the adoption of governmental policy to bring greater equality and economic justice to the poorer classes by means of an activist state with a mixed economy. Social justice and the quality of life were both parts of the party's concerns. Popular Republicans in power also attempted to strengthen the family by means of a comprehensive national housing policy including the availability of low-cost loans to young married couples, low-cost housing, and socially responsible rent increases. Popular Republicans likewise worked to strengthen structural pluralism by encouraging the activities of various Catholic labor, educational, youth, agricultural, and press associations in sympathy with Christian Democracy.¹⁹

Vatican II

The Catholic quest for democratic pluralism reached a definitive conclusion when Pope Paul VI promulgated the "Declaration on Religious Freedom" at the Second Vatican Council on December 7, 1965. Eighty-eight percent of the bishops present approved this declaration. Major emphasis was put on individual freedom of con-

science as a constitutional and civil right. Man made in God's image was declared to have innate dignity and because of his conscience he was viewed as capable of exercising responsible freedom. Naturally the Roman Catholic Church was recognized in the Vatican document as teaching the true religion. But the highest norm for life was seen as the objective divine law that man follows by his conscience. The complete separation of Church and state was recognized since the Church as a spiritual authority should be free to teach the truth. The state should allow for full freedoms for all religious groups to be governed by their own internal norms. Likewise the state was urged to acknowledge the rights of the family, including the free choice of religious or secular schools. Official recognition was given to the necessity for democratic pluralism, the rights of groups, an end to theocratic intolerance, the moral task of the church, and limits to the modern secular state.²⁰ From the Catholic viewpoint the integration of "God and Liberty" was now achieved.

Observations

1. The mennaisian call for the identification of "God and Liberty" was clearly on the right track. Lamennais was himself a century ahead of the hierarchy of his Church. There is in the mennaisian social apologetic an awareness of the importance of creation and the rights of groups to a pluralist theory. Above all, Lamennais was a visionary who caught the imagination of many Catholics who were wrestling with the problems of theocracy, democracy, and secularity in public life. His main contribution was as a prophet, not as a systematic theoretician.
2. The commitment of Christian Democrats to pluralism gradually

gained acceptance by many Frenchmen, especially in the rise of the Popular Republican Movement as a major governing party between 1944 and 1962. What Vatican II approved was the consensus of pluralist thinking and practice that was already a fact.

3. The 1965 "Declaration on Religious Freedom" represents an official shift of Catholic teaching on pluralism amounting to a reversal of the condemnation of Lamennais by Pope Gregory XVI.
4. A notion of general reason as the basis for politics is common to Christian Democracy and is founded on the nature/grace dualism of

In spite of the mennaisian high view of Biblical infallibility, the proper integration of "God and Liberty" was not achieved in the Catholic tradition. This dualism prevented the development of democracy truly integrated with a noncompromising Christianity.

Catholic thought. In spite of the mennaisian high view of Biblical infallibility, the proper integration of "God and Liberty" was not achieved in the Catholic tradition. This dualism prevented the development of democracy truly integrated with a noncompromising Christianity. For all the talk of the authority of general reason as a defense against the Revolution and the secularization process, the Christian Democratic

tradition from Lamennais to the Popular Republican Movement was unable truly to confront this secularization process with the Gospel of the Christ who is Lord over all the creation. This Christian Democratic tradition has always advocated the open party of all men of good will who agree with the current political program. One is reminded of Dr. Cornelius Van Til's example of the carpenter who cuts wood for the building of a house not knowing that his young son has tampered with the saw so that the boards are cut slant-wise. They are ultimately unusable because they do not fit together properly. So it is when the teachings of Christianity are set according to the standards of sinful human personality inherent in the Catholic nature/grace synthesis.²¹ By contrast, we must see creation and politics with the glasses of Scripture and the eyes of faith. Thus the Christian Democratic tradition in France has made an important contribution to the question of pluralism, but mainly as isolated insights and accomplishments and not as a system of thought. We are indebted to the mennaisian tradition for raising some of the right questions. But we must examine the Kuyperian tradition to see if any clearer theory and practice of Christian pluralism is possible.

Notes

¹F[elice] Lamennais; Editorial, *L'Avenir*, October 16, 1830 in *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris: 1836-37; rpt. Frankfurt/Main: Minerva, 1967), X, 132 (my translation).

²F. Houtart and A. Rousseau, *L'Eglise face aux Luttes Revolutionnaires* (Brussels: Edition Vie Ouvrière, 1972), pp. 12-41; A. Cobban, *A History of Modern France* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962), II, 9-69.

³Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, VI, 308-10, 315, 320, 318-19, 329, 334-35, 340-41, 338, 341, 346, 347-55.

⁴Lamennais, *Essai sur l'Indifference en matiere de Religion*, I, in *Oeuvres Complètes*, I, i (my translation).

⁵Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, I, ii-xix, 2-3 (my translation).

⁶Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, I, 14, 18-143, 71, 275 (my translation).

⁷Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, I, 276, 278, 380-81, 303 (my translation).

⁸Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, I, 315-16, 329-31, 335 (my translation).

⁹Lamennais, *Essai*, IV, in *Oeuvres Complètes*, IV, 121-177, 310-57; *Essai*, II, in *Oeuvres Complètes*, II, 73-94; *Defense de l'Essai in Oeuvres Complètes*, V, 172, 131 (my translation).

¹⁰Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, V, 161 (my translation).

¹¹Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, II, 195-96, 85.

¹²F. Lamennais, *Des Progres de la Revolution et de la Guerre Contre L'Eglise* (Louvain: Vanlinthout et Vandenzande, 1829), pp. 93-138, v-x, 21 (my translation).

¹³Lamennais, *Des Progres*, pp. 39, 62, 163, 171.

¹⁴Lamennais, *Oeuvres Complètes*, X, Oct. 17, 1830, pp. 141-45; Dec. 7, 1830, pp. 196, 199, 200-04; June 28, 1831, pp. 322-23; June 30, 1831, pp. 346, 348; November 15, 1831.

¹⁵C. Carcopino, *Les Doctrines Sociales de Lamennais* (Paris: PUF, 1942), pp. 67-173. The texts of both condemnations of Lamennais are found in P.N. Stearns, *Priest and Revolutionary: Lamennais and the Dilemma of French Catholicism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 188-96. For a contemporary Catholic critique see J.J. Oldfield, *The Problem of Tolerance and Social Existence in the Writings of F. Lamennais*, (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

¹⁶The text of "Rerum Novarum" is found in E. Gilson, ed., *The Church Speaks to the Modern World* (Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1954), pp. 205-40. See also R.H. Schmandt, "The Life and Work of Leo XIII" and J.N. Moody, "Leo XIII and the Social Crisis" in E.G. Gargan, ed., *Leo XIII and the Modern World* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), pp. 15-86.

¹⁷J. Maritain, *Christianisme et Democratie* (Paris: P. Hartmann, 1947), pp. 7-10, 23-24, 32, 34-35, 41, 44, 47, 57 (my translation).

¹⁸Maritain, p. 60 (my translation).

¹⁹Maritain, pp. 85-93; R. Rochefort, *Robert Schuman* (Paris: Cerf, 1968), pp. 267-86; G. Bidault, *Resistance* (New York: Praeger, 1967), pp. 174-78; R.E.M. Irving, *Christian Democracy in France* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973), pp. 110, 117, 129-134, 60-64.

²⁰T.F. Stransky, ed., *Declaration on Religious Freedom of Vatican Council II* (New York: Paulist, 1966), pp. 53, 63-91.

²¹C. Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith*, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1955), p. 91.