

## THE VARYING FORTUNES OF CORPORATIVE THEORY IN THE HANDS OF THE SOCIAL CATHOLICS, 1870-1918

THE BRAND of corporatism sponsored by La Tour du Pin came to be adopted by the majority of Social Catholics in the period 1870-1918, although dissident minorities like the Social Reform and Social Democratic groups refused to accept it. Even the majority, however, did not place an equal emphasis upon corporatism throughout the whole era. In the seventies most Social Catholics were reluctant to approve corporatism; in the next two decades, they gave a prominent place to it and introduced corporative legislation in parliament. In the years preceding the first World War, while still supporting corporatism, they devoted more attention to social legislation.

### FROM ECONOMIC LIBERALISM TO CORPORATISM

During the seventies and early eighties the Social Catholic movement tried to emancipate itself from the laissez-faire tendencies of Périn and Le Play. The force of Le Play's ideas was particularly strong and his disciples were well organized. In 1856 he had founded the Society of Political Economy, a learned association, and in 1872 he organized the propagandist Unions of Social Peace. Together the two societies comprised the Social Reform group which began publishing its fortnightly review, *La Réforme sociale*, in 1881. This group dominated Social Catholic thought in the early years of the Third French Republic, and continued to propagate its doctrines long after its influence had waned.<sup>1</sup>

Le Play's advocacy of patronage or paternalism of the upper classes, formation of friendly societies, or *confréries*, and

<sup>1</sup> Parker T. Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France* (New York: Macmillan, 1921), pp. 355-361; *Le Réforme sociale* (1913), 513-541.

Christian indoctrination of workers was strengthened by the efforts of Léon Harmel, proprietor of the Val-des-Bois spinning mills and guild. Val-des-Bois was organized into a paternalistic Christian guild. Its guild board, composed of an elective council of workingmen with an employer chairman, possessed only advisory authority on wages, shop management, social insurance, and vocational training. In paternalistic fashion, Harmel provided free medical care for workers, dowries for girls at marriage, and low cost housing. He particularly encouraged the Catholic religion among his workers. The influence of Harmel was noticeable in the early reports and congresses of the *Oeuvre des Cercles*, the Catholic labor associations which had been organized by La Tour du Pin, De Mun, and others. In 1873 Harmel joined the *Oeuvre* and encouraged it in its purpose of "devotion of the directing class to the working class," preparing a Manual setting forth the principles and describing the operation of Val-des-Bois.<sup>2</sup> At the congress of the *Oeuvre* in Rheims in 1875, Father Marquigney, one of the early leaders of the *Oeuvre*, defended the position of Le Play and Harmel. Accepting competition as the general law of labor, Marquigney asserted that the medieval ideal of master-worker solidarity could be retained through the encouragement of patronage on the part of the employer, and of trusting gratitude on the part of workers.<sup>3</sup>

The breaking away from liberalism and patronage and the evolution toward corporatism was evident in the *Avis*, or recommendations, of the *Conseil d'Etudes* of the *Oeuvre des Cercles* drafted during the years 1878-1882. These *Avis* represented the opinion of the *Conseil* on such matters as Catholic professional associations of arts and trades, occupational freedom, and duty of the state toward labor, but they were usually

<sup>2</sup> Albert de Mun, *Ma Vocation sociale, souvenir de l'oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers, 1871-1875* (7th ed., Paris: P. Lethielleux), pp. 73, 243-246; Moon, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-120.

<sup>3</sup> Georges Jarlot, *Le Régime corporatif et les Catholiques sociaux, histoire d'une doctrine* (Paris: Flammarion, 1938), pp. 48-51.

drafted by one or two men. In the early *Avis* the emphasis on employer organization and patronage was very marked.<sup>4</sup> Mixed unions were permitted but only on a voluntary and largely confessional basis, while restriction of competition was half-heartedly proposed.

With the fifth *Avis*, written in 1879, progression toward corporatism was more apparent,<sup>5</sup> while *Avis* number eight, written in 1882, unreservedly broke with Périn's conception of purely free and voluntary guilds. This latter *Avis* stated clearly that guilds were not to be purely voluntary and free of government control. The state was to prepare privileges for them and recognize them in law while they were reappearing in fact. Moreover, the corporation should be a political unit and vote either through direct or indirect suffrage, on questions concerning labor, property, and commerce.<sup>6</sup>

This change in attitude toward corporatism was evidenced in those *Avis* composed at different times by the same person. The Comte de Breda, for example, revealed in *Avis* number seven (1881) a remarkable change from the views he expressed in *Avis* number four (1878). In the latter he was chiefly concerned with patronage,<sup>7</sup> while in the former he demanded mixed associations, the union of similar industries on a regional basis, corporative patrimony, and arbitral tribunals.<sup>8</sup> In

4 For example, *Avis* No. 3, "Associations professionnelles d'arts et de métiers," written by Louis Milcent in July 1878. *Association catholique*, VI, 311-312, XI (1881), 258-260.

5 "Devoir de l'état envers le travail," *ibid.*, XI (1881), 262-264. In keeping with its title, this *Avis* was chiefly concerned with the role of the state in a corporative regime. The state was to be the protector, not the creator of corporative life. It should encourage professional associations, corporative patrimony composed of worker employer contributions, and arbitral jurisdictions and should reserve the right to examine and approve corporative statutes.

6 "Nature du travail," *ibid.*, XIII (1882), 511-555.

7 "Liberté du travail," *ibid.*, XI (1881), 260-262. In this *Avis* Breda recommended voluntary associations of employers of the same profession to limit competition and ameliorate the workers' lot.

8 "Le Principe de l'organisation du travail," *ibid.*, XI, 387-412, 548-574.

fact, in an article in 1887 in *Association catholique*, the review of the *Oeuvre des Cercles*, Breda pointed out the danger of the abuse of patronage. He felt that even the best-intentioned intervention of employers would not suffice to remedy the moral and social situation of the workers, and that only the corporative regime could accomplish this.<sup>9</sup>

During the eighties and nineties, the doctrines of La Tour du Pin gained supremacy over those of Le Play, Périn, and Harmel.<sup>10</sup> Many Social Catholics concurred in La Tour's declaration in April 1882 that Harmel's Val-des Bois was not really a guild and did not possess a genuine corporative patrimony.<sup>11</sup> Following the lead of La Tour, the congress of directors of Catholic worker associations voiced their unanimous conviction that the corporative regime was the sole means of counteracting the evils engendered by the "anarchical state of the times."<sup>12</sup> And a Manifesto in *Association catholique* of March 15, 1883 stated outright that the Social Catholics now dared to proclaim the corporative regime as the only solution to the labor question.<sup>13</sup>

From 1883 on corporatism held a safely established place in the pages of *Association catholique*. Contributors might argue about specific aspects of a corporative regime, such as the degree to which professions should be represented in the government, but the majority of them agreed upon the desirability of corporatism. Although in 1891 *Association catholique* was dissociated from the *Oeuvre des Cercles*, its policy remained the same, and starting from November 15, 1895 it published in front of each issue a "Program", the fundamental reform of

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, XXIII (1887), 340 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Charles Maignen, *Maurice Maignen, Directeur du Cercle Montparnasse et les origines du mouvement social catholique en France* (Luçon: S. Pacteau, 1927, 2 vols.), *passim*.

<sup>11</sup> La Tour du Pin, "Chronique," *ibid.*, XIII (April 1882), 475-477.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, XV (1882), 269, 290.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, XV (March 15, 1882), 273 ff.



which was the "corporative reorganization of society, that is, the reconstruction in modern form of the medieval organization of trades into guilds or corporations".<sup>14</sup>

In 1897, *Association catholique*, together with the magazines *Justice sociale*, *Sociologie catholique*, and *XX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, established the corporative program of the so-called Union of Reviews. Specifically the program called for a corporative system similar to La Tour du Pin's plan of corporative chambers. Most of the elements of La Tour's scheme were included—registration of the members of each trade; encouragement of labor unions and employer associations and their representation in a corporative council; regulation of the trade by the council subject to a referendum of members of the trade and state approval.<sup>15</sup> Although certain individuals and groups within the Social Catholic movement disagreed with this program, it was raised as a standard to which the greater number of Social Catholics repaired.

#### ALBERT DE MUN AND THE STRUGGLE FOR CORPORATISM IN PARLIAMENT

While a corporative doctrine was being framed under the inspiration of La Tour du Pin in the *Conseil d'Etudes* of the *Oeuvre des Cercles* and in the review, *Association catholique*, a handful of Social Catholics in the Chamber of Deputies fought a long, hard, and for the most part losing battle to get this doctrine enacted into law. The leader among these deputies and the chief Social Catholic spokesman in parliament was Count Albert de Mun.

There was a marked parallel between the careers of Albert de Mun and La Tour du Pin. Born in 1840, six years after La Tour, de Mun attended the same college of Versailles and was trained as an army officer at Saint Cyr. Upon his graduation in 1862, he was ordered to Algeria where he spent five years

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, November 15, 1895.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, XLIX (1900), 2.

in the Third Regiment of African Chasseurs. In 1867, at the time of his marriage to Mlle. d'Andlau, he was transferred to Clermont-Ferrand and there came into contact with an *Oeuvre Catholique Ouvrière* founded by the *Conférence de Saint Vincent de Paul*.

In the Franco-Prussian War De Mun was assigned to the Army of Metz and among his fellow officers was La Tour du Pin. They even fought side by side during part of the Battle of Regonville and were both interned at Aix-la-Chapelle by the Germans. Their stay in prison cemented an erstwhile casual friendship and together they read Keller's book, *The Encyclical of December 8, 1864 and the Principles of '89*, and were attracted by its guild theories. When liberated by the Germans, both returned to France to serve on General Ladmirault's staff and to participate in the suppression of the Commune. De Mun's opinion on the causes of the Commune, as stated to a Commission of Inquiry, was that it resulted from the apathy of the bourgeoisie and a lack of moral education among workers. He believed that the treatment of the *Communards* was too harsh and would only increase social hatreds.

In 1871 De Mun, with La Tour and others, was one of the founders of the *Oeuvre des Cercles* and he became its secretary-general. In 1875 he was constrained to retire from the army; his resignation was requested on the grounds that he had made political speeches in uniform. Consequently from 1875 on, De Mun was free to devote his time entirely to politics.<sup>16</sup>

His election to the Chamber of Deputies in 1876 and 1878 was invalidated by the anticlericals, but in 1881 his claim to a seat was successfully established. A brilliant orator, he championed in the Chamber the Social Catholic and corporative ideas elaborated by La Tour du Pin. Until the *Ralliement* in 1892, he was an aggressive legitimist, identifying the cause of Social Catholicism with that of monarchy, but in that year he followed the Pope's direction and rallied to the support of the

<sup>16</sup> De Mun, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

Republic, while La Tour du Pin remained a royalist. In this respect their paths diverged, De Mun helping Jacques Piou and others to found the democratic Popular Liberal Party in 1902 and La Tour associating himself with the *Action Française*. Although their friendship cooled as a result, both continued to support corporatism and respected one another's achievements. La Tour rendered warm homage to De Mun in his introduction to the latter's autobiographical account of the early years of the *Oeuvre*. De Mun died at the beginning of the first World War, worn out by work and the strain of a weakened heart.<sup>17</sup>

De Mun's reputation springs not from the writing of books, but from the eloquence and zeal which he applied to the cause of corporatism. At first, like so many other Social Catholics, his guild concepts were hazy and hesitating and tinged with the ideas of Le Play, Périn, and Harmel. He was indefinite regarding the form of guilds, visualizing them largely as a center of Christian activity where antagonism between capital and labor would give way to patronage exercised in a Christian spirit and freely accepted.<sup>18</sup> With his entrance into politics and the general clarification of the Social Catholic stand on guilds, he began to sharpen his views. In a speech at the tenth General Assembly of the Workingmen's Clubs, May 7, 1882, De Mun described the guild as

a community formed among employers and workers of the same profession held together, first of all by acceptance of the principle of social justice, which imposes on the former, as well as on the latter, reciprocal duties; that is the moral bond; and united by a common possession, by a corporate property arising from the voluntary sacrifices of both [classes]: that is the material bond.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Moon, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-90 and *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> *Association catholique*, VI, 587-593.

<sup>19</sup> Albert de Mun, *Discours* (3rd ed., Paris: Librairie Ch. Poussielgue, 1895), I (*Questions sociales*), 403.

The guild was to be governed by an elected council composed of employers, workers, and members of the upper class—the latter in the capacity of arbiters. The council was also to administer collective property and economic institutions. "For these professional communities freely formed, raised up by private initiative," continued De Mun,

we demand legal existence: not toleration but the sanction of law for their regulations . . . . It is not difficult to perceive how the guild, when legally existing, might in the future become the basis of a sincere, fair, and true representation of interests in the domain of politics.<sup>20</sup>

One of the first and most difficult tasks facing De Mun in parliament was to formulate and to voice during the debates of 1883 and 1884, the Social Catholic position on the proposed law for full legalization of trade unions. During the Second Empire, unions had been awarded a limited recognition, but subsequently agitation to remove all limitations increased.

It was with mixed feelings that De Mun and his colleagues regarded the law. On the one hand they found much in it to which they could raise objection. Article Four disturbed them as it forbade receipt of gifts or other acquisitions by unions except under onerous conditions. Further, the unions were to be organizations of private law, whereas De Mun and the Social Catholic deputies demanded institutions of public law officially recognized, having rights and privileges, enacting the law of the profession and representing the professional body before the state. They felt that the proposed law did not organize trades, but perpetuated the class struggle. It encouraged unilateral unions rather than mixed trade associations of employers and employees or even mixed councils.<sup>21</sup> In the debate of June 12, 1883 De Mun declared to the proponents of the bill:

<sup>20</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>21</sup> Jarlot, *op. cit.*, p. 97.



What is lacking in the unions as you conceive them—unions of employers or unions of workingmen, but isolated and separated from one another—is precisely what is the great want, the great social necessity of our times, and what existed at the basis of the old guild institutions, namely, personal contact, conciliation of interests, appeasement, which cannot be had except by the reconstruction of the industrial family.<sup>22</sup>

On the other hand, De Mun and his friends did see some positive good in the new measure. It would formally abrogate the detested Chapelier law of 1791 which prohibited labor organizations,<sup>23</sup> and it would encourage the formation of separate employer and employee syndicates which could be the basis of mixed professional organizations or chambers. De Mun was therefore in a dilemma. He finally arrived at the decision not to oppose the law but to attempt to secure amendment to it which would give preferential treatment to mixed syndicates. He proposed

that the law give special determined advantages to all the mixed syndicates which might be founded . . . . We demand this privilege for the mixed syndicates and not for the separated . . . because we believe that the former alone which consecrate the common association of employers and workers, present the necessary social guarantees to merit the encouragements which we hope to attribute to them.<sup>24</sup>

Thus De Mun desired that such mixed syndicates, uniting employers and workers of the same or similar trades, should be empowered to receive gifts and legacies, to establish collective funds, to create institutions for insurance against sickness, unemployment, accidents, and old age, and to acquire such property as necessary for the creation of workers' lodgings, refuges for children, and hospitals for the sick. The Social Catholic amendment, in spite of the efforts of De Mun and his fellow

<sup>22</sup> Chambre des Députés, *Débats*, 1883, pp. 1277 ff.

<sup>23</sup> Jarlot, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

<sup>24</sup> De Mun, *Discours*, II, 84.

deputies, De la Bassetière and Le Cour Grandmaison, was rejected and the law of 1884 was passed without giving mixed unions any special privileges. Among those who helped defeat the amendment was Georges Clemenceau who raised up fears of the Old Regime and clericalism.<sup>25</sup>

De Mun, however, did not lose heart at this defeat. Again and again in the Chamber he raised his voice in favor of a guild regime. On January 14, 1884 in the course of a debate on trade boards in the mining industries, he urged guild organization, combining employers and workers and containing within itself the natural means of arbitration as a true remedy for labor unrest.<sup>26</sup> In another debate, this time regarding the government's program for the alleviation of the labor crisis, De Mun asked the government:

Will you study the creation of a corporative organization of labor based on the union of masters and men? We have asked you to provide the means; you refused; but we still demand them.<sup>27</sup>

De Mun and the Social Catholics remained ardent supporters of progressive labor legislation and social insurance laws, but they insisted, for the most part in vain, that such measures, while they should be enacted by the state and made compulsory for the nation, should be administered by guild organizations which would be better able to cope with local and trade conditions and would be more efficient than a bureaucratic state. For example, on October 20, 1884 De Mun argued that accident insurance should be based on labor organizations rather than on the administrative bureaucracy of the government. Again in the debates of 1888 on the same question, De Mun proposed accident insurance funds for each industry or group of similar industries, which should be administered by a mixed

<sup>25</sup> Jarlot, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

<sup>26</sup> Chambre des Députés, *Débats*, 1884, p. 190 ff.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2076.

employer and worker council.<sup>28</sup> His proposal was defeated, as the law when finally passed in 1898 put the risk at the exclusive charge of the chief of enterprise and organized a national fund which, the Social Catholics claimed, took on an *étatiste* character.

However, in the law passed on June 29, 1894 on aid and retirement funds for miners, De Mun and the Social Catholics seem to have won some of their points. They desired corporative providence funds, with compulsory insurance, and the law as passed provided for funds to be collected from a levy on wages, from contributions of employers, from state grants, and from legacies and gifts. The fund was to be administered by a mixed council, one-third of its members to be designated by the employer and two-thirds by the workers.<sup>29</sup>

The Social Catholic fight for permanent conciliation committees and compulsory courts of arbitration failed many times. The Lockroy law, passed in 1892, provided for purely voluntary arbitration, and rejected the De Mun-Le Cour Grandmaison proposal for permanent committees of conciliation.<sup>30</sup>

The law of 1908 on the organization of labor councils likewise failed to satisfy the Social Catholics. The councils' functions were to enlighten the government on labor conditions, to facilitate general accords and collective contracts, and to furnish competent mediators for labor conflicts. The councils were to be elected not by syndicates and organized groups, as the Social Catholics had requested, but on a purely individualistic basis. Consequently they were denounced by the Social Catholics as amorphous, inorganic, and anti-corporative.<sup>31</sup>

The Social Catholics suffered another defeat in the contest over retirement funds for workers. They were extremely disappointed that the law of 1906 did not allow the professions

<sup>28</sup> De Mun, *Discours*, IV, 21 ff., 36, 37.

<sup>29</sup> Jarlot, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>30</sup> Jarlot, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-119.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 184-187.

themselves, organized on a regional basis, to manage the funds. According to Gailhard-Bancel, another of De Mun's Social Catholic colleagues in the Chamber, the law might have been the beginning of corporative organization, but instead a national fund was instituted and the state was given too much power over the retirement funds and their administration.<sup>32</sup>

The attempts of De Mun and his co-workers to tack guild amendments on to various pieces of legislation—in other words, to introduce a corporative regime unobtrusively and piecemeal—had for the most part failed. It remained, therefore, for the Social Catholics to bring in a bill of their own which would openly propose a corporative system instead of trying to get their ideas into existing bills. Accordingly in 1906 De Mun, Castelman, and Piou sponsored a measure on professional organization.<sup>33</sup>

In the preamble to the proposed law, the usual Social Catholic arguments for corporatism were presented. The need for solidarity between workers and employers was underlined and supported by a quotation from Paul-Boncour's book, *Economic Federalism*, to the effect that "there exists among members of the same profession, a solidarity more real than that between inhabitants of the same commune."<sup>34</sup> The sponsors of the bill felt that only a strong, rational, autonomous professional organization could achieve the social betterment of workers, and prevent the oppressive and tyrannical unity which bent all to the same regulations. Since conditions varied for different regions and different branches of the same profession, regional trade councils would be able to achieve elasticity in the application of professional or trade regulations. These organizations could relieve the state of some of its tasks. Citing the sociolo-

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 187-196; *Association catholique*, LXV (1908), 237.

<sup>33</sup> *Proposition de loi sur l'organisation professionnelle*, présentée par MM. Léonce de Castelman, Piou, Ollivier, Le comte Albert de Mun, Députés. Chambre des Députés, *Documents parlementaires*, 1906. Séance du 6 juillet, 1906. Annexe no. 217, pp. 768-771.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 768.



gist, Durkheim, the authors of the bill maintained that the professions themselves should take over such functions as assistance, which were in the hands of the government and private agencies.

The specific terms of the proposed law followed the general outline of the program of the Union of Reviews. In the regional trade councils to be established, members of employer, labor, or mixed associations were to enjoy a larger representation than persons not affiliated with such groups. However, legislation of the councils concerning apprenticeship, labor conditions, and vocational training would need ratification by the whole trade or profession.

The proposed law said nothing about representation of the trade councils in the government, but in the preamble the statement was made that

perhaps we should have been able to render it [the proposed legislation] more complete by attributing to the regional union of professional councils a share of the national representation in our political assemblies . . . . We thought it was preferable not to raise too many questions at the same time and to simplify our proposition, leaving to time the care of accomplishing the work.<sup>35</sup>

The supporters of the measure merely contented themselves with the hope of "arriving one day at the truth and fullness of a national representation by the representation of interests in a high assembly."<sup>36</sup>

In spite of the valiant efforts of De Mun and his fellow deputy, Jacques Piou, and in spite of the support of the Popular Liberal Party which they had founded in 1902, the measure was not passed. Defeated in parliament, the Party continued to give voice to its demands in conventions and through the writings of its leaders.

<sup>35</sup> *Proposition de loi sur l'organisation professionnelle, op. cit.*, p. 770.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 768.

SOCIAL CATHOLIC CORPORATIVE DOCTRINE  
IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

Although the Social Catholics did not cease to strive for a corporative regime in the years 1906-1914, their corporative proposals tended to be obscured by demands for social and labor legislation and professional representation in parliament. The very term "corporative" was usually avoided.

This trend may be observed in the publications of the *Action Populaire*, a central bureau of propaganda and information founded in Rheims in 1903 and allied with the Popular Liberal Party. In the pages of its periodical, *Mouvement sociale*, the former *Association catholique*, acquired and rechristened in 1909, were to be found numerous articles on industrial legislation and the organization of a professional senate. To the latter topic Eugène Duthoit, a member of the *Action Populaire* and Professor of Economics at the University of Lille, devoted a great deal of study. He believed that the Chamber of Deputies elected by universal suffrage should merely consent to taxes, while the senate chosen by electoral colleges organized by region and type of economic activity should have jurisdiction over professional and trade interests. In the case of industry, these colleges should be composed of an equal number of employer and labor delegates, but two-thirds of the membership would be reserved to syndical organizations. Duthoit provided for the distribution of seats in the senate as follows: agriculture, one hundred seats; commerce, thirty; liberal professions, twenty; constituted bodies, such as universities, institutes, magistrates, and clergy, fifty. In addition the senate itself was to choose twenty members.<sup>37</sup>

The decreased Social Catholic emphasis on corporatism may be gathered from the tenor of the discussions in the *Semaines Sociales*, meetings of which were held once a year from 1904

<sup>37</sup> Eugène Duthoit, "Essai d'une organisation politique harmonisée avec un régime normal du travail," *Association catholique*, LVII (1904), 289 ff.; see also: *Le Suffrage de demain* (Paris: Perrin, 1901); *Vers l'organisation professionnelle* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1910).

to 1913. These *Semaines* were in fact national congresses of the *Action Populaire* of Rheims and brought together Social Catholics of all shades and parties, clerics and laymen, for a week of lectures and conferences on social questions.<sup>38</sup> Although Etienne Martin-Saint-Léon repeated the La Tour du Pin formula for mixed trade councils at the opening session,<sup>39</sup> *Semaines Sociales* of subsequent years devoted increasing time to questions of apprenticeship, wages, hours, and conditions of work. During the war these meetings were discontinued, but were begun again in 1919.

An equal, if not greater, interest in social legislation was shown by the Christian Democrats, a Catholic group organized in 1893 at Rheims by several young priests. They gave expression to their views in their journal, *Justice sociale*, which was condemned in 1908 by Pius X because of its modernist views.<sup>40</sup> During their brief existence as an organized group, the Christian Democrats, under the leadership of Abbé Naudet, sought the betterment of the working class. While on the surface they seemed to accept the general terms of the La Tour du Pin corporative plan, they placed much more emphasis upon class organizations than most Social Catholics. Certain functions such as discipline, apprenticeship, and administration of a collective patrimony were to be taken over by class syndicates rather than by a mixed corporative council. Moreover, the Christian Democrats stressed democracy and political and civil equality to a much greater degree than other Social Catholics. They refused to accept the Social Catholic concept of hierarchy. Hence in detail and in spirit their program actually differed from that of La Tour du Pin and met with criticism on the part of the majority of Social Catholics.<sup>41</sup>

38 Moon, *op. cit.*, pp. 340-341.

39 *Semaines sociales de France, Compte rendu*, 1904.

40 Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

41 For the theories of the Christian Democrats see: Naudet, *Propriété, capital et travail*, ch. XIV "L'Organisation professionnelle et la représentation des intérêts," pp. 35 ff.; *La Démocratie et les démocrates chrétiens* (Paris, 1910).

## THE LEGACY OF SOCIAL CATHOLIC CORPORATIVE DOCTRINE

In the period 1870-1914, the Social Catholics probably showed more interest in the corporative idea than any other group during this period and their writings on the subject were apparently more voluminous than those of any other school. They drew attention to the word "corporative" through their publications and proposals in parliament. Although their interest in corporatism seemed to wane somewhat during the years preceding the first World War, they had prepared a doctrine which they were to advance with increasing vigor in the interbellum years—particularly in the nineteen-thirties. In that decade the Social Catholics gave the same prominence to the corporative idea that they had given it under the leadership of La Tour du Pin and Albert de Mun in the years 1884-1906. At the same time their influence extended to other schools of corporatism; and in 1940 their doctrines helped to shape the corporative theories (although not to the same degree the practices) of the Pétain regime.