

that the JOC and the JAC highlighted, was this whole question of social and apostolic action. Up until the 1930's, social Catholicism had primarily concerned itself with civic reform and improved worker conditions(52). For the 'Action Catholique', however, the emphasis was more on spiritual action; the rechristianisation of a profane world and its institutions(53).

It is true that no comprehensive sociological study of these movements has ever been undertaken. These early developments were, after all, only the beginning. It is perhaps easier to understand the significance of the Action Catholique, by studying the evolution of each of its movements over a longer period of time. Certainly their ideas had changed enormously by the end of the second world war. In emphasising traditional values of the family, and the land, it is not surprising to see that the JAC was more sympathetic to Vichy than the JOC had been; although both of these later became involved in social movements to protect the family and worker conditions. With the experience of war, the social element was therefore to some extent refound.

It is not possible, in the present context, to enter into a detailed analysis of how this evolution took place, and how much this formed part of general developments in Catholicism as a whole. It would be necessary to understand how the 'Missions' came about, and how all this led to the 'worker priest' movement. Instead we shall content ourselves with examining two inter-related problems that the JOC faced as a result of its growth and development.

We have commented on the fact that Action Catholique existed in a multiplicity of forms. However, it is one thing to say that within a pluralist society a plurality of movements must form, but quite another to think that these groups can co-exist in a sympathetic relationship. For example, as these movements matured institutionally, specialisation and segmentation by milieu eventually led to conflict. In such a way, the JOC, increasingly critical of other movements for their over bourgeois character, tended more and more to seek self-autonomy and exclusive rights to the organisation of workers action. As a consequence, its original message of spiritual rejuvenation weakened faced with the 'influential logic' of the Communist Party(54). This mixture of social and religious principles within an organisational framework, therefore, led to a sort of 'confusion of languages.'

The essential point is that when an organisation forms within and principally for a specific social milieu, it necessarily takes on the culture and habits of its milieu. With institutional maturity that organisation will act to defend the vested interests of its milieu, so that religious values are progressively replaced by the political ambitions of the social class, or more specifically, of the organisation itself(55).

Nevertheless, during the 1930's, the development of these youth movements marked a resurgence of vitality amongst Catholics. The action of these movements, along with the growing influence of Catholic intellectuals, of dialogue and discussion in a

diversity of meetings and groups, favoured an atmosphere of rupture with the conformist, bourgeois Catholicism of the nineteenth century.

"Le catholicisme individualiste du XIX^e siècle, le catholicisme d'obligation, du sentiment et des pratiques fait place à un catholicisme à la fois plus personnel et plus social inspiré par les vertus théologiques et qui se propose de muer la vie du chrétien en oraison permanente. C'est un catholicisme conquérant à orientation apostolique, qui requiert de chacun de ses fidèles, un travail en pleine pâte humaine pour le salut non seulement de lui-même mais du monde(56).

It has so far been intended to demonstrate the state of Catholic belief in France. After examining how the phenomenon of dechristianisation proceeded, both in historical and sociological terms, we have now briefly looked at the attitudes that Catholics themselves were adopting. In this it is clear that their views were mostly unorthodox and unacceptable to the Church as a whole. It has to be said that these innovations in Catholic thought met with a hostile reception from the majority of bishops, and arch-bishops. Finally, it is now proposed to examine how this spirit of rupture from orthodox Catholicism was represented amongst intellectuals. It would be fallacious to claim that direct links can be drawn between the complexity of ideas found in different segments of the Catholic population at this time. Nevertheless, it is hoped that certain common issues will readily become available, so that problems facing Catholics may be

understood on a broader level; that is as problems concerning society as a whole.

The Intellectual Spirit of 1930

The significance of the intellectual in the evolution of Catholic attitudes, has already been stressed. The generation of 1930, however, has been recognised as 'the' most striking in depth and originality of thought. Nevertheless, it is important to set these young writers into the continued intellectual development of the nineteenth century and the socio-economic conditions of the twentieth.

Culturally, intellectual life in the first third of the twentieth century remained characteristically aristocratic; the lycées were reserved for the Bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia was dominated by writers, and the massmedia was in its infancy.

Following the Dreyfus Affair, writers in France became increasingly accustomed to signing declarations and petitions as the most effective means of social and political comment. This trend was taken a step further with a growing number of 'Revue' publications, conceived as periodicals for the French intelligentsia to find outlet for its cultured writings(57). It therefore perhaps seems unsurprising that the young university graduates of the late 1920's, finding no place for their opinions

in existing publications, should conclude that they had to form their own.

Perhaps more significantly, these intellectuals faced the almost simultaneous appearance of three crises: that of society, upset by war and economic depression; that of the worker movement, divided as a result of the Bolchevic Revolution; and that of the Catholic Church, still unable to find a place in the modern world. In nearly all aspects of French social and political life, therefore, 1930 marked the end of an era, the 'death' of bourgeois society, in short 'la grande crise'.

It has been convenient to group the intellectuals of 1930 under three headings; a series of publications appearing under the collective name of Jeune Droite(58); a group of writers expressing themselves in and around the revue Ordre Nouveau; and the Esprit movement, which is probably the most well known of the three.

In the light of subsequent events, the Jeune Droite and Esprit have been placed respectively to the political right and left; whilst the Ordre Nouveau has been regarded as a group of political abstentionists. However, by distinguishing them as such, many of their common roots and links are underestimated.

It has already been mentioned that the right wing tradition of French Catholicism had been strengthened following and partly as a result of the Dreyfus Affair. The military victory of the first world war did nothing to alter this trend. Similarly,

Catholic intellectual thinking became progressively involved in the political philosophy of the Action Française. When the Pope condemned this nationalist movement in 1926, therefore, intellectual life experienced a crisis period of reevaluation, as many Catholics found that they could no longer support 'traditional' policies of anti-republicanism, and remain obedient to papal authority.

It was, therefore, partly from this crisis, that the Jeune Droite was founded; that is as a means for right-wing Catholics to find expression. Even so, these young Catholics were much more liberal minded, wishing to open up discussion with other groups, and to some extent, break away from previous doctrines.

Philosophically, a thomist philosopher named Maritain became the inspiration for many Catholics of all political persuasions. At first involving himself with the Action Française, he eventually supported its condemnation with the publication of 'Primauté du Spirituel'. In this and subsequent writings, he supplied the religious ideas around which the Jeune Droite was founded.

The intellectual debate of the day was therefore philosophical; and it was in this sense that Mounier, the founder and editor of Esprit was also influenced by Maritain, particularly in the way the latter emphasised the apostolic action of philosophy(59). A greater influence, though, was Charles Péguy (Chrétien engagé dans le temporel), from whom Mounier took the

idea of the importance of common links between the spiritual and temporal. Peguy supported the view that although the main inspiration for Christian action was the spiritual, the 'mystique', this could only be realised in politics. He therefore developed the problem that had closed Le Sillon movement; and found no contradiction in his Catholic faith for advocating direct political action. This more than anything formed the basis for Mounier's writing.

It is not, therefore, easy to distinguish the political opinions of these movements. It is certain that the Jeune Droite were more in the intellectual mould of Maurras, whilst Mounier and Esprit were less politically conservative; but to begin with at least, it seems that they were more united in a spirit of 'non-conformisme' than divided on political differences. Especially, as, to a great extent, they were reacting against established doctrines. It is, therefore, perhaps unsurprising to read Mounier referring to the Action Française, and this movements 'courageous' struggle against parliamentary democracy(60). It has consequently been suggested that there was a spirit of 1930, just as there was one for 1848, 1936, etc.(61).

This spirit of unity is most noticeable in their joint rejection of modern bourgeois society, and all its implications for Man and the Church(62).

Politically, the 'désordre établi', was seen as a direct consequence of the revolutionary principles of 1789, considered

as abstractions without any contact with reality, and particularly inapt for the evolution of society in 1930. The State in particular was singled out for its imposing influence upon the individual; so that modern man, basing his life upon popular notions of freedom and equality, was no longer able to take responsibility or risk(63). Liberal democracy was consequently referred to as a "régime idéal de pourriture"(Robert Aron) and "un système périmé d'institutions archaïques" (Jeune Droite) (64). Similarly, by supporting these structures, the function of the capitalist system was described as a subversion of human values, as the very basis on which the corruption of the State was founded(65).

The character of the 'spirit of 1930' therefore now seems clearer. In sum, the theories of these young writers were philosophical and moral before being economic or political. The social disorder to their eyes was only the superficial consequence of the moral and spiritual disorder of man; of a mistaken conception of man and his destiny.

After attacking the subversive nature of modern society, these writers turned their attention to the Church, urging Catholics to separate Christian order from the established disorder(66). They saw that established Catholicism had become permeated with the very same spirit of bourgeois liberalism, and that the clergy remained blind and complacent to its progress (67). It is therefore unsurprising to see that these intellectuals existed in a marginal situation, alienated from official

Catholics, who, so it seemed to them, were a participant part of the crisis. Their singularity is consequently quite clear. For most Catholics, loyalty to God, still meant loyalty to the Church hierarchy. By questioning this authority, these writers set themselves apart from both social and traditional Catholicism. Mounier in particular, was determined to distinguish himself from the Christian democrats, who he saw as not being adventurous enough in their aspirations, by accepting the "impurities" of established doctrines(68).

It was, therefore, more against a series of ideologies or myths that these writers rebelled. Throughout the work of each movement we find the words 'rupture', 'disgust' and 'refusal'. The over-riding spirit of 1930 though was revolutionary(69). This revolution, however, was not to be marxist or nationalist, which they regarded as antiquated, ideological and idealist, but an inner personal revolution of Man as an individual person(70); in short, a spiritual revolution(71). A phrase from Péguy was consequently taken by all three groups in common significance; "La révolution sera morale, ou elle ne sera pas", which emphasised the duality of personal involvement and its importance to moral order(72). The spiritual revolution, therefore, was defined in four distinct ways: firstly, as a total redefinition of values, and so a rupture from the fundamental doctrines and principles of the contemporary disorder; secondly, faced with the growth of materialism, the revolution emphasised the necessity of a return to the spirit; thirdly, the revolution could only be the fruit of the creative liberty of man, and not the

result of any social or economic determinism; and, finally, by the term 'Révolution spirituelle' these groups intended that their members should undertake a total conversion in their personal lives, as they anticipated the birth of "un homme Transformé", "un homme transfiguré", "un homme nouveau"(73).

However, despite this agreement and unity of spirit in criticising modern society, it is less easy to find common consensus on how the new order should be formed(74). To show how this was so, it will be convenient to look at what is meant by the philosophy of 'personnalisme', and how each group regarded the individual in his relationships with the State.

It is not easy to define 'a' 'personnalisme' as in fact it existed in various forms(75). Equally, it often contains this 'romantic' concept of Man that is not always acceptable in philosophical terms, to the less spirited. Broadly speaking though, the term 'personnalisme' is used to describe an 'ideal' situation in which man as individual is mentally attuned to his social environment, thus allowing his spiritual development. In French this was popularly known as "L'épanouissement de la personne", which really means man developing his spiritual sense of being(76). As such it served as a perfect contrast to nineteenth century individualism that isolated the 'personne' and totalitarian collectivisms that immersed him.

Even so, how did these groups distinguish themselves in the way they believed that the 'personnaliste' system should be set up?

All three groups had agreed that the State had become too powerful, and that the individual was not materially, and spiritually isolated from his fellow man. Similarly, they had all insisted that Man was a social creature, existing in a 'dynamic relationship' with society(77). They had therefore reaffirmed a notion that dated back to Tocqueville that there should exist a series of intermediate institutions between the State and the individual, in which man could find social and spiritual expression(78). In France, however, even when such institutions did exist, they seemed to be outmoded in the modern world(79). The crux of their argument was therefore that new institutions had to be founded, in which the spiritual revolution could take place; but on what basis were they to be formed? Herein lies their main differences, particularly between Esprit and the Jeune Droite.

The Jeune Droite, remaining politically nationalist(80), looked to what they saw as 'eternal' laws in the past(81), and so to traditional structures, as the main support to man's spiritual development. Their policies therefore mostly advocated the formation of the 'corporate' state, as a direct consequence of the belief that men are least 'anomic' when faced with a higher authority to direct and guide them in a moral psychological sense(82). They therefore believed that traditional institutions(83) such as work and the family, had to be strengthened, and that an over-riding love for the nation had to be stimulated. It is unsurprising that such beliefs should finally lead some of their writers to advocate the setting up of 'la personne' at the

head of the State, i.e. reinstalling the monarchy. In these ways, or so they believed, social and spiritual guidance would lead to the refounding of society.

As for Mounier, he too believed in eternal truths, but for him it was necessary not to confuse them with the old values of the past. He, therefore, directed Esprit towards a double mission; to dissociate these eternal truths from the transitory forms that they had taken in the past and to find new structures (84) for their representation in the modern world. There was consequently a dialogue between the Jeune Droite and Esprit, the latter being critical of the former for the way it had attacked permanent values to perishable institutions. Alternatively, the Jeune Droite believed that Esprit was putting the very values they were trying to defend into danger. Equally, in opposing 'corporative society', Esprit showed that they understood how these small societies within society could give rise to 'collective egoisms'(85), and become closed. The implications of all this are only too obvious, is ordered society a source of subversion, imposition or liberation for the individual? The change of accent, coming from the same analysis is very slight but of profound significance.

However, the 'personnalisme' of Mounier was not against society, was not for individualism. His philosophy was principally based on the affirmation of the 'personne' as part of his social environment, except that for Mounier, individual fulfillment came about as a result of relationships between fellow men. His

revolution therefore had to be 'Personnaliste et Communautaire'(86).

This issue has been the main point of criticism of Mounier in that he so often argues the validity of his political propositions, in terms of what has been called "une sorte de confiance mystique dans le peuple"(87). His catholic faith in the positive quality of the human character is so often allowed to over-rule other criticisms and doubts. It is, therefore, sometimes unclear just what his actual propositions for a new society are in real terms. So often he is vague and imprecise.

In fact, this is a common criticism of all three movements, in that it is quite apparent that these writers were more philosophers than men of action. The political action that they were advocating was, therefore, highly personal. In this, and by setting themselves apart from traditional ideologies, it is often unclear exactly what they were proposing in lasting terms. This issue is highly significant.

Mounier, for example, later carried on a dialogue with the communists, whose doctrine he refused to denounce(88). Basically, seeing that any allegiance with an established political doctrine would necessarily make him susceptible to the changing fortunes of that doctrine, he too was never able to resolve the problem of being a politically motivated writer, wanting to encourage political action, without becoming a politician.

Again, there is this recurrent problem for Catholics; how

can the one faith be interpreted into political action? Nothing divides men more than their political beliefs, as these imply a whole different attitude to God and the World. This was particularly true during the politically intense years of the 1930's.

Until 1934, agreement on the necessity for spiritual revolution, and a refusal to separate the spiritual transcendence of Man from his earthly existence, had led all three movements to denounce left as well as right wing politics(89). It was in this common attitude, that a spirit of unity can be recognised. However, after 1934, with the advent of the 'Front Commun', the spirit of 1930 ended. As the political climate worsened, there was a re-emergence of traditional left and right divisions in French politics. Events in Ethiopia, Spain and Munich made abstention impossible. Esprit subsequently adopted a 'left wing' attitude(90) in attacking Franco, and the Munich agreement, whilst the Jeune Droite became increasingly sympathetic to fascism.

It is therefore clear that French intellectuals have, since the eighteenth century, debated and criticised the socio-political culture of their country, usually with a view to changing it. The intellectual tradition of France has consequently distinguished itself in at least three ways: firstly, by its aristocratic attitude, so that intellectuals so often consider themselves as the 'conscience' of the nation; secondly, by what Stanley Hoffmann calls a 'totalisme', by which he means an 'all or nothing' tendency(91); and, thirdly, by its moralism. However, above

all this, the intellectuals of 1930 believed that their ideas could shape or change history(92).

It is not easy to demonstrate how the force of ideas can actually influence real events. It is true that many of their writings were used in Catholic discussion groups, and some of the Action Catholique movements; so that their ideas permeated the new activity taking place at the heart of French Catholicism. For many though, even amongst young Catholics, these writers were regarded as heretics(93). For still others, they merely represented a group of bourgeois revolutionaries(94).

Again, it is not possible in the present context, to discuss all the points raised in this study of French intellectual thought. Much more could be said on the relationships that these writers held with each other, other non-catholic writers, and the rest of French society. For the moment, two points seem of of particular interest.

Firstly, by emphasising spiritual revolution and the importance of the 'personne' in his relationship with society, there seems to be good evidence that the corporate spirit of Vichy was partly inspired by the socio-political ideas of these intellectuals(95). Paradoxically, 'personnalisme' as a system of thought greatly influenced the resistance groups of the Uriage(96). The personnalist philosophy therefore supplied resistance fighters with ideas that they could use in condemning fascism, because this latter suppressed rather than inspired the individual.

It is interesting that a philosophy could be interpreted in two totally different ways. In part, 'personnalisme' seemed to be proposing social structures that could develop the spirituality of the individual and yet, at the same time, it contained enough similarities with fascism to make this latter attractive to many Catholics. Even so, for the moment it is enough to note that this theme of spiritual development by creative discovery was common to many groups of various political persuasions. Following the war, this type of personnalist language again became popular but this time because it seemed to be emphasising the rejuvenation of the individual through communal reconstruction(97). Clearly, this point has significant consequences in sociological, political and philosophical terms.

Conclusions

I

During the 1930's, with the development of religious sociology, the formation of Catholic youth movements and the emergence of a new generation of intellectuals, there were at last signs that some Catholics realised that nineteenth century ideas were no longer applicable to modern day problems.

Until the second world war, the Church had regarded itself as a fortress besieged by secularism, modernism, and communism. As a former editor of Esprit has concluded in his work on the Catholic Avant-Garde(98), its traditions had consequently remained deeply rooted in feudal structures that date back to the twelfth century. In this, democracy was suspect, civic duty consisted in loving France with passion and religious action meant regular church attendance. It was against this alliance of conservative politics, the land, and the Church that some Catholics (although still a minority) reacted.

In this a main stimulus was the apparent non-christian attitude of the the proletarian class. Many catholics therefore occupied themselves with bringing workers back into the fold. By the 1930's, however, the French worker was no longer victim of revolutionary individualism, and economic liberalism; he had developed a new maturity. No longer was he isolated, neither materially, morally or intellectually. Common experience with his fellow workers had brought about a solidarity, exceptional in French society. Its rechristianisation was, therefore, not

simply a question of more intense activity from socially minded Catholics. For socialism, and more specifically communism, had now given the working class its own 'earthly' sense of destiny. It therefore now believed that its future lay in its own hands, as a part of some sort of natural evolutionary process(99). This doctrine was characterised by an immediate rather than a deferred salvation.

It is clear that such a belief has been consistently resistant to Catholic action; especially as so often, the Church has set up a barrier between socialism and itself. Any sympathy by Catholics, for socialist policies, has therefore so often been considered by the Church hierarchy, as a repudiation of faith. Similarly, because of the bourgeois character of Catholicism, any religious conversion has had to be automatically preceded by a cultural one. Too often, conversion to the bourgeois language and culture has therefore been seen as a necessary prerequisite to spiritual salvation.

III

Politically, the spectrum of beliefs during the 1930's, is a complex one, as it is so often difficult to find a lasting Catholic allegiance to any one party. Yet Catholics have repeatedly found themselves in a position of having to define their faith in relation to national and international events. Even so, with military defeat, armistice, and national revolution, two tendencies are clearly recognisable.

It is clear that amongst priests, those opposing Vichy were later to form the missionary movements. On the other hand, for a good proportion of the Church hierarchy, 'good' laws from a 'good' government were seen as the best means of overcoming the current of dechristianisation, the cause of which they attributed uniquely to the anti-clerical laws of the Third Republic.

By now it seems clear that we are not faced with a simple problem of secularisation. Although this seems of manifest importance, the issues at stake go beyond this level of analysis as the basic fabric and structure of French society is heavily involved here. In a very real sense, it therefore seems possible to distinguish the way in which certain sections of French society have come to regard themselves as individuals in relation to France as a nation. As a bold conclusion we can therefore say that, during the nineteenth century, contradictory forces of nationalism and republicanism had never resolved themselves, so that within French society, and indeed reflected in the Church, two opposing concepts of how France should be modelled had made social consensus impossible.

As already suggested, the 'traditionalist' model wanted to link love of God with love of the Nation and therefore obedience to the State. It therefore seems unsurprising that Pétain was able to seduce so many Catholics with his emphasis on family, work and patrie. This kind of concept of France is anti-revolutionary, and anti-parliamentary, but it has also led to

a strong sense of nationalism with all that that implies for sympathy to fascism and xenophobia towards other nations. It still exists.

The opposing model, coming as it does from the Revolution, sees man's expression and happiness as a function of his ability to be free from social institutions, often seen as imposing and threatening(100). Such a characteristic enhances and is enhanced by the French spirit of 'débrouillardisme', of individual rather than mediatory action. Yet individualism is so unsatisfactory in describing this situation. Strong allegiances have formed in France, but these are rarely representative in a collective form. Repeatedly, Frenchmen have seen their individuality as most fully expressed in refusal and revolt. Such a characteristic, common amongst the intellectual movement of the 1930's, is again a product of a pluralist society, of a lack of common consensus. This has meant that ideas and ideals have consistently formed the basis of social and religious action; usually in the form of a movement. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the French concept of 'mouvement' is quite specific - as basing themselves on ideas and ideals they have often formed in response to events of the day, and yet have subsequently been unable to routinize and structuralise their ideas in an institutional way. It therefore seems little wonder that so many French writers, including Catholics, have asked themselves how it is that strong social institutions could be formed.

In this sense, when Domenach asks why it is that the

'personnalisme' of Mounier never asserted itself(101), when he had identified the problems of modern French society, it is true that its language was linked too much with that of anthropology, and that, writing as he did of definable values between believers and non-believers, it seemed to many that this was just a disguise for traditional Christianity, as a cloak for the old clerical aspiration of moral control. Yet then Domenach himself goes on to emphasise this French intellectual preoccupation to think in terms of institutions(102), and certainly their formation over the years has been proposed on political, cultural, social and religious grounds. Yet by the nature of French society they have consistently failed to emerge, to form as a source of expression and support for the social individual. Why?

Sociologically, and philosophically, it is possible to think of institutions in terms of common values and consensus beliefs. However, these values are rarely identifiable in established forms, seldom measurable ontologically. Yet attempts to impose or create institutions around recognisable values have always assumed that their existence was definable. In reality, these values do not exist in a static or permanent condition, but are in fact in a state of dynamic development. Their definition is therefore only ever provisional; always destined to be overturned by events that create new ones. In a sense, this is the heart of the problem for religion. Christianity is not 'of' the world, but it is 'in' it(103), so that while religion tries to sanctify the world, that world changes. Christianity

consequently finds itself perpetually presented with a world that it has not sanctified. By its very nature, therefore, Christianity tends to act as a religious revolutionary force, whilst being socially conservative.

Powerful social and religious institutions cannot therefore be imposed or created as it is not possible to define the bases on which they should be formed. To think 'institutionally' would, therefore, seem to mean thinking of them as self-creating, self-forming, and not based on the notion of a society united in moral harmony, on "un maximum d'accord sur les buts"(104). Again, this idea has been an important part of post-war cultural policy in France, where advocates of 'éducation populaire' believe that the essence of the 'personnaliste' philosophy is encapsulated here. Popular education, it is proposed, will stimulate the spontaneous emergence of institutions and associations.

III

The present study set out to give a socio-historical account of different aspects of French Catholicism, when faced with major forces of social change. To some extent, some of the issues raised here have been synthesised into a broader conceptual framework, allowing a number of observations to be made involving the whole of the French socio-political culture. This was an ambitious undertaking, the limitations and failures of which are only too clear. Nevertheless, it is hoped that a

number of aspects deserving further attention have been highlighted.

To conclude it would seem that intense activity on the part of Catholics during the 1930's has brought little reward in terms of actual religious observance(105). Yet France remains totally immersed in her catholic heritage; problems facing Catholics during the 1930's are, therefore, no less valid today.

When a Catholic writer such as Mounier admits to being obsessed with the distress of modern man, who without interior dimension is incapable of human relationships, he has in fact anticipated Marcuse's work on one-dimensional man. Equally, when he reacted against the bourgeois world of university life, and criticised the modern concept of man, who by bearing no sense of being is destroyed in a material world, divorced of mystery, he appears to have identified the crisis problems of 1968(106).

In April 1968, Loubet del Bayle finished his study of the writers of 1930 by calling for "une véritable philosophie qui permettra d'organiser le monde sans le violenter, une philosophie capable d'aider l'homme a susciter, à composer et à éclairer sa propre attitude devant le mystère de l'être, le destin de la personne, l'avenir de l'humanité"(107).

One month later again a socio-political crisis forced Catholics to define their faith in terms of their concept of how French society should be organised. In doing so, they showed that many of the old issues, many of the old problems, were

still there.

Since then there has been a re-emergence of Catholic traditionals to the right, under Archbishop Lefebvre(108) and the collusion of Christianity and communism to the left. For the former, the individual is still seen as subordinate to the strict authority of the Church; spiritual fulfilment is therefore to be found in obedience to orthodox doctrine. Alternatively, communist-christians have formulated theories linking the humanitarian aspects of communism, to those of Christianity, liberation is therefore found in collective action.

These arguments of collectivism, authority, individuality, and liberty have occupied Frenchmen for over two hundred years. It is a debate that is continuing, and one in which Catholic religion remains intensely involved.