

EARLY SOURCES OF MARITAIN'S SOCIAL THOUGHT

Pierre L'Abbé

while doing research on Maritain's early years, before 1906, I found evidence which suggested a potentially strong influence of Tolstói (1828-1910), Jean Jaurès (1859-1914), George Sorel (1847-1922) and Charles Peguy (1873-1914) on Maritain's social and political orientation. Some obvious parallels became clear between the thought of these men and the mature social theory of Maritain. Since making these discoveries, I have wanted to trace more specifically how these influences may have come about. Therefore, the chance to study the 'New Christendom' of Maritain's Integral Humanism⁽¹⁾ provided the opportunity. In my estimation, out of all the socio-political influences on Maritain before his conversion, these four men stand out as the most important. Whether these influences were lasting ones, however, is the question I hope to answer at least in part. In the paper, I will examine the first three thinkers, leaving Péguy out, only because his thought could not easily be analyzed according to the formula I have chosen.

(1) J. Maritain, Integral Humanism trans. J. Evans (New York: Scribner, 1968; rpt. Notre Dame: Notre Dame, 1973); all references to this volume shall refer to the French text, see below.

Three problems present themselves as obstacles to a continuity of social thought between the influences of Maritain's early years and the work of Integral Humanism. The first is that these writers represent Maritain's interests before his conversion, while the work of Integral Humanism represents the pursuit of a Catholic inspired political philosophy. The second is that a break of twenty years, from 1906 to 1926, stands between Maritain's early study of social and political thought and a return to this area, which he had left in favour of pursuing pure philosophy and aesthetics. The third problem is the lack of references to, or the acknowledgement of, the influence of the above writers in Integral Humanism, with the partial exception of Sorel. Despite these three problems, I do find that there is a substantial continuity between the interests of the young Maritain and the mature conceptions of a 'New Christendom.' Describing just what these continuities are will constitute the body of this paper, and afterwards I will be able to respond to the three outlined problems.

It is not my desire to, nor do I feel that I can, show a strong and a direct dependence of the social/political ideas of Integral Humanism upon this early period, nor can I say that the continuities to be outlined could not have had their roots in other sources with which Maritain may have been more familiar when writing Integral Humanism. I would, however, find it sufficient and highly noteworthy to be able to conclude that at least some of the continuity had come about as a result of the direct influence of Maritain's interests in this early period and that Maritain's overall

social/political orientation existed at least in germ from the pre-conversion years.

Avant de pouvoir passer à l'analyse des continuités, je dois présenter des faits historiques, pour démontrer que la pensée de Tolstoï, Jaurès et Sorel avait en réalité produit une grande impression sur le jeune Maritain.

On peut trouver des références à Tolstoï dans beaucoup des oeuvres de Maritain: ce fait montre que, tout au long de sa carrière, cet écrivain a conservé une place dans sa mémoire. Raïssa nous donne une idée de cet intérêt de Jacques dans Les Grandes Amitiés: "Il négligeait l'heure des repas chez lui, ce qui chagrinait sa mère et dérangeait beaucoup la cuisinière, d'autant plus qu'à cette époque, il s'était mis en tête, par tolstoïsme, de servir lui-même à table.⁽²⁾

Une source externe qui nous montre que Maritain avait non seulement un intérêt personnel, mais peut-être aussi un intérêt ostentatoire, est une lettre de Jules Riby à Joseph Lotte (des collègues de Charles Péguy): "Quel est donc cet article de Maritain dont parle Ballet? J'ai entrevu autrefois le jeune Maritain. Il a dû venir de l'anarchie au christianisme par Tolstoï. Tout au moins c'était un tolstoïen fervent, -- au point de se coiffer de calottes d'astrakan pour 'avoir fair plus

(2) R. Maritain, Les Grandes Amitiés, t. 1 (New York: Maison Française, 1941), p. 66.

Russe.' La vie l'a peut-être formé. Il y a de ça plus de dix ans."⁽³⁾

Depuis que j'ai commencé cette recherche, j'ai eu la bonne fortune de trouver dans le dernier numéro des Cahiers Jacques Maritain un article de Lucien Mercier intitulé «Jacques Maritain avant Jacques Maritain: un engagement dans le siècle» qui apporte de nombreux éléments à l'appui de cette recherche historique. Mercier nous montre que Maritain était entré au service de l'Union démocratique pour l'Education sociale durant l'automne 1900. L'objectif de ce groupe était de donner des discours aux malades hospitalisés. C'est à ce titre que Maritain a discoursé le premier décembre 1900, au sujet des «Contes de Tolstoï» et le cinq janvier 1901, au sujet des «idées morales de Tolstoï.» En plus, Mercier nous montre qu'au mois de mars 1905, Maritain a publié un article sur Tolstoï, dans le journal Tribune russe, qui était une antenne du Parti socialiste révolutionnaire. Pendant quatre mois de l'année précédente, Maritain avait

(3) Feuillet de l'Amitié Charles Péguy, 54, p. 28. Another outside source, not included by Mercier, which shows a connection to Tolstoï is an account given by Robert Debré concerning the short-lived socialist journal for children, Jean-Pierre, to which Maritain contributed and was involved with its organization. Debré recounts that in the course of planning this journal with Jeanne Maritain, (Jacques' elder sister and editor of Jean-Pierre) the conversation became occupied with the topic of Tolstoï and Jeanne Maritain exclaimed with regard to the writer: "C'est le plus grand. C'est le plus grand." (R. Debré, L'honneur de vivre (Paris: Stock et Hermann, 1974, p. 72).

été secrétaire de ce journal, mais Mercier note que cette collaboration est la dernière marque des liens socialistes de Maritain.⁽⁴⁾

As for the influence of Jaurès on Maritain, I can again note that there are passing references to Jaurès in the works of Maritain, although not as many or as consistent references as to Tolstoï. The single most informative evidence of the influence of Jaurès is the first known letter of Maritain to Charles Péguy, dated March 13, 1901. In a closely reasoned and well-articulated letter of almost three thousand words, the eighteen year old Maritain rebukes Péguy for his criticism of Jaurès. The letter demonstrates a strong familiarity with Jaurès' book, Action Socialiste. Maritain commented on this letter in 1972: "j'étais ardent socialiste depuis mes premières années d'adolescence, et j'avais pour Jaurès non seulement une enthousiaste admiration, mais ces sentiments de gratitude et d'affection qu'un grande figure généreuse provoque chez bien des disciples inconnus (et je ne renie pas ces sentiments, quoi qu'il en soit de sa rhétorique)."⁽⁵⁾ Mercier's article gives us information on Jaurès as well. He chronicles Maritain's interest through letters to Ernest Psichari. The letters of April 15, 1900, and April 4, 1901, show that Maritain attended speeches of

(4) Lucien Mercier, "Jacques Maritain avant Jacques Maritain," Cahier Jacques Maritain, 13 (1986), 17, 20.

(5) Feuillet de l'Amitié Charles Péguy, 176 (1976), 9.

Jaurès and came away somewhat inspired. Although an enthusiastic follower of Jaurès, a letter of June, 1900, shows that Maritain could speak harshly of Jaurès bourgeois associations.⁽⁶⁾

References to Sorel are more frequent and substantial in the work of Maritain than are references to either Tolstoï or Jaurès. Sorel is the only one of the three to be named in Integral Humanism. These acknowledged references to Sorel do not come without certain cautions: what Maritain calls the errors of, the confusion of social progress with the fight against religion, and the use of a Marxist conception of class warfare. Having given those provisos, Maritain does show appreciation for some of Sorel's ideas and even takes the step of defending Sorel against the Sorelians.⁽⁷⁾ As for any personal association between Maritain and Sorel, not much can be said. Raïssa does make reference to some association in Les Grandes Amitiés and I believe that it can be said with a high degree of probability that Sorel was no stranger to Maritain. Numerous accounts of other chroniclers of the life of Charles Péguy describe Sorel as a frequent visitor to the Cahiers during the years when Maritain also frequented 8, rue de la Sorbonne and worked for Péguy as a secretary and copy-editor. In particular, both Maritain and Sorel attended the Bergson lectures, meeting beforehand in

(6) Cahiers Jacques Maritain, 13 (1986), 13-4.

(7) J. Maritain, Humanisme intégral, Oeuvres complètes, vol. 6 (Paris: Saint-Paul, 1984), p. 511-3.

Péguy's shop, during the same time period. A final noteworthy and curious, connection between the two men was that Sorel was originally named, along with Maritain, and Charles Maurras in the will of Pierre Villard. Sorel's name was, however, dropped from this list of men whom Villard thought were the most capable of ensuring the maintenance of France's moral and intellectual traditions.⁽⁸⁾

We can now move on to a close examination of those continuities which exist between the mature thought of Maritain as found in Integral Humanism and the influences on the young Maritain before 1906. The problem of the integration of religion and society is without a doubt one of the main concerns of Integral Humanism. I can not give as much attention to this problem as the treatment of it in Integral Humanism would warrant for the following reason: that I am examining Maritain's life in a period previous to his own conversion and avid interest in this problem and must therefore work with mainly social and political issues. These were at the time of deep concern to him, and despite the evolution of his thought, do remain important. Nevertheless, general accounts can be given of the attitudes of Sorel, Jaurès, and Tolstoï towards religion and these may be compared with that of the general approach to the problem found in Integral Humanism.

(8) J. Maritain, Notebooks trans. J. Evans (Albany, New York: Magi, 1984), p. 129.

Sorel takes a hard line against the compatibility of religion and society. Some of his criticisms can be placed into the category of criticisms of institutionalized Christianity, such as his view that Christianity could not have a true social morality because Christianity was unequipped to deal with a modern civil society.⁽⁹⁾ Sorel did recognize that the social morality of his society was indeed Christian, but he regarded such an ethic based on moral theology as defunct and expected that a new social ethic would in the future replace it. We must not be thrown off by Sorel's diatribes against Christian morality; his view was, to the contrary, to advocate an ethic for society with well-defined morals. It was the development of the working class movement which would create this new ethic.⁽¹⁰⁾

Jaurès also has a double-sided attitude towards the problem. He supported the anti-clerical reforms of Combes, driven by the assumption that, confessional education was a threat to national unity, and he voted to restrict the powers of the congregations. On the other hand, Jaurès foresaw that the progress of dialectical socialism would bring under its wing many divergent forces including the fraternal Christian community, and the dignity and true liberty of the human person. These

(9) G. Sorel, De l'Eglise et de l'état (Paris: G. Jacques, 1901), p. 55.

(10) M. Crutis, Three Against the Third Republic (Princeton: Princeton, 1959; rpt. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1976) p. 68, 115.

forces would be combined with an imminent materialistic dialectic in the creation of a new society.⁽¹¹⁾

Tolstoi's stand is notably different; he can find no grounds for compatibility whatsoever between religion and any non-religious form of civil organization. Despite sharing many of the aims of socialism he has harsh criticism for the European socialist movement, accusing it of only attempting to satisfy the lowest needs of man, that being the material. He does in fact reject socialism. Since in his view, Christianity is incompatible with any organized state, the only thing that can save humanity is a religious conscience.⁽¹²⁾

Maritain's position is that religion and society must be integrated. He is, however, careful to separate the Church in its spiritual work from the state, although the state is one infused by Christianity: "Cependant la simple unité d'amitié dont nous avons parlé ne suffit pas à donner une forme à ce corps social, -- cette spécification éthique sans laquelle la cité n'a pas de bien commun véritablement humain; -- ou plutôt pour exister comme unité d'amitié, elle-même présuppose une telle forme et une telle spécification.

(11) M. Busieau, Jean Jaurès (Bruxelles: Labor, 1980), p. 114-5.

(12) R. Rolland, Tolstoy, trans. B. Miall (London: Unwin, 1911), 206-7; L. Tolstoy, The Works of Leo Tolstoy Vol. 20, trans. A. Maude (London: Oxford, 1935), p. 282.

"Si cette forme est chrétienne c'est donc que la conception chrétienne aura prévalu, -- selon le mode profane et pluraliste que nous avons dit."⁽¹³⁾

Maritain would be in substantial sympathy with the views of Sorel and Jaurès on the need for assuring a place for morality within a new society. But it is with Tolstoï despite his attitude on the incompatibility of Church and State that I find Maritain's position to be most closely associated because only for both Maritain and Tolstoï is religion essential and vital for society.

An important starting point for formulating ideas on a new society for Maritain, as well as for the other three thinkers, is the critique of the bourgeoisie. This critique is the genesis of many ideas on a 'new state' for our writers.

Sorel attacked the bourgeoisie with a vehemence. Much of his writing is devoted to this critique and one could go so far as to say that the success of a social revolution would largely depend upon the proletariat's battle with this evil force. For Sorel, bourgeois society was ripe with vices, envy, greed, scepticism, etc., and this condition was largely responsible for the breakdown of the family, marriage, and had even destroyed a necessary sense of sanctity. The masses on the other hand were by nature conservative, and if left to conduct their own society would defend traditional concepts of morality. The bourgeoisie were able to foil any such conduct by controlling the masses. They were able to

(13) Maritain, Oeuvres complètes, Vol. 6, p. 488.

construe people's superstitious beliefs in science and in Christianity for their own benefit and prestige. Also, out of this came the notion promoted by the bourgeoisie that a certain educated group had a far greater capacity to govern than did the general population. The masses were thereby held in check, unable to initiate any change. Likewise, the educational system was designed to produce enlightened men, not to give training in the practical studies needed by the general population. Given the hold that such a bourgeoisie had on such a social structure, Sorel concluded that democratic government and universal suffrage would not in any way improve the lot of the masses, but would work to reinforce the hold of the bourgeoisie, who were the only group worthy of standing for election.⁽¹⁴⁾

Tolstoï found similar problems in bourgeois society. He was even against the promotion of education which he saw as an attempt by the privileged class to educate the people in a manner best suited for their own manipulation. In 1861 Tolstoi had developed a full theory of education, which in later life he came to disregard.⁽¹⁵⁾ His opinion was that in constitutional democracies such as England, France, and the United States, social progression actually had been arrested. Representative government and universal suffrage could

(14) P. Andreu, George Sorel (Paris: Syros, 1982), p. 122.

(15) L. Tolstoy, Tolstoy On Education, trans. A. Pinch (Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson, 1982), p. 28.

not work because a nation of millions of people could not express its singular will. The will of the majority could never be the will of the people.⁽¹⁶⁾

Jean Jaurès' views were somewhat different. He too recognized that the educational system could be used to manipulate the proletariat, however he promoted education and mentioned that it should not be organized in such a way as to reinforce class. Moreover, he did regard education as progress towards a new social order. Likewise, progress could also be brought about by democratic means. A series of legislative reforms could in fact bring social ideals closer, and therefore Jaures held to the principle of universal suffrage.⁽¹⁷⁾

Maritain, for his part, also lashed out against the bourgeoisie. In Integral Humanism, he chastises it for having a Jansenist spirit, and a rationalism which denies evil. This class is proficient in hypocrisy, successfully denying its own self-interest in the economic order, and in the class structure. With regard to leadership, Maritain did believe that the masses could be irrational and in fact only a few were capable of political leadership. But this few was not confined to any one class. Maritain could therefore support universal suffrage and believed that social reform could be brought about by democratic means.⁽¹⁸⁾

(16) Rolland, p. 202-5.

(17) Busieau, p. 74, 114.

(18) Maritain, Oeuvres complètes, Vol. 6, p. 281.

with regard to the critique of the bourgeoisie per se, I find that Maritain's views are closely associated with those of Sorel. As for the more important consideration of the democratic state and universal suffrage, it is Jean Jaurès with whom Maritain agrees most.

We can now turn to an issue somewhat more contained than that of a critique of an establishmentarian class, namely the ownership of property. Tolstoï stood strongly against the principle of private property. He regarded it as a great crime which enabled the monopolization of the soil, and therefore an enslavement by the few. He even went so far as to indite the concept as being the pivot of evil.⁽¹⁹⁾ In the society envisioned by Sorel the concept of private property would be replaced by one of labour, which would hold the same significance for the proletariat as property had for the bourgeoisie.⁽²⁰⁾ Jaurès position shows a sensitivity to both society and the individual. He foresaw that *la propriété sociale sera la base et la garantie de développements individuels.*⁽²¹⁾ Although Maritain has modified views for the agrarian sphere in other works, he affirms in Integral Humanism that "...c'est une forme sociétaire que la propriété, croyons-nous, devrait prendre dans la sphère économique industrielle, en sorte que le régime de la copropriété se

(19) Rolland, p. 210.

(20) Curtis, p. 117.

(21) Busieau, p. 75.

Substitue là autant que possible à celui du salariat...⁽²²⁾ Although the particular approaches to property are in fact different for all four thinkers, it can be said that Maritain is in basic agreement with Jaurès, and Sorel. As Maritain points out, the precedent of Proudhon in this respect should be taken into account.

From material questions of property, we can turn to an anthropological question of whether human nature in a new society may be ameliorated. Sorel has a consistent anthropological view which lies, I would say, in the tradition of anthropological pessimism. For him, movements toward greatness, or the sublime, were always forced, while movement towards decadence was always natural. This remains Sorel's view despite the progress of a social revolution. In Michael Curtis' opinion, this stand is an improvement upon naive socialist beliefs that goodness would automatically come out of a change in economic conditions.⁽²³⁾

Jaurès, although he sometimes took a Marxian line, disagreed that a communist state would bring about a new human nature, and this was because he could not accept the Marxian premise that a person, in capitalist society, was only capable of being self-interested. It follows that the person, as Jaurès viewed him, was

(22) Maritain, oeuvres complètes, Vol. 6, p. 501, Y. Floucat, "La philosophie sociale de Jacques Maritain," Revue Thomiste, 78, no. 2 (1978), 226-269.

(23) Curtis, p. 120, 139.

capable of democratically progressing towards and sharing in a 'new society.'⁽²⁴⁾

Although Tolstol's view is somewhat different from that of Jaurès or Sorel, neither did he foresee a new human nature. Rather, humanity in its pre-revolutionary phase is limited by evil, and the problem of establishing a 'new society' involved casing evil off.⁽²⁵⁾

By contrast, Maritain's view was that a new Christendom would see a new human nature, not a radically different saintly person, but a humanity whose nature could be changed slowly, however, such an amelioration would never be complete. Maritain does not appear to be in line with any of the three thinkers on this point.⁽²⁶⁾ In fact, four distinct views seem to be propounded.

Another anthropological issue is that of equality, and in particular, feminism. In general, Sorel did support a universal equality and an equality for women. He believed that women, by finding their equality, would be rendering a service to society as a whole. With respect to his concern for the moral fiber of society, however, Sorel did suggest that women working could lead to the ruin of the family.⁽²⁷⁾

(24) Busieau, p. 78.

(25) Rolland, p. 206.

(26) Maritain, oeuvres complètes, Vol. 6, p. 308.

(27) Andreu, p. 117.

The energy Tolstoï contributed toward promoting equality was considerable. Both in theory and in practice, Tolstoï fought for the equality of many groups and minorities. In particular, he took up the cause of the Dukhobores, whom he in the end encouraged to emigrate to Canada. With respect to feminism, however, Tolstoï's completely dismissed the movement of the time as an aspiration towards bourgeois values.⁽²⁸⁾

To my knowledge, Jaurès made no direct statements on feminism. Like Sorel and Tolstoï, however, he was outspoken on equality. In particular he fought against child labour and hoped to affirm the rights of children in the same way that the rights of adults might be upheld.⁽²⁹⁾

Maritain, on the issue of equality, is adamant. Moreover, it is central to his theories on the possibility of a new Christendom: "De fait, par là même que le monde chrétien est quelque chose du monde, subissant aujourd'hui la loi des intérêts de classe devenus prédominants dans la civilisation moderne. Il semble que la réalisation générale d'une pareille condition soit une chose bien éloignée. Car s'il est vrai que rien n'est plus nuisible aux progrès du christianisme et plus contraire à son esprit que les préjugés et les aveuglements de classe ou de race parmi les chrétiens, il est vrai aussi que rien n'est plus

(8) Rolland, p. 209.

(9) Jean Jaurès, Etudes socialistes (Paris, 1902; rpt. Paris: Resources, 1979), p. 214-20.

répandu dans le monde chrétien." On feminism, Maritain is no less direct. Although he does not insist on an immediate realization of equality for women, he does insist that such equality is affirmed in an absolute sense and will progressively be realized in the temporal order and judicial structures. As for women in marriage, Maritain confirms that if a woman so chooses to be dependent upon her husband for the sake of her family, she may in no way lose any of her rights.⁽³⁰⁾ Where Tolstoï, Sorel and Jaurès have seemed to affirm universal equality, but have given a qualified (or no) response to equality for women. Maritain has not only strongly affirmed both of these points, but has made them central to the realization of a 'New Christendom.'

One controversy which has been formative for French political theory on equality is the Dreyfus Affair. Jaurès was a central figure in the pro-Dreyfus movement and made a point of rebuking other socialists for not doing likewise, asserting that all forces of evil and oppression must be battled.⁽³¹⁾ Sorel at the time also gave his signature in support of the revision of the Dreyfus case, but later, he was to retract his support.⁽³²⁾ Interestingly, Tolstoï in Russia also had his opinion on the Dreyfus affair. His reaction was, however, not supportive: he cited the movement as one of

(30) Maritain, Oeuvres complètes, vol. 6, p. 511, 513, 564.

(31) Busieau, p. 106.

(32) G. Sorel, De l'Eglise et de l'état, p. 52-54.

what he termed a moral epidemic, asserting that in such movement the majority of those involved did not know the facts of the case.⁽³³⁾ Maritain was himself a Dreyfusard, a term which has come to signify much more than the support of one man. If we consider support of the Dreyfus affair to be a living and viable social stand, then the only point of agreement we find here is between Maritain and Jaurès.

From consideration of questions on equality, we will make a leap to investigating the writers' thoughts on the use of violence. Tolstoï provides the most clear-cut response to the issue -- one of pacifism and complete non-resistance. But as Tolstoï corrected interpreters in his own day, this stand does not mean to be indifferent to evil, rather "the conflict with evil is the sole object of Christianity, and the commandment of non-resistance to evil is given as the most effectual means of conflict." Tolstoï even advised that Russia as a nation should withdraw from all warfare because non-Christian peoples would have an advantage over them because of their Christian principles.⁽³⁴⁾ Sorel's stand is also fairly clear-cut, but it is opposite to that of Tolstoï. For Sorel, war was associated with national heroism, while pacifism was associated with intellectuals and the bourgeoisie. For him, violence was not only necessary, but the only means by which the proletariat

(33) Rolland, p. 154.

(34) G. Woodcock, Civil Disobedience (Toronto, CBC Publications, 1966), p. 41-50.

would be able to emancipate themselves from obstinant bourgeois tyranny.⁽³⁵⁾

Jaurès does not have such a one-sided view. He opposed Blanqui and socialist philosophies which saw violence as a legitimate recourse in the face of opposition to social reform. Although he did oppose violence, Jaurès believed that it could be legitimately used if necessary to bring about justice.⁽³⁶⁾

Maritain likewise opposed the use of violence, but did in some cases recognize that it might be necessary. Acknowledging, however, that the necessity of having to resort to violence is unnatural to true human nature, as such a possibility has only came about because of man's depraved condition.⁽³⁷⁾

The only position which Maritain would be in agreement with is that of Jaurès. Both agree that violence can be used as a last resort if the cause is just and greater good will seemingly be done.

An associated concept to that of violence is revolution, and here again we find that the only pro-supporter is Sorel. For Sorel, revolution is a key issue in the emancipation of the individual and in bringing about a better society. This work could only be done through a type of revolutionary syndicalism. He even foresaw the possibility that a state of more or less

(35) Curtis, 140.

(36) Busieau, p. 91

(37) Maritain, Oeuvres complètes, Vol. 6, p. 571.

continual revolutionary activity may be necessary in order to sustain such an emancipation.⁽³⁸⁾

Jaurès, for his part, did advise that the proletariat must be organized with a view to class warfare. If given the possibility, the proletariat should secure their emancipation through a democratic evolution. But meeting with such a cooperative opposition could not be guaranteed, and therefore Jaurès saw the possibility that revolution may be necessary.⁽³⁹⁾

As far as Tolstoï was concerned, a revolution was necessary and it was imminent. He wrote in 1905 that a revolution which would set men free from brutal oppression was about to begin. Revolution was necessary and central in order to substitute a corrupted Christianity, a system of dominance, with a true Christianity based on equality and liberty for all persons.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Maritain also foresaw a situation in which a catastrophic event was inevitable because of the rejection of God and the attempt of humanity to save itself by its own means. In his sense, the catastrophic could include revolution stemming from class warfare, but may manifest itself by other means. Issuing in after this catastrophic event would be a period of reform slowly leading to a full realization of a 'New

(38) Curtis, p. 255.

(39) Russeau, p. 105.

(40) Rolland, p. 109-210.

Christendom.'⁽⁴¹⁾ In one sense, Maritain here seems to be in accord with Jaurès that real reform can come about through a slow process of change. On the other hand, like Tolstoï, Maritain does appear to regard a catastrophic event as inevitable.

From the question of whether revolution can usher in a 'new society,' we can turn to the question of the legitimacy of the collaboration. Sorel gave a resounding 'no' to collaboration. For him, reformist policies such as social legislation, cooperatives, profit sharing, etc., were all policies which would affirm the principle of private property and thereby uphold bourgeois society.⁽⁴²⁾

Tolstoï as well, could not support any collaborative measures with the state. He even advocated that workers should refuse to serve the state. To do this the people should renounce property, because lack of property was the means by which they were kept disfranchised.⁽⁴³⁾

Jaurès, however, did support a collaborationist theory. Indeed, he very much lived out that theory by supporting Millerand and joining the Waldeck-Rousseau government. He explained his actions with the principle that a socialist party should support a government to which the alternative was a less liberal one. Jaurès

(41) Maritain, Oeuvres complètes, vol. 6, p. 572.

(42) Curtis, p. 141.

(43) Rolland, p. 131.

could even envision cooperation with governments that were in majority bourgeois.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Maritain also has a fully developed collaborationist theory. For a 'New Christendom' to operate properly, Maritain foresaw that political activity need not necessarily be exercised by Christians, although he added the proviso that all political activity should be operated on the basis of Christian-inspired principles. However, he was open to the idea that a 'New Christendom' could cooperate with people whose conduct could even be regarded as suspect so long as the effect of the political action was seen as promoting the good. Finally, Maritain saw that a collaboratiot spirit would even be necessary among various Christian parties, because, while nevertheless all operating under a Christian spirit, such parties could differ politically.⁽⁴⁵⁾

As far as a spirit of collaboration is concerned, it is clear that Maritain is in substantial agreement with Jaurès. Furthermore, we can find another parallel between Jaurès theory of internationalism and Maritain's personalist model. The nation, according to this theory, had the right to exist and to protect its own integrity even, if need be, by national defense, while over and above the nation stood an international peace organization. This organization should suppose that each

(44) J. Jaurès, Anthologie de Jean Jaures (London: Editions Penguin, 1947), p. 56-58.

(44) Maritain, Oeuvres complètes, vol. 6, p. 582.

nation of its own accord adhered to the principle of internationalism. As Jaurès affirmed, "C'est dans l'Internationale que l'indépendance des nations a sa plus haute garantie."⁽⁴⁶⁾ I find this description to be related to Maritain's advocating that persons assure their own fully human nature by identifying their good, as in part, being the good of the community.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, we can recall the historical evidence, given at the beginning of the paper, on the influence of these writers on Maritain before 1906. The evidence clearly shows that Maritain was not only familiar with, but, at least for a time, highly influenced by the thought of Tolstoï and Jaurès. The evidence of an influence of Sorel in this early period is not so strong, however, the many references to Sorel's work in Maritain's later writings do show that he did become familiar with Sorel's work in a later period if he had not done so before 1906.

Je pense que c'est en considérant chacune des questions dans toute leur complexité, que l'on tire le meilleur profit de ce genre de comparaison de questions spécifiques. Profitable également, mais à un moindre degré, est une énumération des sujets sur lesquels Maritain est en accord avec chaque écrivain. Ainsi, je peux donner les résultats d'un examen de tous les sujets comparés. Des dix sujets traités, relativement à deux

(46) Busieau, p. 93.

des sujets, la possibilité d'une nouvelle condition humaine et l'égalité, je n'ai trouvé aucune harmonie substantielle entre Maritain et les autres écrivains. Au sujet de la révolution, j'ai trouvé que Maritain était d'accord avec Jaurès et Tolstoï, mais à deux égards différents. Sur seulement un point -- la critique de la bourgeoisie -- Maritain était d'accord avec Sorel uniquement. De même, je n'ai trouvé d'entente avec Tolstoï uniquement que sur la question de l'intégration de la religion et de la société. Mais avec Jaurès, j'ai trouvé que Maritain était en accord sur la question du suffrage, de l'Affaire Dreyfus, de la violence et de la possibilité de collaboration. Donc, pour donner un décompte final, on peut dire que Maritain était en harmonie avec Sorel sur deux des dix questions, avec Tolstoï sur trois et avec Jaurès sur six. Je voudrais noter que ces résultats vont à l'encontre de mes intuitions initiales; je m'attendais à ce que les idées de Maritain aient plus en commun avec celles de Tolstoï ou de Sorel.

After suspecting the influence of these three writers from my study of Maritain's early years, I then decided to undertake such a comparative study. In order to reduce bias, I first did a close survey of Integral Humanism, enumerating certain political and social ideas and then turned to the work of Tolstoï, Sorel, and Jaurès to find what compatible social philosophy might be found there.

A disadvantage of this approach is that by looking at specific issues more general continuities may have been missed. An example might be that Maritain's 'New Christendom' is not a utopia and neither are the

'new societies' envisioned by the other thinkers' attempt at the creation of a perfect world. Rather, the concern for all four writers is the urgent need for better living conditions for the masses. A second general and significant continuity is Maritain's orientation of upholding social ideals in a political sphere while preserving what could cautiously be called traditional moral values. The same political-ethical split is to be found in all three writers. As Maritain said in Le Paysan de la Garonne: "Je me tiens aussi loin que je peux des uns et des autres, mais il est très naturel (sinon très réjouissant que je me sente moins loin... de la gauche quand il est question des choses qui sont à César, et moins loin... de la droite (hélas) quand il est question des choses qui sont à Dieu."⁽⁴⁷⁾ Although such an orientation had already been well established in the nineteenth century tradition of Catholic liberalism, evidence does suggest that the influence of the above writers was Maritain's introduction to this way of thinking. Any strong conclusions on this point will, however, have to await further study.

To return to the three problems which I outlined in my introduction, the first was that the period in question here was previous to Maritain's conversion. Afterwards, his political philosophy could only be a Catholic inspired one. While it is true that a Christian spirit permeates all his political philosophy, I do not see why this would negate the retention of some social

(47) J. Maritain, Le paysan de la Garonne (Paris: Declée, 1966), p. 46.

and political ideas to which he may have been sympathetic previous to 1906. The second problem area was that from 1906 to 1926, Maritain paid relatively little attention to the area of political philosophy. On the one hand, this may suggest that after a twenty year period, Maritain could have outgrown all his social and political influences, I also believe it possible that, on the other hand, the young Maritain in these early years may have gained a social and political orientation which became part of his personal mature outlook; therefore, perhaps while forgetting by name these early influences, he may have retained them in terms of his general attitudes towards social and political ideas. On the third problem, that is lack of references to the three writers in Integral Humanism, I find that the passing references to the writers (and some substantial ones to Sorel) do in fact show that Maritain held a certain sympathy for the thought of these men. Lack of an in-depth treatment of these writers in his later years, I think, should not prevent us from searching for the influence of their thought.