

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 67-3970

BOCK, Edward Cornelius, 1922-
WILHELM EMMANUEL VON KETTELER: HIS
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1967
History, modern

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

WILHELM EMMANUEL VON KETTELER: HIS SOCIAL
AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
EDWARD CORNELIUS BOCK
Norman, Oklahoma
1967

WILHELM EMMANUEL VON KETTELER: HIS SOCIAL
AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

APPROVED BY

Kenneth D. Sauter

Donald J. Barthrong

Leza Williams

William H. Maehl, Jr.

Robert L. Riege

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PREFACE

Circumstances and environment are important in the determination of interests. Born into the lowest social class, I experienced the ravages of the Great Depression in my early youth. My father took a lively interest in the various proposed solutions to the Great Depression. Because of this I acquired a desire to study social and political history. Above all, I felt that, since the roots of the Great Depression lay in the past, history could teach means to avoid future pitfalls for society.

Men of the past who proposed solutions to social and economic problems always challenged my curiosity. In early youth I studied the encyclicals Rerum Novarum of Pope Leo XIII and Quadragesimo Anno of Pope Pius XI with the aid of commentaries. During the same period I read every history book in the small village library. I maintained this interest, especially in social history, until senior college, when Thomistic philosophy began to take most of my attention.

In 1963-64 I wrote a Master's thesis on the organization of the German Catholic Center party, since it had

a key position in the political history of modern Germany. In the early days of the second Reich its function was predominantly one of opposition to Bismark. Yet, the Center party promoted a social program through which it aligned itself with the social legislation of Bismark, as long as Bismark's social legislation did not strengthen the dominance of the imperial government over the federal states. During the Weimar Republic the Center party consistently held the balance of power, although in itself it was ineffective as a political entity. At present the topic is of interest because of its influence upon the principles of the Christian Democratic Union of the West German Republic, which is the kind of political party that Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler idealized.¹

In the research for the Master's thesis the name of Bishop Ketteler appeared so very frequently that it aroused my curiosity. When I recognized that the scattered ideas of Ketteler which I encountered were identical with those of Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno and Thomistic philosophy, my interest was further increased.

Who was this man, Ketteler? Where was his niche in the history of Catholic social thought? What was his complete social system? Upon what was it based? What was

¹Karl Buchheim, Geschichte der christlichen Parteien in Deutschland (München: Kösel Verlag, 1953), 10; also cf. Politisches Jahrbuch der C.D.U. und C.S.U. (Frankfurt am Main: K. G. Lohse, 1950), 180-84.

his relationship with the Center party? What was his importance in the history of modern Germany, if any?

German Catholic authors, such as Karl Bachem and Otto Pfülf, were too involved in ecclesiastical affairs and in hagiography to answer all of the questions about Ketteler. Karl Bachem wrote a nine-volume history of the Center party. He points out the relationship of Ketteler to the Center party in general terms, but does not clearly develop his social system. Otto Pfülf, the official Catholic biographer of Bishop Ketteler, places emphasis upon his ecclesiastical work. Other German authors merely mention Ketteler as a Catholic leader during the mid-nineteenth century.

English-speaking authors, even Catholic ones, barely mention Bishop Ketteler. One credits him as one of the founders of Catholic liberalism.² Many mention him briefly as the forerunner of Leo XIII and that he is important in Catholic social thought.³ Nowhere could I find a concise analysis of the life and social thought of Wilhelm Ketteler. This led to my decision to learn as much as I could about Bishop Ketteler.

For this purpose I went to Germany in the summer

²Cf. George Mosse, The Culture of Western Europe (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961), 246-47.

³Ibid.; and for an example of a Catholic author: Ernest Kitzler and others, The History of Western Social Thought (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1959), 74.

of 1965. I soon realized that to obtain all of the necessary materials on Ketteler was impossible, since during the Nazi regime resources were destroyed or secretly dispersed to the smaller Catholic institutions of rural Germany. I estimate that two or three years of research would be necessary in order to gather all the sources for a definitive biography of Wilhelm von Ketteler.⁴

The head librarian of St. Boniface Abbey in Munich gave me this explanation. From 1934 to 1938, the libraries and archives of Germany were "purified" by the Gestapo. Books and manuscripts of prominent Catholics, especially those who participated in the activities of the Center party, were on the Gestapo's priority list. To prevent destruction these books and manuscripts were secretly dispersed throughout rural Germany. At present efforts are being made to collect and return these to their respective libraries and archives.

Encountering these difficulties, I decided to study Ketteler's social and political ideas instead of writing a biography. The principal sources I utilized in this study are Bishop Ketteler's published sermons and books. These were difficult to find. I used other primary sources

⁴James J. Sheehan, The Career of Lujo Brentano (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 27, n. 19, verifies this difficulty. He complains of the lacunae in the diocesan archives of Mainz concerning material on Ketteler. He was merely attempting to find a letter of Bishop Ketteler to Lujo Brentano.

when they were available. I accomplished my research primarily in St. Boniface Abbey and the Stadtbibliothek in Munich, the diocesan archives and Stadtbibliothek in Mainz, and two rural libraries of Andechs and Eichstätt in southern Bavaria. After I left Germany, Adrian Vorderlandwehr, an American student at the University of Munich, continued my search for primary source material and found several manuscripts at Eichstätt.

I wish to thank Mr. and Mrs. James J. Kelly, Lakeview Towers, Apartment 810, 6001 North Brookline, Oklahoma City, who sponsored the European trip. Without their generosity the trip would have been impossible.

I must especially acknowledge the encouragement of Kenneth Irving Dailey, Ph. D., Associate Professor of History, Oklahoma University, and of Robert L. Reigle, Instructor in the Department of History, Oklahoma University, who devoted much time to constructive criticism. I express gratitude to Adrian Vorderlandwehr for the many days of assistance which he gave me in the libraries and archives of Germany.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
Chapter	
I. WILHELM EMMANUEL FREIHERR VON KETTELER: AN INTRODUCTION AND A SYNOPSIS OF HIS LIFE ...	1
- Introduction - Birth and Early Life - Education "Conflict of Cologne" - The Book, <u>Symbolic</u> - University of Munich - Final Influences Toward the Priesthood - The "Peasant Pastor" - The Frankfort Parliament - Bishop of Mainz - Early Work in Mainz - Further Ecclesiastical Affairs - Last Active Years - The Bishop's Silver Jubilee and Death - Conclusions	
II. GERMAN UNITY AND GERMAN NATIONALISM	48
- Introduction <u>Grossdeutsch-Kleindeutsch</u> - Acceptance of Prussian Leadership - Soester Conferences - Immediate Causes for a Catholic Party - Results of Ketteler's Leadership - German Unity and Ketteler's Nationalism - Conclusions	
III. GERMAN LIBERALISM AND KETTELER'S THOUGHT	66
- The Liberalism Which Ketteler Opposed - Ketteler: The Thomist	

The Freedom of Man
 The Church and Liberalism
 German Liberalism Prior to 1848
 Balance of Power
 Freedom for All
 Liberalism, the Father of Socialism
 Socialism Logical on Liberal Premises
 The Equality of Men
 The Inequality of Liberalism
 Equality, a Moral Issue
 The Result of German Liberalism
 Constitutionalism
 Freedom of Press and Speech
 England: Ketteler's Ideal
 Freedom for All Although Misused
 The Press
 Freedom of Religion
 Freedom of Assembly and Speech
 Suffrage
 Representation
 Federalism
 Education
 Marriage
 Church-State Relationship
 Conclusions

IV. KETTELER'S SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION 114

Introduction
 Christian Charity
 The Church's Duty
 Basic Concepts of Christianity Applied
 to Modern Problems
 Economic Isolation of the Workingclass
 The Dangers of Mechanization
 Class Cooperation
 A Defender of the Essence of Capitalism
 Ketteler and Karl Marx
 Man-power vs Economic-power
 Just Wages
 The Economic Instability of the Worker
 The Church and the Worker
 The Value of the Worker
 Private Property
 Women Laborers and Child Laborers
 Shorter Work Hours
 The Just Wage and Human Values
 Right of Workingmen's Associations
 Co-operatives
 Trade Unions
 Ketteler and Lassalle
 Conclusions

V. BISHOP KETTELER AND THE CENTER PARTY	160
A Catholic Political Party	
The Center Party and German Catholics	
The Center Party's General Program	
The Official Program of the Center Party	
The Centrists' Social Legislative Program	
The State and Social Problems	
A Ketteler-Windthorst Feud?	
Ketteler's Assistance to the Center	
Ketteler's Defense of the Center	
Conclusions	
VI. CONCLUSIONS	195
BIBLIOGRAPHY	201
APPENDIX I	221
APPENDIX II	231

WILHELM EMMANUEL VON KETTELER: HIS SOCIAL
AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

CHAPTER I

WILHELM EMMANUEL FREIHERR VON KETTELER: INTRODUCTION
AND A SYNOPSIS OF HIS LIFE

Introduction

Social thought dominates the intellectual history of the nineteenth century, because many intellectuals sought remedies for the ill effects of industrialization upon the working classes. Among these were two Roman Catholic leaders, Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler and Pope Leo XIII. Because he was pope, Leo XIII tends to overshadow Ketteler, and his encyclicals upon social and political questions remain the basis of present Catholic thought. Leo XIII injected new energy into the Catholicism of the modern capitalistic era. However, Leo XIII was not the first Catholic leader to apply Catholic theology to the social and political areas; nor was he the first to apply the principles of Thomistic philosophy to modern sociology. Pope Leo himself recognized this, for he called

Bishop Ketteler his "most able precursor."¹ Pope Leo XIII studied Ketteler's works in the French translations and adopted Ketteler's principles as his own,² stating: "I learned from him."³

There is no essential difference between the two systems, for the social and political principles of Leo XIII are the ones of the matured Ketteler.⁴ The similarities between the concepts of Ketteler and Leo "are too obvious to require comment."⁵ The strong similarities between these two men are not peculiar, for both were steeped in Catholicism with the added impetus of Thomistic philosophy and had a sincere concern for the welfare of the lower classes. Yet apparently Ketteler is the forgotten man; only German Catholics seem to remember him.

Pope Leo XIII had a universal effect upon Catholicism; Ketteler was merely a German bishop. Leo wrote in Latin for all Roman Catholics; Ketteler wrote in German for German Catholics. Leo XIII was an internationalist;

¹Heinrich Reinarz, Von Ketteler und Leo XIII: der sociale Bischof und der sociale Papst des 19 Jahrhunderts (Düsseldorf: Druck und Verlag von L. Schwann, 1926), 18.

²Ibid.

³Karl von R8th, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler (Gladbach: Volksvereins Verlag, 1927), 10.

⁴Mosse, op. cit., 246-47.

⁵George G. Windell, The Catholics and German Unity, 1866-71 (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954), 38.

Ketteler, a German nationalist. Yet all authors who thoroughly study these men will agree with the statement of a German historian who calls Bishop Ketteler "the worker bishop, the forerunner of Pope Leo XIII and Pius XI."⁶

Although Bishop Ketteler's influence upon the Catholic Church is not always recognized, German Catholic authors emphasize his impact upon German Catholic social thought. Even at the present time German Catholic bookshops keep in stock his basic booklet, Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart. When the "Social Bishop" is mentioned in Catholic circles, the German Catholic will respond: "Ketteler." The Christian Democratic Union, which at present is the strongest political party in the West German Republic, is an outgrowth of the former Center Party and embodies Ketteler's social and political principles.

Ketteler was renowned throughout Germany as an orator, an author, a journalist, a Church politician, a defender of the Church, and a defender of the rights of man. Heinrich Reinarz writes that Ketteler was the unchallenged and recognized leader of Catholic Germany, and that he was the first architect of a Christian social and political system.⁷

⁶Hubertus Prince zu Löwenstein, Deutsche Geschichte (Berlin: Haude und Spenersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), 312.

⁷Reinarz, op. cit., 2.

This study initially will present a brief synopsis of the life of Bishop Ketteler as a background to the considerations of his ideas as well as his activities in political affairs. After these introductory comments upon his biography not only are his ideas on social and political questions emphasized, but also his efforts in the promulgation of those concepts. His patriotism, his social system, and his progressivism are thoroughly examined. As far as possible his relationship with the Center Party is investigated.

His attacks on German Liberalism, his considerations on Lassallean labor unions, and his perceptions of industrialization and capitalism receive considerable attention. An attempt is made to penetrate the mental attitude with which Ketteler approached these considerations. Special attention is given to the social program and its basis, which Ketteler recommended to German Catholics.

In his written works and allocutions Bishop Ketteler touched upon every aspect of the German Catholic's public life--upon everything which even remotely affected the Catholic Church in Germany. His activities of a purely ecclesiastical nature are only considered in so far as they indicate his attitudes and ideas on social and political concepts.

The historical value of this analysis is evident. It has value in showing the effectiveness with which

Ketteler's concepts penetrated German Catholic thought from 1848 to the present. It has still greater value since, through Leo XIII and Pius XI, these concepts are the basis of present Roman Catholic social and political thought.

Every man of leadership possesses personality characteristics and stable attitudes which make him a leader. Ketteler possessed a tremendous amount of energy and determination for an ideal, which drove him on to leadership. There was nothing spectacular in the life of Wilhelm von Ketteler. Deep faith in Christianity and a spirit of initiative made Bishop Ketteler an outstanding Catholic leader. It was an ordinary life filled with conviction and optimism, lived in the spirit of Christ. His life was filled with a love of the poor and a patriotic love of Germany.

Birth and Early Life⁸

When Wilhelm Emmanuel Joseph Hubert Maria Baron von Ketteler-Alt-Assen-Harkotten was born on Christmas Day, 1811, at Münster in Westphalia, Napoleon dominated

⁸The synopsis of Ketteler's life is generally based upon: Ernst von Deuerlein, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler: Soziale Gerechtigkeit (München: Bayerische Schulbuch Verlag, 1950); Karl Röhth, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler: Ein Lebensbild (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Verlaghandlung, 1912); Karl Forschner, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler (Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1911); Otto Pfülf, Bischof von Ketteler, 1811-77 (3 vols.; Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1899).

the European continent. When on July 13, 1877, on a return trip from Rome, Ketteler died in the Capuchin monastery of Burghausen in West Bavaria, Chancellor Bismark was at the pinnacle of his power at the head of the Prussian-dominated German Empire.

Wilhelm apparently had a happy home life and seemed to love and respect his parents. As Bishop he wrote to his sister, Countess Anna Galen: "We really considered our parents as representatives of God. They brought us up in the refreshing spirit of the pure fundamentals of Christianity; they were filled with love for us and sought only our welfare. The best family in the world instilled the love of God in me."⁹

Wilhelm's father, Friedrich, was a lawyer and a local politician in Westphalia. As a young lawyer he was elected to the Landrat of the Warendorf district and in this capacity was recognized as a champion of the peasantry. Later Wilhelm's father was a deputy of the Westphalian provincial Landtag. After the Congress of Vienna, Ketteler's native province became a part of Prussia. His father was appointed to a Prussian office, chairman of the district council of Warendorf, Westphalia. Thus, early in life Wilhelm saw local politics at first hand.

Wilhelm treasured the spiritual and moral example

⁹Röth, op. cit., 11.

of his father. When his brother Richard christened his son Friedrich, Wilhelm wrote: "Fritz must become an intelligent man so that he can follow in the footsteps of his grandfather."¹⁰ When his father died in 1832, he wrote to his sister, Countess Sophia Mervelt: "Upon what can we better build and strengthen ourselves to face the vicissitudes of life than to follow the serious spirit and will of our beloved father which he so morally and lovingly presented to us."¹¹

Wilhelm's mother, Clementine, was the daughter of the Governor-General of Münster, Clemens August Baron von Menge zu Menge und Beck. Four years after her death Bishop Ketteler paid her an indirect tribute in the fifth of his famous six sermons on the social order. In that sermon on December 19, 1848, he said: "The greatest blessing which God can bestow upon any man in the order of nature is without doubt the gift of a truly Christian mother. With reason I say, not necessarily an affectionate mother, for, if she is filled with the spirit of the world, her love for her children is not necessary but injurious. . . . If the mother rests in her grave for a long time, but the son, seized by the storms of life, is tossed to and fro and is close to losing his faith and sense of

¹⁰Ibid., 11-12.

¹¹Ibid., 12.

morals and to fall into eternal destruction, then the pious and noble strength of his Christian mother will appear to him and with wonderful strength she will lead him back to the correct path of faith and of virtue."¹²

Although the Ketteler family was wealthy, the children were unspoiled by luxury.¹³ When the eldest son, who belonged to the Cadet Corps in Berlin, complained to his mother about his difficult life and the bad food, she wrote him on May 25, 1824: "If the food is spoiled and impure, that is fatal. Otherwise one is able to become accustomed to everything. When I was twelve years old, I had to arise at five every morning for three years, and I had only a hard, stale piece of bread for breakfast. The food for the other meals also was of inferior quality. At the end of that time I was so used to it that I did not dream of anything better."¹⁴

Wilhelm's mother taught the future "social bishop" the lesson of charity. She consistently visited the huts of the poor in the neighborhood. Frequently she brought the needy to the castle of Harkotten and "robbed" the various wardrobes for clothing.

¹²Sermon: "Die katholische Lehre von der Ehe und Familie," delivered on December 19, 1848, at the Mainz Cathedral, as found in R8th, op. cit., 12-13.

¹³R8th, op. cit., 12.

¹⁴R8th, op. cit., 13.

Although the Kettelers belonged to the nobility, they desired to educate their children in an atmosphere lacking snobbishness and haughtiness. Almost in Spartan fashion the nine headstrong Ketteler children were educated in simplicity and frugality. They were clothed in plain dress and the boys were not permitted to wear a head covering in winter or in summer. No servants ministered to the household, for each child performed the tasks which servants ordinarily performed. All of the children arose early each morning and promptness for their lessons with their private tutors was a necessity. Frequently and purposely their food was served without seasoning, but the children had to eat it without complaint. One example will indicate the extent of this austerity. Once Wilhelm brought home shoe polish and boasted about the use of it. His mother quickly confiscated the polish on the grounds that she did not wish a son upon whom not even a drop of water dared to fall.

Education

The first instruction which Wilhelm received was from a private tutor in the Ketteler home. His mother warned the tutor, Polmann, that he had to practice much patience with Wilhelm, since he was a lively and unruly boy. One of his later schoolmates, Baron August von Schmising-Korff, who visited the Ketteler home frequently,

related: "As a boy he was always cheerful but at times very stubborn, for which his father always punished him sternly."¹⁵ Throughout his life Wilhelm continued to show this stubbornness.

In the autumn of 1823 Wilhelm entered the gymnasium in Münster, a city where the Kettelers owned a home. However, his parents were dissatisfied with his progress at the gymnasium. His academic progress did not concern them, but his stubbornness did. Nuns staffed the gymnasium and his parents felt that their headstrong son needed male teachers.

At this time it seemed traditional for Catholic nobles to send their sons to Jesuit schools for their education. From the autumn of 1824 to the summer of 1829, Wilhelm attended the Jesuit school for boys at Brig in the southern canton of Valais, Switzerland. He attacked everything which he undertook at Brig with passion and energy and, until he matured, this passionate temperament frequently went unbridled. For example, one of his teachers related that in a fit of anger he bit into a drinking glass with such force that he completely shattered it. Whenever Wilhelm considered himself correct, he defended himself passionately and argued or fought even with his best friend.

¹⁵Röth, op. cit., 28.

In 1829 Wilhelm entered the University of Göttingen to study law, physics, and history. Toward the middle of the first semester he joined a fraternity, the "Güstphalia" corps. Soon after Ketteler lost the tip of his nose in a duel with a fellow law student and corpsman, Baron Friedrich von Lohmann, concerning an argument whether Lohmann had stepped on Wilhelm's toes by accident. As a German nobleman and student he had to defend his honor; as a Catholic he was forbidden to fight the duel. Wilhelm decided to have a surgeon in Berlin replace the tip of his nose with a silver one. This decision caused a family disturbance. His father wrote him that he would disown his son if he attempted to come home with a silver-tipped nose. His mother wrote to her sister that if they were not certain of Wilhelm's strong faith, they would indeed be very concerned about his future. Years later when Ketteler was Bishop of Mainz, he told his seminarians: "Indeed I was a lively student but God protected me from the extreme things of the world."¹⁶

With the prospective surgery in mind, Wilhelm enrolled at the University of Berlin for the winter and summer semesters of 1830-31. Because of the consternation it caused in the family, Wilhelm relinquished the idea of the "silver nose" and the facial disfigurement remained a

¹⁶Pfaff, op. cit., I, 35.

lifelong characteristic of Ketteler. Since he wished to attend certain lectures of particular professors, Wilhelm now entered the University of Heidelberg, the center of German romanticism and Liberalism. At Berlin he participated in lively discussions on politics, Church affairs, and philosophy. He continued this at Heidelberg. Ketteler's interest in Church affairs led him to attend lectures by Professor Schmidtlein at the University of Munich during the summer of 1832 on the relationship between Church and state and the rights of the Church. Wilhelm Ketteler then returned to the University of Berlin where he received a degree in law on May 21, 1833, and immediately accepted a minor position in the Prussian bureaucracy as a consultant in the legal bureau at Münster. This legal training influenced his preparations for his sermons and books later, and the importance which he placed upon law and order in society.¹⁷

At this time Ketteler wrote his first essay, a brief prepared for his junior bar examinations:

Darstellung der allgemeinen Grundsätze, durch welche der preussische Staat bei Behandlung der Juden und Mennoniten seit dem Jahre 1815 geleitet wurde, und staatsbürgerlichen Verhältnisse dieser Religionsparteien im Regierungsbezirke Münster. In this brief Ketteler supported the rights of

¹⁷Ibid., 39.

the Jews and Mennonites, based upon the historical development of rights, and criticized the twenty-five years of Prussian officialdom's practices and measures. Ketteler argued that education was necessary for people to exercise their rights as citizens. He adhered to this principle for the rest of his life. Ketteler also held that the restrictions upon the Jews were irrational. Furthermore, he maintained that the height of injustice was to take away rights once granted. This was exactly what the Prussian government did to the Jews, for by the Edict of 1812 the Jews had obtained citizenship, but by a cabinet order of August 18, 1822, this was abruptly rescinded. Ketteler concluded that such illogical action by an individual was excusable, but by a government, unpardonable.¹⁸

"Conflict of Cologne"

From June 1, 1833, to July 1, 1838, Wilhelm Ketteler served in the Prussian legal bureau at Münster. The cause of his resignation in 1838 was the "Conflict of Cologne," a term utilized by German historians to designate the difficulties in Prussia between the civil authorities and the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. It receives this appellation because the discord erupted between the Prussian government and the archbishop of Cologne concerning the removal of a Catholic theologian

¹⁸ibid., 40-42.

from the University of Bonn.

At this time the theological faculties of the Prussian universities, whether Protestant or Catholic, were financed by the government. Ordinarily theologians of both religious groups were appointed to the same university faculty. The bishop, in whose territory a university was located, nominated Catholic appointees for the professorial chairs. The Prussian government generally heeded the request of a bishop to remove any Catholic theologian from the university's faculty.

Archbishop Clemens August von Droste-Vishering of Cologne petitioned the Prussian Minister of Religion and Education for the removal of a Catholic theologian from the faculty of the University of Bonn, which was in the jurisdictional territory of the archbishop. When the Prussian Minister refused to remove the professor, who was excommunicated by Rome for Febronianism,¹⁹ the archbishop withdrew his seminarians from the university. The Minister of Religion and Education ordered the students to return, but Archbishop Droste-Vishering refused to

¹⁹The Prussian government was not alone in defending a febronianist, for many German Catholics, even members of the hierarchy defended Febronianism. In 1763 Johann Nikolaus von Montheim, under the pseudonym of Justinus Febronianus, published a book on the basic law of the state of the Church and the legal power of the Roman Pontiff. Bishop Montheim held that the pope possessed no universal jurisdiction over the Catholic Church, and proposed that bishops act more independent of Rome. (Cf. Friederich Lauchert, "Febronianism," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VI, 23-25.)

permit their return. The archbishop was arrested on November 20, 1837.

The Febronian episode was only the beginning of the discord between the government and the Prussian Catholic hierarchy. The second element of the discord concerned mixed marriages and the scene shifted to Gnesen-Posen.

From the Council of Trent (1545-63) to March, 1966, when a rescript of the Propaganda of the Sacraments changed the Canon Law, the Catholic Church had essentially the same legislation concerning mixed marriages.²⁰ A mixed marriage is still defined as a union between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic. Prior to March, 1966, the Church permitted the Catholic party to marry only after the baptized non-Catholic party promised to baptize and educate the children, born of the marriage, as Catholics. If these promises were not signed, the Catholic was not permitted to marry the non-Catholic, and if the Catholic married the non-Catholic outside the Church, he lost membership in the Catholic Church. In 1834 the Prussian civil code prescribed that boys of such a union should follow the religion of the father and girls, that of the mother.²¹ The archbishop of Gnesen-Posen,

²⁰William Fanning, "Mixed Marriages," The Catholic Encyclopedia (1908 ed.), IX, 698; Petro Cardinal Gasparri (ed.), Codex Juris Canonici (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Book Shop, 1946), Canons 1058-1103 and 2257-2277.

²¹Fanning, loc. cit.

Martin Dunin, refused consent to mixed marriages in his archdiocese under this Prussian law and he was arrested on June 21, 1837.

These two arrests disturbed German Catholics including Ketteler. Ketteler resigned his position with the Prussian legal bureau, stating that he did not wish to serve a state which demanded the sacrifice of his conscience.²² He tentatively decided to become a priest in order to assist and defend the Church.

The Book, Symbolic

On May 9, 1839, Ketteler wrote his sister Sophie that he felt that the only manner in which he could find peace was to follow the will of God by helping the less fortunate in society.²³ In response she presented Ketteler with the book, Symbolic, by Johann Adam Möhler, one of the outstanding German Catholic theologians of the nineteenth century.²⁴

Möhler's general themes were: (1) through the renewal of each Christian's individual spiritual life the ills of society would be healed; (2) all Christianity had

²² Hellmuth von Rössler, Grösse und Tragik des christlichen Europa (Berlin: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1956), 603; Heinrich Treitschke, History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul (7 vols.; London: Jarrold and Sons, 1919), VI, 264.

²³ PfUlf, op. cit., I, 42.

²⁴ Ibid., 43-44.

to re-dedicate itself, not merely Roman Catholics; and (3) new philosophic systems were not needed to cure the ills of society. Individuals composed society. Therefore, if each individual Christian renewed his own life, renewal would follow in society. If only one individual made a spiritual renewal in his private life, he added something to the improvement of society. Möhler directed his plea for spiritual renewal to all Christians, for only through Christ's commandment of charity could society be renewed. This for him was the cure to all of the ills in society. Möhler held that solutions to the problems of society had always been present in the Christian way of life; they merely had to be practiced. This idea of a spiritual renewal to aid society so impressed the young Ketteler that he wrote Sophie on February 8, 1840: ". . . I have indeed attained a true passion for the ideas of Möhler."²⁵ He began the renewal of his own spiritual life by daily attendance at Mass and frequently receiving Holy Communion.

University of Munich

Ketteler entered the University of Munich in the autumn of 1841 to study theology, although he had not definitely decided upon a priestly vocation. From the beginning of his theological studies Ketteler possessed

²⁵Ibid., 43.

the conviction that theology was practical and not an intellectual exercise.²⁶ This conviction was further enhanced when he came under the influence of the Catholic discussion group founded and led by Johann Joseph von Görres. Görres influenced Ketteler more than any other professor in Munich.

Görres was the most gifted German Catholic writer in political and social concepts in the first half of the nineteenth century.²⁷ He was born at Coblenz on January 25, 1776. In his youth he was a republican and in the French Revolution he beheld the great movement for freedom. He wrote a pamphlet, Allgemeine Friede, ein Ideal (1798), in which he praised the principles of the French Revolution and hoped that these would rapidly spread to all nations. He began the publication of a monthly journal, Das Rote Blatt, in which he expounded his ideas on freedom and the importance of the French Revolution. After Görres spent a few months in Paris in 1799, he became disillusioned and disappointed in the results of the Revolution as portrayed by that city.

²⁶Rössler, op. cit., 603.

²⁷Karl Buchheim, Ultramontanismus und Demokratie (München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1963), 80-103; J. P. Kirsch, "Görres," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VI, 652-54; Bachem, op. cit., I, 132-39; Golo von Mann, "Görres," Die Grossen Deutschen: Deutsche Biographie (5 vols.; Berlin: In propyläen Verlag bei Ullstein, 1955), II, 518-31.

Around 1800 he came under the influence of Schelling and identified himself with the German Romantic movement. In 1806 he began to lecture at the University of Heidelberg, the center of Romanticism, and made frequent contributions to Romantic journals.

In 1814 Görres returned to politics. At Coblenz he founded a weekly newspaper, Der Rheinische Merkur, in which he attacked Napoleon, pleaded for a progressive Germany, and advocated the restoration of the old empire under the Hapsburgs. To him a progressive Germany meant an empire in which political and civic liberty flourished. In 1816 the Prussian government confiscated his weekly newspaper and ordered his arrest. Görres escaped to Strassburg where in 1821 he published Europa und die Revolution. In this pamphlet he warned European rulers that unless they granted freedom and liberty, revolutions were eminent.

Görres accepted the appointment as professor of history at the University of Munich in 1827. Here he founded and directed a discussion club composed of Catholic faculty members and students. The club promoted an understanding of the political and social problems of the day and fostered a drive for the Church's freedom from state control. In 1838 this group founded a periodical, Historisch-politische Blätter, to promulgate the program of the club. Görres contributed to every issue of this periodical

to the very day of his death on January 29, 1848.

In 1838 in response to the "Conflict of Cologne" Görres wrote Athanasius in which he condemned the action of Prussia and protested the arrests of the archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen-Posen. In this book he issued a call to all German Catholics for action in the support and defense of their Catholic brethren in Prussia. He encouraged Catholics to promote freedom of religion for all religious groups. For Görres religious freedom and civic freedom were inseparable.

Ketteler readily accepted Görres' ideas. Especially acceptable to Ketteler was Görres' preamble for a new spirit of German Catholicism:

We must become more conscious that Christianity exists not only for private use, but it must play an active part in the entire life of the people and their relationship with others.²⁸

Another professor of Ketteler was the famous Catholic Church historian, Ignaz Döllinger, who had some influence upon the future bishop. Döllinger became famous as an opponent of papal infallibility, which led to his excommunication from the Catholic Church in 1877. In 1870 as Bishop of Mainz Ketteler wrote concerning Döllinger:

I agree only with the Döllinger whose lectures formerly filled his students with enthusiasm and with love for the Church and the Apostolic See.²⁹

²⁸As quoted in Bachem, op. cit., I, 84.

²⁹Katholik, I (1870), 252.

Döllinger, however, influenced Ketteler sufficiently as a student so that Ketteler stood between Febronianism and Ultramontanism. Ketteler opposed the tendency toward absolute centralized power of the papacy.

The antithesis of Febronianism was Ultramontanism. There is some discrepancy concerning the true nature of Ultramontanism between Catholic theologians and Catholic historians. In their definition the theologians define Ultramontanism in a broad sense. According to these authors Ultramontanism advocated the prevention of governmental interference in Church administration. In spiritual matters Ultramontanism fostered the complete freedom of the Church from secular interference. In temporal matters Ultramontanism combated legislation which impeded the exercise of religious authority over the faithful.³⁰

This is not the Ultramontanism of the nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century it maintained the principle of the absolute supremacy of the pope. It strove for the definition of papal infallibility, adopted by the first Vatican Council (1869-70). It promoted the maintenance of papal temporal power and after 1870 Ultramontanism advocated the restoration of the papal states.³¹ In the

³⁰Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, and Salvatore Garofalo, Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1951), 268-69.

³¹Ulrich Benigni, "Ultramontanism," The Catholic

first sense Ketteler was an ultramontane, but not in the second sense.

Final Influences Toward the Priesthood

While attending the University of Munich Ketteler chose Count Reisach, Bishop of Eichstätt, as his spiritual advisor and it was he who directed the young Ketteler to take the final step into the Catholic priesthood.³²

Ketteler showed the fullest development in his priestly candidacy in a letter to his sister Sophie of February 6, 1842. Wilhelm emphasized that the priesthood was the best way to assist society and that the key to a better society was the understanding of one's fellow men.³³

He was also influenced and encouraged toward the priesthood by the student members of the Görres discussion group. These included: Paul Melchers, who later became a member of the Frankfurt Parliament and in 1865 Archbishop of Cologne; Adolph Kolping, founder of the Catholic labor associations of Germany and a contributing editor of the Historisch-Politische Blätter für das Katholische Deutschland; and the English convert George Phillips, later a professor of history at the University of Munich

Encyclopedia, XV, 125; Buchheim, Ultramontanismus und Demokratie, 12.

³²Treitschke, op. cit., VII, 11.

³³Pfaff, op. cit., I, 104.

and an editor of the Historisch-Politische Blätter, with whom Ketteler and Kolping frequently carried on lively discussions on the social problems of the time. Already the Westphalian Baron and jurist emphasized to his student companions that a way had to be found to awaken the Catholic people to the social needs of the time.

The most important of Ketteler's student companions was Adolph Kolping. The economic and social background of the two was entirely different, for Kolping was born of poor parents. Cologne was Kolping's hometown and, after his ordination to the Catholic priesthood in 1845, he worked in the archdiocese of Cologne. Kolping was especially interested in the lot of the apprentices and journeymen among the craft workers. In order for them to meet the challenge of the new industrial economy, he organized associations to improve vocational instruction, to make social and recreational activities available, and even to make food and lodging available for traveling members. The presidents of these organizations were priests, but membership was open to non-Catholics and Catholics. By 1900 the movement spread to all parts of Germany.³⁴ Whenever possible Ketteler promoted these associations. Kolping encouraged Ketteler to become a priest in order to assist the poor.

³⁴Koppel Pinson, Modern Germany (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), 181.

The "Peasant Pastor"

Wilhelm Ketteler was ordained to the Catholic priesthood on Saturday, June 1, 1844. In his first sermon on the following day in the family chapel at Harkotten, he manifested his priestly motto: "I am the good shepherd."³⁵ On November 27, 1877, in a letter to his domestic servants he referred to the attempt which he made throughout his priestly life to fulfill that motto.

Shortly after his ordination Ketteler was appointed an assistant pastor in Beckum near Münster. He held this position from the autumn of 1844 to that of 1846. Here his greatest material achievement was the construction of a Catholic hospital.

Both at Beckum and later at Hopsten Father Ketteler was recognized as a champion of the poor.³⁶ In his private letters, he frequently expressed his concern for the poor and expressed a desire to promote the welfare of the unfortunate. On June 10, 1839, he had written to his family that those who possessed sufficient things in life were indeed fortunate, when one saw the many who did not have enough things to lead a normal life.³⁷ In the same year he had written his brother Wilderich that the only hope

³⁵PfUlf, op. cit., I, 119.

³⁶Rössler, op. cit., 604.

³⁷PfUlf, op. cit., I, 47.

of society was to imitate the mercy of God toward the unfortunate.³⁸ In another letter of July 4, 1840, which he had written to the same brother, he stated: "If only I had the ability and the perseverance to assist the workers, for the great uneducated masses frighten me more than anything else."³⁹

Even after he became the Bishop of Mainz, he continued to call himself the "peasant pastor" and to desire a return to that position. He wrote to a friend on May 24, 1855: "You know that I am entirely a peasant pastor."⁴⁰ His entire purpose as a priest and as a bishop was to be "the peoples' servant through the will of Jesus Christ--the servant of the poorest as well as the wealthiest."⁴¹

In the autumn of 1846 he became administrator and a year later pastor of the rural parish of Hopsten in the diocese of Münster. Ketteler lived and worked with the peasants and was renowned for his personal efforts among his parishioners during the famine of 1847 as well as the typhoid epidemic which followed. His peasant parishioners considered Ketteler strong in body, mind, and spirit.

³⁸Ibid., 51.

³⁹Ibid., 77.

⁴⁰Ibid., 138.

⁴¹Ibid., 143.

Throughout his pastoral career the children of the poor concerned Ketteler. This included not only their education but also their environmental conditions.⁴² Ketteler's farewell sermon in May, 1848, before his departure for the sessions of the Frankfort Parliament, to which he was elected, best express his complete objective as a pastor: "My vocation is in the Church and in the cottages of the poor and the sick--to work for the welfare of mankind."⁴³

The Frankfort Parliament

Despite his feeling about his vocation he accepted a mandate as a representative to Frankfort. This acceptance only came after his confessor insisted that it was a duty to accept and that it was for "the welfare of mankind." The district of Tecklenburg and Warendorf elected him to represent them at the Frankfort Parliament. He arrived in Frankfort on May 20, 1848.

The priest-delegate stood for the freedoms of religion, speech, press, and assembly. Ketteler desired a constitutional monarchy which would protect the rights and freedom of the individual and safeguard the freedom of the Church from state interference. The more Ketteler distrusted German Liberalism, the more he moved from a position of the left to that of the right.⁴⁴ He opposed quick

⁴²Ibid., 127-31.

⁴³Ibid., 134.

⁴⁴Rössler, op. cit., 605.

and extreme changes in either direction, violence of any type, a republican form of government, and the secularization of schools. When he was convinced that the Liberals in the Frankfort Parliament were a power-seeking group and when he was certain of the secular spirit of German Liberalism, Ketteler opposed it vehemently.⁴⁵ His opposition to the secularization shows this, for it prompted the only speech which Ketteler delivered in the parliamentary sessions. This opposition to Liberalism, begun in late 1848, reached its climax in the late 1860's, when he wrote his pamphlet, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum. The immediate cause for this pamphlet was the rapid growth of Socialism, which Ketteler believed was the logical "child" of Liberalism.

In September, 1848, the Mainzer Journal wrote of him: "Ketteler, the promoter of freedom, is deeply concerned about it."⁴⁶ With enthusiasm Ketteler welcomed the formation of the "Catholic Club," an organization of Catholic deputies, and threw himself into the work of the group to insure freedom, to protect the interests of the Church and to find a solution to the "school problem" (the secularization of all German schools). Even at this time he advocated, as a possibility, the formation of a Catholic

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Mainzer Journal, No. 89 (September 19, 1848), 2.

political party. However, because Ketteler was relatively young and because he was merely the pastor of a rural parish, Hopsten, he made no attempt to be forward or outspoken. From the discussions of the Catholic group and the sessions of the Frankfort Parliament Ketteler kept voluminous notes, especially concerning the position of the Catholic Church in Germany. Later he utilized many of these notes on the Church in the preparation of his book, Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche.⁴⁷ In the discussions of the "Catholic Club" Ketteler distinguished himself by his broad and discerning knowledge of the social problems and movements of the time. Among German Catholics he obtained recognition for his speech against the secularization of German schools.

In the funeral sermon, delivered on September 21, 1848, at the exequies of General Auerwald, a Protestant, and Prince Lichnowsky, a Catholic, both victims of a riot, Ketteler gained national fame for his exoneration of the German people from responsibility.⁴⁸ This is the first recorded instance of his German nationalism.

Although Ketteler did not play a major role in the Frankfort Parliament, it assisted in the development of

⁴⁷Pfälf, op. cit., I, 156.

⁴⁸Karl Bachem, Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei (9 vols.; Köln: Julius Bachem Verlag, 1927-32), III, 60.

his hatred of German Liberalism and his ideas concerning freedom and religion and their relationship. Among his personal papers and notes on the Frankfort Parliament the draft of a speech was found which proposed the abrogation of noble titles. At the first Congress of German Catholic Associations, held at Mainz in October, 1848, he was nationally recognized as one of the principal speakers. He declared that as religion needed freedom, so freedom needed religion.⁴⁹ During Advent of 1848 the Bishop of Mainz invited Ketteler to preach a series of sermons on the social question. These six sermons later were to become famous and were published with the title: Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart. Furthermore, these sermons were the initial steps towards Ketteler's Catholic leadership in Germany.

Bishop of Mainz

In October, 1849, Father Wilhelm Ketteler became rector of St. Hedwig's Catholic Church in Berlin through the special request of Frederick William IV. The patriotic sermon of September 21, 1848, brought this recognition from Frederick William IV.⁵⁰ Ketteler reorganized St. Hedwig's Hospital and for the first time since the Reformation led a Corpus Christi procession through the streets of

⁴⁹PfUlf, op. cit., I, 163.

⁵⁰Rössler, op. cit., 605.

Berlin.⁵¹ His tenure at St. Hedwig's was of short duration, for on March 15, 1850, Pope Pius IX appointed Wilhelm von Ketteler Bishop of Mainz. The immediate cause of his elevation to the episcopacy was Josephinism.

The theory of a state-dominated church in the Germanies was unique, because it involved the smallest detail in regulating religious activities. In Prussia the government regulated all the activities of the Evangelical Church to the minutest detail. After the secularization of Church property in 1782, the Emperor of Austria, Joseph II, did the same thing with the Catholic Church there to such an extent that the clergy called him, "Brother Sacristan."⁵² Between 1790 and 1870, from time to time Catholic rulers of German principalities attempted to practice this procedure, which became known as Josephinism. During this period there were also a few theologians who attempted to teach this to seminarians.

The first nominee of the Mainz Cathedral Chapter for the episcopal throne was Professor Leopold Schmid, an advocate of Josephinism. Pope Pius IX rejected this nomination. Since there were several advocates of Josephinism in the Cathedral Chapter and since papal rejection of a nominee was not the practice, the canons of the Chapter

⁵¹PfUlf, op. cit., I, 196-99.

⁵²Bachem, op. cit., I, 41-44.

opposed another nomination. After coaxes and threats the Cathedral Chapter of Mainz nominated three candidates, among them Wilhelm Ketteler. The Hesse government approved the appointment by Pius IX and Ketteler's consecration and installation as Bishop of Mainz took place on July 25, 1850.

Immediately after his installation Bishop Ketteler attacked Josephinism. He reopened the theological seminary of Mainz in 1851. Thereby, Ketteler freed his future priests from the influence of theological faculty of the University of Gniessen, where the Hesse government required Catholic seminarians to attend. The Bishop also filled vacant pastorates without the approval of the Hesse government, which was required by Hessian law. Ketteler desired to force the Hesse government either to negotiate new terms or to prosecute him. Eventually Bishop Ketteler sought negotiations and Freiherr Reinard von Dalwigk zu Lichtenfels complied.

The principle which guided the Bishop's negotiations was: Give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.⁵³ The two principals agreed on their respective jurisdictions concerning schools, the seminary, pastoral appointments, and marriage.

This agreement, the Darmstädter Convention of 1854,

⁵³Rössler, op. cit., 605.

was not approved by the papacy, since Pope Pius IX had ordered that all of the bishops of the upper Rhine deal with Josephinism in unison in the smaller Rhine principalities.⁵⁴ After a visit to Rome by Bishop Ketteler, he and Baron Dalwigk negotiated another agreement in 1856 which incorporated the Canon Law on marriage into the Hessian legal code. This was also sent to Rome for approval and was never returned. Until 1870 Hesse maintained religious peace through the harmonious relationship between Bishop Ketteler and Baron Dalwigk.

The success of Ketteler in Hesse concerning Church-state relationship led to an invitation from Archbishop Hermann Vicari of Freiburg im Breisgau to assist in the solution of the difficulties between the Archdiocese of Freiburg and the Baden government. Since the Darmstädter Conventions of 1854 and 1856 became popular among German Catholics, Franz Kirchheim requested Bishop Ketteler to write his first book, Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche, published in April, 1862, concerning Church-state relationship.

Early Work in Mainz

Church-state relationship was not the only problem which faced Ketteler as the new Bishop of Mainz in 1850. Catholicism in this ancient diocese was at a low ebb.

⁵⁴Löwenstein, op. cit., 313.

Many churches were practically empty for divine services. Archbishop Geissel of Cologne summarized this ecclesiastical condition in Mainz in a letter to his auxiliary Bishop Baudri at the time of Ketteler's installation: "The poor, new Bishop of Mainz has inherited a difficult task. . . . The venerable diocese has disintegrated and God help the new shepherd revive it."⁵⁵

With his usual energy Ketteler attacked the ecclesiastical problems. He visited and preached in every parish in his diocese. Through his institution of diocesan conferences and study clubs the Catholic laymen of his diocese were involved in an adult educational program concerning social, political, and religious questions. Ketteler attempted in every possible manner through sermons, pastoral letters, the Catholic press, and publications to exemplify and foster Catholic action to his flock. By 1853 his efforts were so successful that the diocese of Mainz was pointed out as the example of an ideal German Catholic diocese. An article of praise and of analysis in the Historisch-Politische Blätter in July, 1853, concluded: "The Bishop of Mainz leads the way, let us follow him."⁵⁶

In these early years of his episcopacy Ketteler

⁵⁵Rüth, op. cit., 123.

⁵⁶Historisch-Politische Blätter, XXXII (July, 1853), 844-96.

received firsthand experience with the practical problems of the Catholic industrial workers and the poor. Ketteler came in contact with them through the visitations of each parish in his diocese and also through his visits to many factories in the Mainz area. He also came in contact with the common people through the study clubs and lay associations which he established in his diocese. Through these Bishop Ketteler learned not only concerning the working conditions in factories, but also concerning the ideas which the worker and the poor man had about his own problems. The Bishop himself recognized their value in the development of his concepts.⁵⁷

In addition to these activities Bishop Ketteler began practical and specific work with the poor and the laboring classes. In 1856 he established a Catholic school for girls of the workingclass and in 1864, one for boys. These two schools were vocational ones, where the students were taught home economics, handicrafts, weaving, carpentry, shoemaking, etc. From his personal funds Ketteler founded a scholarship for the education of a young man from the workingclass of Mainz. During the same period the Bishop built an orphans home and a day nursery for the children of the workers. In December, 1855, Ketteler opened a hospital for the poor and founded a

⁵⁷PfUlf, op. cit., I, 187-95.

Catholic lay group which visited the poor and cared for the sick among the workers. "Where there was need, he wished to help as a good shepherd of his flock."⁵⁸

Since Ketteler advocated workingmen associations, he invited Father Kolping to Mainz in 1851 to establish Catholic associations among the craftsmen in his diocese. The Bishop not only encouraged Catholic workers to join these, but himself participated in their meetings. Thus, Catholic Workingmen Associations were founded in Mainz, Darmstadt, Bensheim, Bingen, and Offenbach. Bishop Ketteler visited each group regularly.⁵⁹ All of these activities show the interest which Ketteler had for the welfare of the workingman in his diocese.

Since industrialization expanded rapidly in the Rhine Valley and since Socialism also developed at a similar pace, the Bishop of Mainz felt that it was his duty to study industrialization, Socialism, and the problems of the workingclasses. He read and studied widely on all of these. Ketteler's library contained all of the latest publications concerning the social and political questions. In addition to these he read the Sozial-Demokrat, Deutscher Volksstaat, Der Frankfurter, Allgemeine Zeitung, Deutsche Landwirtschaftliche Zeitung, and many

⁵⁸Johannes Mundwiler, Ketteler (München: Hauptstelle katholisch-sozialer Vereine, 1927), 70.

⁵⁹PfUlf, op. cit., I, 270 ff.

other newspapers and periodicals, including the Catholic ones of Germany.

Ketteler accumulated statistics on working conditions, wages, standard of living, and the cost of living of the laboring classes of France, England, and Germany. He compared these with one another. The more he came in contact with the workingclass and the more he studied their conditions and the various, proposed solutions to their problems, the more practical and mature Ketteler became in his own system and the more he moved toward the concept that the state utilize legal means to foster their welfare.⁶⁰

In 1848 he believed that social reform was initiated by the interior regeneration of each individual soul. As he studied the economic implications of the problem, Ketteler added practicality to this first principle. When the Liberal Schulze-Delitzsch and the Socialist Ferdinand Lassalle made forceful appeals to the German workingman, the Bishop studied their doctrine and even wrote a letter of encouragement to Lassalle.

Hermann Schulze-Delitzsch was a German Liberal of the left who initiated the movement for workers' co-operatives without state assistance. Political activity was taboo in these organizations. In 1862 delegations of

⁶⁰Ibid., III, 289-92.

workers sought the endorsement of Schulze-Delitzsch and other Liberal Prussian leaders of the Progressive Party for universal suffrage. The denial of this petition gave Lassalle his opportunity. Lassalle accepted the call of the workers on March 1, 1863, and initiated the Social Democratic Party of Germany. Basically Lassalle believed in Socialism with state aid for co-operatives and the right of the workingclass for suffrage and political action.⁶¹

A speech of Lassalle in Mainz was the immediate cause for the publication of Ketteler's book, Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum. The Bishop wished to inform the Catholic workingmen of Mainz what position he held concerning their problems and concerning Lassalle's ideas. Ketteler adopted Lassalle's criticism of the modern treatment of labor as a chattel.⁶² He accepted the following points of Lassalle's program: (1) producer co-operatives but without state assistance, for Bishop Ketteler feared state absolutism via interference;⁶³ (2) that the worker should utilize political action to obtain his rights and objectives; and (3) that universal suffrage should be granted in order that the workingclass might use its

⁶¹Pinson, op. cit., 196-200.

⁶²Löwenstein, Deutsche Geschichte, 313.

⁶³Pfuhl, op. cit., II, 183-201.

political power.⁶⁴ The adoption of these ideas from Lassalle led many newspapers of the right [especially the Hessische Landeszeitung] and rightist groups to accuse Bishop Ketteler of Socialism, while the Sozial-Demokrat, the Socialist organ, praised him. Bishop Ketteler in his booklet, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, answered these accusations from the right, especially from the National Liberal Party.

In 1864 Ketteler still counted heavily upon the initiative of Christian charity for the organization of producer co-operatives, which he thought would restore social justice without state intervention. By 1869 he adhered to the idea that public authority was necessary to restore social justice.

The reasons for this change were the influence which Socialism possessed over the German workers and the rapid industrial advancements of Germany.⁶⁵ The possible influence of Karl Marx's Das Kapital upon the German worker and upon German Socialism alarmed Ketteler. For this reason he presented a long report to the Fulda Conference of German Bishops in the autumn of 1869 with the suggestion that the enforcement of social justice was a duty of public authority. This report became the social

⁶⁴Rössler, op. cit., 610.

⁶⁵Ibid., 609; Windell, op. cit., 24-25.

legislative program of the future Center Party.⁶⁶ Until his death Ketteler strove for social justice and fostered concepts by encouraging Catholics to political action.

This encouragement of Catholic action Ketteler had already begun in 1866 and became another step toward Catholic leadership. When Austria's defeat at Sadowa in 1866 filled German Catholics with consternation, Ketteler attempted to revive their spirits in his pamphlet, Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866. Although Ketteler had prayed for Austrian success, he now was "reconciled to the will of God."⁶⁷ In this booklet Ketteler presented two basic themes. On the one hand, he advised German Catholics to compromise with the future changes; on the other hand, he besought the Prussian government not to be the instrument of Protestantism. With this booklet Bishop Ketteler accepted the leadership of Prussia in German affairs because it was a reality.⁶⁸

Further Ecclesiastical Affairs

Besides his activities on the political and social scene and although not a theologian, Ketteler was involved in the various doctrinal controversies of his era. The

⁶⁶Windell, op. cit., 278-79.

⁶⁷A letter to his sister Sophie as quoted in Windell, op. cit., 5-6.

⁶⁸Ibid., 27.

theological seminary, which the Bishop established at Mainz and whose principal representatives were Christoph Moufang⁶⁹ and Johann Heinrich, was recognized for its adherence to the scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas and for its hostility to the anti-Roman tendencies of Febronianism and the pro-state tendencies of Josephinism. Ketteler urged other German bishops to establish their own theological faculties, independent of the German secular universities. But the major theological controversy of Bishop Ketteler's lifetime was papal infallibility.

Shortly after the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, Pope Pius IX decided to summon a council to define papal infallibility. On the eve of the First Vatican Council Bishop Ketteler opposed the dogmatic definition of papal infallibility: "In our times it is inopportune to increase the number of dogmas," he wrote to Bishop Dupanloup, leader of the opposition.⁷⁰ Ketteler feared that a declaration of papal infallibility would result in religious absolutism and centralism. With this in mind, Ketteler submitted a series of observations, which he asked Francis Brentano, a professor at Würzburg, to edit, to the episcopal conference at Fulda on September 1, 1869. Bishop Ketteler's

⁶⁹He represented Mainz in the Reichstag in the 1870's and was a member of the Center party. Cf. Chapter VI, p. 199.

⁷⁰Röth, op. cit., 169.

principal observation was the importance of an opportune time for the definition of papal infallibility. At the same time, however, he drafted a letter, in which the German Bishop's Conference urged all Christians to submit to the pronouncements of the future Church council.

Although Ketteler belonged to the minority in the council which opposed the declaration of the new dogma, he protested the "Roman Letters" of Ignaz Döllinger, which were published in Munich under the pseudonym of Quirinus. In the council itself, Ketteler circulated a pamphlet by the Jesuit Quarella, which seemed to attack the doctrine of papal infallibility. It was Bishop Ketteler who suggested the petition of May, 1870, in which a number of bishops demanded that the eleven chapters of the schema on the Church be considered before the discussion on papal infallibility. On May 23, 1870, Ketteler declared at a plenary session of the council that he had always believed in papal infallibility, but seriously questioned the theological proofs and whether they sufficed to justify a dogmatic definition. Bishop Ketteler left Rome before the final vote, but later he wrote a letter to Pope Pius IX submitting to the decision of the council. In September, 1870, he signed the Fulda Declaration in favor of the defined dogma. In order to clarify and to explain this dogma to the rulers of Prussia, Bishop Ketteler obtained an audience with William I and also had two private conferences

with Bismark. Apparently he did not convince them.

Last Active Years

From the publication of Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866 to the establishment of the German Empire in January, 1871, Bishop Ketteler devoted his principal efforts to social questions. After 1870 Ketteler began another short period of German political activity.⁷¹ He not only supported and promoted the Center Party in order to obtain the same constitutional rights for Catholics in the newly founded German Empire as they enjoyed under the Prussian constitution, but also was elected a deputy to the German Reichstag. From December 14, 1870, to March 14, 1872, Bishop Ketteler represented the Baden district of Waldürn-Tauberbischofsheim.⁷² He resigned from the Reichstag because of his episcopal duties.

A slight incident occurred in Mainz on March 15, 1871, which shows the regard Kaiser William I had for Bishop Ketteler. On that date the Kaiser's train stopped at Mainz. As the Kaiser entered the train station to be greeted by the municipal officials, he inquired whether Bishop Ketteler was present. An aide of William I pointed out Ketteler. Kaiser William I approached the Bishop and

⁷¹For his activities in the Reichstag cf. Chapters II and V.

⁷²Pfaff, op. cit., III, 142-68.

for ten minutes the two conversed privately. What they discussed is unknown.⁷³

Although politically inactive after March, 1872, Bishop Ketteler kept in close contact with public affairs and wrote articles against the Kulturkampf and the National Liberal Party.⁷⁴ He made every effort to defend the Center Party and to maintain the spirit of German Catholicism during the Kulturkampf.

During this period he practically dominated the Fulda Conference of German Bishops. For example, in 1873 Archbishop Melchers and Bishop Ketteler were leaders in the adoption of a resolution which urged the bishops to oppose the May Laws of the Kulturkampf by absolute, passive resistance, but to compromise on the Prussian law which regulated the administration of Church property.⁷⁵

In 1873 Ketteler published his last book, Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, which is considered his last testament to German Catholics. This book, written in 1870, was in the form of notes in early 1867.⁷⁶ The reason for its publication in 1873 was primarily the Kulturkampf. More specifically Bishop Ketteler wished to

⁷³Ibid., 144.

⁷⁴Cf. Chapter III.

⁷⁵Deuerlein, op. cit., 423.

⁷⁶PfUlf, op. cit., III, 257.

show that the program of the Center Party was not only for German Catholics, but also for all German Christians.⁷⁷

Germania, the official organ of the Center Party, commented upon this book in a series of five articles after its publication in early 1873.⁷⁸

The Bishop's Silver Jubilee and Death

The celebration of his silver jubilee as Bishop of Mainz on July 25, 1875, was the climax of Ketteler's last years. On July 24, 1875, Germania predicted that all German Catholics would participate in honoring Bishop Ketteler and that "Bishop Ketteler will always remain in the hearts of the German Catholic people."⁷⁹

Bishop Ketteler received congratulations from Pope Pius IX, all of the German bishops, every major Catholic organization, and many civic leaders. A delegation under the leadership of Ludwig von Windthorst represented the Center Party. August Reichensperger and Judge von Buss of Freiburg, two Centrists, wrote newspaper articles in recognition of Bishop Ketteler's work on social problems.⁸⁰ Ludwig von Windthorst resided at the episcopal home during the celebration at Mainz. At the end of the

⁷⁷Ibid., 258-60.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Germania, No. 142 (July 24, 1875).

⁸⁰Pfaff, op. cit., III, 249.

first day's celebration Windthorst gave the concluding address which "reached the climax in the recognition of the leadership of Ketteler."⁸¹ At the conclusion of the second day Windthorst dared the government or anyone else to remove Ketteler as the Bishop of Mainz and stated that Ketteler's celebration demonstrated the strong unity of all German Catholics.⁸² Windthorst concluded this speech:

We are proud of the Bishop of Mainz; he is the best example of a fighting bishop. In his youth he fought for his honor. If his excellency fights more today, he fights against a revolution. Revolutions are not only fought on the streets, for we have examples in history that there are other revolutionary sites just as dangerous. I offer my appreciation to all of you who have come from all across Germany to honor Bishop Ketteler--to toast the fighting bishop. God grant that the "fighting Bishop" will remain with us for a long time that he may continue to lead us.⁸³

This was the final public affair in which Bishop Ketteler participated. Two years later he died in Bavaria on his return from Rome. This trip was his regular ad limina visitation, which every bishop is bound to make about every three years. On July 18, 1877, Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler's remains were buried in the crypt of the Mainz Cathedral. A large delegation under the leadership of Ludwig von Windthorst represented the Center Party at the funeral.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Ibid., 253.

⁸³Röth, op. cit., 229-30.

Conclusions

This short synopsis of Ketteler's biography leads to several inferences. He was diametrically opposed to absolutism of any kind. Ketteler feared that, as modern industrialization progressed, capitalism without basic Christian principles would develop into an economic absolutism. On the other hand, Ketteler did not oppose industrialization, but desired that this industrial expansion and progress should enhance the material welfare of each and every German citizen.

The spirit of initiative and of optimism which characterized Bishop Ketteler's life is best expressed in his own letter of May 6, 1870, to Paul Haffner, his successor as Bishop of Mainz. Bishop Ketteler wrote: "I am completely confident of a new social structure which the old Christian truths will develop in the future for all of society."⁸⁴ This initiative was aptly recognized by Catholic politicians in Germany. Windthorst, the leader of the Center Party during the Bismarkian era of the German Empire, stated in 1890: "We venerate him [Ketteler] unanimously as the teacher and foremost champion of Catholic social aspirations."⁸⁵

Bishop Ketteler was a man of extraordinary energy

⁸⁴Ibid., 129.

⁸⁵Ibid., 229.

and stubbornness and was urged on by a deep faith in Christianity and a sincere love for the poor. In a sermon on June 25, 1848, delivered in the Frankfort Cathedral, he stated his objective in life: "As He [the Son of God] preached the Gospel to the poor, as He defended the poor, . . . so I wish to imitate Him."⁸⁶ This Ketteler seems to have fulfilled.

Ketteler lived in a period of German history, when Germany strove for unity and attained it under Prussia. He desired a united Germany. After his concern for the welfare of the Catholic Church and of the poorer classes, he manifested a strong spirit of German nationalism.

⁸⁶PfUlf, op. cit., I, 158-59.

CHAPTER 11

GERMAN UNITY AND GERMAN NATIONALISM

Introduction

Any public figure in Germany in the nineteenth century was in some manner involved with German nationalism and with German unification. Bishop Ketteler was no exception and expressed himself concerning unity, nationalism, and Prussian leadership. The Bishop's ideas regarding these issues are best expressed and understood in the historical events from 1814 to 1870, from the Grossdeutsch-Kleindeutsch ideas to the actual unification of Germany under Prussian leadership.

Grossdeutsch-Kleindeutsch

Article six of the first Treaty of Paris (May 30, 1814) provided that "the states of Germany shall be independent and shall be united in a federal league."¹ Since the treaty did not define the "states of Germany," compli-

¹J.A.R. Marriot and Charles Grant Robertson, The Evolution of Prussia (rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 266; Hubertus Prince zu Löwenstein, Deutsche Geschichte, 317.

cations immediately appeared at the sessions of the Congress of Vienna and two German parties arose in the Congress with different interpretations. The Grossdeutsch party wished Austrian inclusion and leadership in the "federal league of German states." The Kleindeutsch party desired the leadership of Prussia with the complete exclusion of Austria from German affairs.

The religious issue was an element in this division between the two German parties. Austrian rulers were Catholic; Prussian rulers, Protestant. Because of the distrust between the Protestants and Catholics among the Germans, it seemed natural that Protestants leaned toward Prussia and Catholics toward Austria. The Congress of Vienna did not settle the dispute and the argument continued between the two parties throughout modern German history. The Frankfort Parliament settled nothing. During these sessions deputy Ketteler belonged to the Grossdeutsch party. When Prussia defeated Austria in 1866, the settlement seemed in its final stages, for it ousted Austria from internal German affairs. When Germany was united with the exclusion of Austria, it definitely seemed to settle the issue, but this did not completely destroy the Grossdeutsch idea.

Not all of the Grossdeutsch adherents based their convictions upon the religious issue, since there were some who saw the Grossdeutsch idea as a political ex-

pediency. In an editorial on December 1, 1854, the Mainzer Journal stated that Germany needed complete unification, including Austria, if it were to survive between the two great powers of France and Russia.² A tinge of this aspect of Grossdeutsch conviction is found in Ketteler's utterances throughout his life, although after 1866 he recognized the lost cause of Austrian leadership in a united Germany.

In his program for German Catholics, Ketteler recommended strong ties with Austria including cultural as well as political ties with the German Empire.³ He argued that the people and the royal house of Austria were Germans and the German Empire existed for the welfare of all Germans. Ketteler maintained that in reality a "Great German Empire" was impossible, but close ties with Austria would assist in the preservation of peace in Europe. Furthermore, it would assist the internal unity of the German Empire, since close ties with Austria would appease Grossdeutsch sympathizers.⁴ Karl Bachem adds that Windthorst followed Ketteler's opinion throughout his public career.⁵ This exemplifies that Ketteler's Grossdeutsch

²Mainzer Journal, No. 280 (December 1, 1854), 281-82.

³Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 4; Windell, op. cit., 100-101.

⁴Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 16-19.

⁵Bachem, op. cit., V, 206.

ideas were upheld in the early days of the Center party.

The great crisis of the Grossdeutsch group came after Prussia's victory over Austria. That Prussian Catholics fluctuated between loyalty to Prussia and the desire of an Austrian victory in 1866 seems peculiar. At the time the Catholic Church probably received better treatment in Prussia than in Austria, for Josephinism⁶ and Febronianism⁷ interfered with the Church's activities in Austria. But the reason for this lay outside the religious sphere. The annexed Rhenish provinces and the conquered Polish provinces had the greater majority of the Prussian Catholic population and these provinces hated Prussia.

After her defeat the exclusion of Austria from German politics was imminent among German politicians. Although the Grossdeutsch party had received a setback, many southern German Catholics still felt that Austria remain the legitimate leader of the prospective German Empire. German Catholics generally were disappointed and disgruntled by the Austrian defeat. In October, 1866, August Reichensperger, a Prussian Catholic politician, referring to Austria's defeat wrote: "It is a world catastrophe!"⁸ Most Catholics gave up and completely

⁶Cf. p. 30.

⁷Cf. p. 14, fn. 19.

⁸Bachem, op. cit., III, 1.

abstained from political activity.

With chagrin the Catholic public leader, who was practical, promoted Prussia as the prospective leader of a united Germany. Since Prussia had shown herself as a modern military power in 1866, she definitely seized leadership in Germany with efficiency and determination.

Peter Reichensperger was one of the more practical Catholic leaders. In an article in the Kölnische Blätter of July 15, 1866, he wrote:

The German confederation is broken and Austria is separated from Germany. But the Germans desire and ought to be brought under one roof, under which they insure themselves now and in the future. Prussia is the only German state which can build that roof. It is the duty of every German patriot to recognize this fact and make it the basis of his thinking, willing and acting.⁹

In a speech to the North German Reichstag he reiterated these ideas on November 26, 1870, and at the time prophesied that Germany would very soon possess unification under Prussia.

Acceptance of Prussian Leadership

However, the man who promoted the acceptance of Prussian leadership among German Catholics was the Bishop of Mainz. In his booklet, Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, Ketteler advised German Catholics to meet the future changes with premeditated compromise.¹⁰ On the one hand,

⁹Ibid., 11.

¹⁰Löwenstein, op. cit., 361; cf. p. 39.

German Catholics were exhorted to permit no one to surpass their patriotism. On the other hand, he besought Prussia not to follow those who wished her to become the instrument of Protestantism and urged the Prussian government to respect all existing political and social institutions. Ketteler invited the southern Germans to join the North German Confederation. In the concluding remarks Bishop Ketteler recommended a close alliance with Austria.

After 1866 the Bishop also fostered the revival of German Catholic political action, which was at a low ebb. Only two Catholic deputies, Peter Reichensperger and Freiherr von Robden, remained in the Prussian Lower House in 1867. In 1868 Hermann von Mallinckrodt and Ludwig von Windthorst joined these two. None of the four belonged to a political party. Catholic action was needed to encourage Catholics to enter politics and public life and under Ketteler's leadership this was done.

Ketteler's leadership and his encouragement of Catholic action soon led to results. Under his inspiration small Catholic associations appeared in various parts of Prussia. In Cologne in 1867 the Neue Burgerverein, later called the Katholischen Volksverein, organized with the purpose of educating the Catholic masses for potential political activity. At the same time a Katholischen Volksverein appeared in Breslau to discuss the rights, protection, and interests of Catholicism both in Prussia

and in the province. Most of the Catholic districts of Prussia established similar groups under Ketteler's guidance.¹¹ In conjunction with Prussian political events these groups spearheaded the formation of a Catholic political party in Prussia.

Events which ignited the growth of Catholic political interest began in December, 1868, with a resolution in the Prussian Lower House to secularize all intermediate schools. At approximately the same time the Franciscans were forced from the Kloster Kalvarienberg, a convent near Neustadt in western Prussia. Shortly after, riots erupted at the Moabit convent and the nearby Dominican church. Reports of the mistreatment of old and sick members in an Austrian-Polish monastery initiated these latter two events.¹²

Newspapers carried various charges against religious houses and petitions for government action deluged the Prussian Lower House. That body appointed a commission under Dr. Rudolph Gneist to investigate the allegations against religious orders. On December 17, 1869, this commission advocated the severest legislation against religious orders. At this point Bismark intervened.

In a discussion on February 2, 1870, with his

¹¹Karl Buchheim, Ultramontanismus und Demokratie, 184-99.

¹²Bachem, op. cit., III, 38.

ministers concerning the recommended legislation, Bismark warned:

In this discussion I must warn you against taking a position contrary to the axiom of Frederick the Great that every one in Prussia seek salvation in his own way, which would shake the trust of Catholics in their freedom and security of religion. From 1848 to 1866 the Prussian Catholics conducted themselves as faithful subjects. A betrayal of the trust of eight million Catholics would be detrimental to the dynasty. The members of a church, oppressed or apprehensive of oppression, are easily fanaticized. The less worries occur, the clearer the consciousness of equal rights becomes and so much more will complaints vanish, which in the past came from people in the Rhine provinces.¹³

The Prussian Lower House followed Bismark's suggestions and dropped the recommendations of the Gneist Commission.

Mallinckrodt, Peter Reichensperger, and Windthorst wished to debate the issue in the Lower House in order that "the matter would come into full view for clarification."¹⁴ For this reason Mallinckrodt introduced a motion on February 10 for a full debate on the issue, stating that it was a challenge to all Prussian Catholics. In seconding the motion Windthorst said that Catholics could not disregard the matter.¹⁵ Without much difficulty the motion failed.

These events made Catholics realize the necessity

¹³Ibid., 39-41.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., 42.

of unified action and Ketteler and Catholic leaders investigated the feasibility of a new Catholic political party. Earnest preparations for a Catholic political party began in April, 1870, when Mallinckrodt brought drafts of the Soester conferences to Berlin for preliminary discussions with other Catholic leaders.¹⁶

Soester Conferences

The Soester conferences which began in 1864 with a small group of Mallinckrodt's friends, presented the nucleus for a political program. Among these friends was Wilderich von Ketteler, the brother of Bishop Ketteler, with whom the Bishop corresponded regularly concerning social and political matters. As early as 1848 these letters presented a discussion between the Ketteler brothers on the feasibility of a Catholic political party, as well as a program for it. Mallinckrodt maintained that no one had a greater influence on him than the Ketteler brothers.¹⁷

The Soester group met once a week to discuss:

- (1) political, social, and economic solutions to contemporary problems based upon Christian principles; and
- (2) an educational program for more effective Catholic participation in public life. This group grew until it

¹⁶Ibid., 98-99.

¹⁷Pfaff, op. cit., III, 149, and refers to his biography on Mallinckrodt, 45.

included most of the Catholic leaders in the Rhine provinces. These discussions produced an outline of the program for the future Prussian Center party. By June, 1870, a definite movement for a Catholic political party was in progress.¹⁸

Immediate Causes for a Catholic Party

Further events in Prussia during the Franco-Prussian War, which began in July, 1870, gave additional impetus to the Catholic party movement. After a series of quick successes, the German Empire was proclaimed at Versailles on January 18, 1871. After the war ended Emperor William I led the victorious army through the Brandenburg gate into Berlin, the new German capital. Two Jesuit priests, Fathers Nix and Ashenbrenner, decorated with the Iron Cross, participated in this triumphal entrance. Catholic enthusiasm for the victory and for German unity was on par with the Protestants.¹⁹

The eruption of the Kulturkampf against the Roman Catholic Church soon dulled the enthusiasm of German Catholics. The National Liberals called a truce during the war to secure national unity. Now this reason was no longer necessary, for Catholic Bavaria was united to Prussia within the new empire. Furthermore, the successes

¹⁸Bachem, op. cit., III, 99-114.

¹⁹Ibid., 121.

of the German armies were also a victory over Catholicism, for were not Austria and France Catholic countries? During the war the National Liberal press cried: "Here Germanism, there Romanism!"²⁰ The victory was a Protestant victory. During the war Italy occupied Rome and the pope lost all temporal power, which many believed signified the end of the papacy. In 1866 the Catholic countries of Austria and Bavaria had suffered defeat and now France and the papacy--how could the annihilation of Roman Catholicism fail in Germany? This attitude gave further impetus to the foundation of the Center party and Catholics emphasized their preparations for the elections of 1870.²¹

These elections were held on November 16, 1870, before the proclamation of the empire, but after the assurance of victory over France. The leaders of the old Prussian Catholic (Center) party, August and Peter Reichensperger and Hermann Mallinckrodt, were elected. Such prominent Catholics as Karl von Savigny, Freiherr Schorlemer-Alst, and Ludwig von Windthorst, and more than fifty Catholic deputies were elected to the Prussian Lower House.

Before the organizational meetings of the Imperial Reichstag, the last sessions of the North German Confedera-

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., 121-25.

tion's Reichstag were held from November 24 to December 10, 1870. The purpose for these sessions was the ratification of the treaties between the various states of the German Empire and Prussia. Mallinckrodt argued that before he could vote for their ratification, he wanted definite clarification of the principles of federalism and a constitutional guarantee of religious freedom. He claimed that the treaties with the south German states did not clearly define state's rights and concluded that the agreements permitted the growth of Prussian militarism and imperialism.²²

A vote of 195 to 32 ratified the treaties. With two exceptions the Catholics voted with the majority.²³ Catholic deputies claimed that they had voted with the majority to obtain future constitutional guarantees for religious freedom. Bishop Ketteler, not a deputy, was foremost in suggesting this viewpoint. As he saw it, this was the only possibility to gain support for future constitutional guarantees for the Catholics.

Results of Ketteler's Leadership

Ketteler injected new life into Catholic activities in Prussia and slowly the disappointment of 1866 wore off.

²²Bachem, op. cit., III, 128-29.

²³Lillian Parker Wallace, The Papacy and European Diplomacy, 1869-78 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1948), 190.

After shrinking from politics, Catholics appeared upon the political scene in Prussia with new vigor. Before the elections for the Prussian Lower House, the Westfälische Volkszeitung, editorialized on April 19, 1870, that the password in the coming elections was Catholic.²⁴ The Essen Volkszeitung on October 22 declared: "Elect clever, true Catholics! This is the program."²⁵ In this spirit Ketteler led Prussian Catholics to accept the results of past events and Prussian leadership in Germany.

German Unity and Ketteler's Nationalism

Wilhelm Ketteler summarized his ideas on German unity and nationalism in his book, Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche: Entwurf zu einem politischen Programm, which he published in 1873 but wrote in 1870. "At this time," he wrote, "Prussia alone can accomplish unity."²⁶ He maintained that German unity under Prussia was a step in the correct direction, for it was a unity which was stronger than in the Holy Roman Empire. Although the German Empire was not his ideal, he wrote that it was a unity of Germans and a unity of any type was far better than disunity.²⁷ Ketteler continued with the same trend

²⁴Bachem, op. cit., III, 130.

²⁵Ibid., 150.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷The cited work, 8.

of thought, attempting to convince his fellow-Catholics:

We Catholics must not impede German unity, for natural laws are self-evident and justified.

Although the train of events has filled an ancient family of Germans with a deep sorrow and also many ancient German descendants, we must accept the new order with full confidence, since the German people have a right at least to some kind of national existence--better this partial unity with the hope that soon the attainment of our desires will freely occur.²⁸

Again and again the Bishop returned to this idea throughout his book:

My ideal was a German Empire, in which the rights of all German peoples would have had full freedom within a completely united empire. It would have been an empire in which the old German royal house with its old German traditions would have found a place.²⁹

The Bishop admonished Catholics and the Center party that they must not permit any group to surpass them in loyalty, love, and enthusiasm to fulfill their duties in the new German Empire, despite the "difficulties Catholics have within the German Empire."³⁰

Then Ketteler enumerated all the injustices against the Catholics within the German Empire, but "all that must not prevent us from performing our duty and showing our loyalty."³¹ He advised Catholics that one of the better

²⁸Ibid., 14.

²⁹Ibid., 74.

³⁰Ibid., 75; also Katholik, I (1871), 257.

³¹Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 75-77.

ways in which they could express their patriotism was to work continually for the freedom and the welfare of all German people.

In a Reichstag speech on March 30, 1871, concerning the German Empire he stated that the German Empire was based upon sounder foundations than victory in war. These were: that the Germans were a "unique people"; that the German Empire rested upon the Holy Roman Empire; and that the German people were a proficient people.³² He concluded his speech with a plea in behalf of the minority groups within the German Empire. He argued that the minority groups needed full freedom and that recognition of their culture was necessary, because the Empire existed for all German peoples.

With emphasis Ketteler opposed particularism within the Empire because "particularism is inimical to unity."³³ Germans must discard particularism, "if we are to become a firmly united nation."³⁴ This did not mean that the Bishop opposed the cultural mores developed in certain areas of the Empire, for he emphasized that the culture, the religion, and the history of each area was worthwhile for preservation and further development. The Empire had

³²Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, 11, 57-58.

³³Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 18.

³⁴Ibid., 19.

to recognize cultural particularism, if the emperor wished the loyalty of all his subjects. All of this was the natural basis "for a universal love of the German Fatherland."³⁵

Bishop Ketteler proposed federalism for the German Empire in order to prevent state absolutism but not to oppose unity under Prussia. He had one great fear for a unified Germany--too much centralized power. However, Ketteler recognized that more was needed than a loose federation, for this impeded the right of sovereignty for the German people. Ketteler proposed the national control of customs, taxes, finances, railroads, the military, and foreign affairs. In state sovereignty he desired a balance of power and prerogatives. Bishop Ketteler summarized his ideas on this:

Undoubtedly particularism is against everything which produces a strong, workable empire. I have always had the idea that a full and absolute sovereignty of a united German royalty was a possibility. I have never reconciled that full sovereignty should be based upon financial power; I have always strongly opposed that it should be based upon material power but always that the German people have an inalienable, historical right to be united into a German Empire under a German emperor. On the same basis I cannot imagine a purely federalist relationship between an emperor and the landed-nobility. . . . over all the sovereignty of the united state stands the inalienable right of all people within the German Empire.³⁶

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Ibid., 22.

The right of the German people to safeguard their freedom and not the rights of a single royal family was the basis of sovereignty in Germany. The rights of any single royal family whether Habsburg, Hohenzollern, Wittelsbach, or any other was not the basis. In Ketteler's plan all German royal families shared equally in royal prerogatives.

Conclusions

Cooperation and a strong love for Germany were his watchwords for every German whether of royal blood or not. He expressed his patriotism which he wished German Catholics to emulate--for that matter every German--with such phrases as: "true sons of the Fatherland"; "a united, great, strong and glorious Germany"; "the spirit of the German people"; and "noble Germans." His own words best express his patriotism:

After my religion my German Fatherland is the deepest affiliation I have. I am prepared to offer my country the sacrifice of my personal interests and all personal recognition.³⁷

Bishop Ketteler's ideal was not a unified Germany under Prussia with the total exclusion of Austria. But Ketteler was a realist. If Germany was able to become united, although only partially, under Prussian leadership, then he would become the most loyal of subjects. Although he desired unity of any type, Ketteler opposed absolutism

³⁷Ibid.

of any kind and strove continually for freedom and the safeguards of freedom. The Bishop may have overemphasized his patriotic love for Germany. The individual welfare and liberty of each and every German concerned him. It was on this point that Ketteler clashed with the National Liberals.

CHAPTER III

GERMAN LIBERALISM AND KETTELER'S THOUGHT

German Liberalism is difficult to define. Ruggiero in his internationally recognized book, The History of European Liberalism, finds it difficult to pinpoint German Liberalism. Although it possessed the external forms of Liberalism, its internal disposition was removed from European Liberalism.¹ German Liberalism had a juridical conception of the state with a spirit of discipline and order. Rechtstaat, the state according to her rights, was the essence of German Liberalism.² For the German Liberal freedom was the means to a higher national end. Liberal feeling combined with national feeling, in which the monarch represented the unity of the state. Bishop Ketteler's analysis may shed some light in understanding German Liberalism.

Ketteler was more a man of action than a pure theorist, which is apparent in his booklet, Die Katholiken

¹The cited work, 211-74.

²Ibid., 253.

im deutschen Reiche: Entwurf zu einem politischen Programm. The entire purpose of this booklet was to outline a political program of action for German Catholics and also to present practical advice for its realization. In his time the first item encountered in the political arena was Conservatism and Reactionism versus Liberalism. In the twilight of Ketteler's public life the rapid rise of German Socialism was a strong factor in German politics. In this chapter German Socialism is dealt with only in so far as Bishop Ketteler believed that Socialism was the logical result of German Liberalism. During his life the Bishop combated both.

The Liberalism Which Ketteler Opposed

The term liberalism has a wide range of connotations. Therefore, one cannot definitely state that Ketteler was anti-liberal in every sense of the term. Usually the principles of the French Revolution, contained in the Declarations of the Rights of Man, are considered the Magna Carta of modern Liberalism. But, whenever general principles are stated in broad terms without specific definitions of those terms, the interpretations of those principles are varied. Thus, one may interpret these principles in such a manner that there is a slight distinction between Liberalism and Socialism; or, on the other extreme, that there is a slight difference between Liberalism and Con-

servatism.

German Liberalism during the later part of Ketteler's life may be generally classified as Bourgeois Liberalism³ with the unique characteristic of extreme nationalism, because it adapted itself more to the propertied and monied classes than to any other group. The rich industrial classes were the mainstay of German Liberalism and Liberalism for its part seemed forced to further the interests of this class. It flourished in Germany under the banner of the National Liberal party. Ketteler attacked this type of Liberalism, yet he declared:

Liberalism uses such a representative, famous name, which was highly respected by our ancestors. Thus, Liberalism has a beautiful name. Who would not be liberal according to the meaning of the word? Primarily this name means to strive for freedom. When it is taken in the nominal sense, no institution is more liberal than the Catholic Church.⁴

Ketteler: The Thomist

When one considers Ketteler's statement that "no institution is more liberal than the Catholic Church," it seems illogical in the light of the political path taken by the Catholic Church. However, both scholastic philosophy

³Guido de Ruggiero, The History of European Liberalism, trans. R. G. Collingwood (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), 254-56.

⁴Wilhelm von Ketteler, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum (Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1871), 2. This booklet was based upon a speech, delivered to the General Assembly of the Catholic Associations at Mainz in September, 1871.

and fundamental Catholic theology permeated the Bishop. Ketteler was one of the proponents of Thomism's revival in the nineteenth century. In order to understand Ketteler's position one must consider some tenets of the philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas. Although St. Thomas considered monarchy as the best form of government, his basic principles did not disqualify other forms of government. Thomas held that the primary source of authority was God. God created man, Thomas argued, with a free will and this power of choice was the basis for the majority of the people to choose their form of government. The power of the government was relative, since God was the only absolute power in existence. The government exercised its power as an agency of God through the will of the people.⁵ As early as the sixteenth century a Thomist, Francisco Suarez of Granada (1548-1617), argued that for this reason the people possessed the basic right to revolt against a tyrant.⁶

In a booklet published in 1862, Bishop Ketteler expressed Thomistic ideas, when he wrote:

The words of progress, brotherhood, enlightenment, freedom and equality are much misused terms but contain the highest ideals of mankind, for they contain a divine and heavenly meaning.⁷

⁵Johann Gredt, De Elementa Philosophicae (2 vols.; rev. ed.; Rome: Vatican Press, 1936), II, 756-69.

⁶Ibid., 769.

⁷Wilhelm von Ketteler, Freiheit, Autorität und

From Aquinas he continued the argument that man was created to strive after truth and goodness. Christianity gave the full and true meaning to the above terms, since it declared that God created man in His own image and likeness. Christianity concluded from this belief that mankind constituted the family of God and that all men were equal in the eyes of God. According to Ketteler's fundamental tenet this was the basis of all political life.⁸

The Freedom of Man

Again in agreement with St. Thomas Aquinas, Bishop Ketteler declared that the highest desire of man was freedom--a freedom based upon free will and divine grace. This freedom "in the Christian sense is comparable to that preached to mislead the people in every place, [he refers to the Liberals] but freedom is a clear beam of light against a dull, dense background."⁹

As early as October 4, 1848, in a speech to the Catholic members of the Frankfort Parliament he emphasized the importance of religion to freedom:

Religion has nothing to fear from freedom; it will again gain its true lustre through freedom. Indeed it is drawn under the protection of man and of the state, but that is not the protection which was promised her. She has divine protection and

Kirche (Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1862), 1.

⁸ Ibid., 2.

⁹ Ibid., 7.

indeed so much more than human protection is given her. Religion can rejoice concerning freedom; for through it she will display her entire strength and truth, and error will disintegrate as soon as one removes the limits set by secular power.

But as religion needs freedom, so freedom needs religion. Whoever has earnestly examined the situation in society must agree. If people do not return to religion, then freedom cannot be fruitful. Only the Church, Christianity, can lead mankind to the fulness of freedom. We need not shrink from any institution in the state, if we build society upon religion.¹⁰

In 1862 Bishop Ketteler wrote that Liberalism overlooked a principal item regarding freedom--"In man freedom is bound to duty."¹¹ He admonished his readers that the general freedom of men drew itself essentially from the free choice of the average man, through which society obtained happiness.

In the same booklet he noted the inclination of German Catholics toward reaction and Ketteler attempted to counteract this tendency. He reminded Catholics that they must never disavow agitation for freedom. Not only was it necessary for Catholics to serve political freedom, but he emphasized that Catholics had to be truer to freedom than secular Liberalism.¹²

¹⁰Verhandlungen der katholischen Versammlung, I, 161.

¹¹Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche, 8.

¹²Ibid., 10.

The Church and Liberalism

Another consideration in relationship to Ketteler's statement that no institution was more liberal than the Catholic Church, is the encyclical, Quanta Cura, with the attached Syllabus of Errors of 1864 by Pope Pius IX, which condemned Liberalism in general terms. Although this document is not a dogmatic definition, Catholics must respect it.¹³ After 1864 many Catholics interpreted this document as a condemnation of ecclesiastical Liberalism, not political Liberalism. Since Pius IX made no effort to clarify his definition of Liberalism, Catholic scholars are divided in their interpretation of the Syllabus. The pontificate of Pope Leo XIII strengthened the position of Catholic scholars who interpreted the document in the narrower sense, a condemnation of secular Liberalism.

Pope Leo XIII explained the Thomistic principles of government in his encyclicals, Diuturnum Illud (June 29, 1881) and Immortale Dei (November 1, 1885). These two documents emphasized that the Church was indifferent to the form of government, as long as the form was just and aimed at the welfare of all citizens. The basis of man's freedom, Leo argued in agreement with Thomas Aquinas, was the very nature of man himself, since man was a rational,

¹³Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, and Salvatore Garofalo, Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology, trans. Emmanuel Doronzo (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1951), 275.

social being with free will.¹⁴ This same type of Thomistic thought permeated Ketteler and he frequently quoted Thomas Aquinas in dealing with political and social questions.

Bishop Ketteler concluded his discussion on the phrase, "no institution is more liberal than the Catholic Church," in the introduction of his booklet against Liberalism:

Freedom and equality are essentially qualities of Christianity; not that the Christian practice of these qualities is apparent in its history, but it is one of its inherent, basic concepts. This may seem astounding but all that is needed is an investigation of the gospel of Christ and the epistles of St. Paul. At the time it was a new concept which Christ presented to the world.¹⁵

German Liberalism Prior to 1848

Bishop Ketteler declared that German Liberalism prior to 1848 differed fundamentally from that after 1848. "Permit us," he wrote in the introduction to his booklet, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, "to investigate the periods of German Liberalism. In its period of growth prior to 1848, Liberalism recognized the freedom of the Church."¹⁶ He concluded that under the name of National Liberals, it now attempted to destroy the Church.

¹⁴Philip Hughes, The Pope's New Order (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944), 76-102.

¹⁵Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, introduction, i.

¹⁶The cited work, 4-5; also Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 111.

With a few reservations Ketteler stated that he could adopt the tenets of pre-1848 German Liberalism. According to the Bishop, the essential principles of pre-1848 German Liberalism were threefold: first, a system against absolutism; second, a system seeking freedom for all; and third, a system free from the financial interests. In the first place Ketteler declared that pre-1848 Liberalism opposed absolutism in politics. In order to prevent a central government from exercising too much power, he himself advocated federalism for the German Empire.¹⁷ In the constitutional sessions of the Reichstag in March of 1871, Ketteler urged that the constitution of the German Empire guarantee the autonomy of each German state in legislation and administration. The central government should only possess those rights which were necessary to maintain unity.¹⁸

Balance of Power

According to Bishop Ketteler this type of federalism would best protect freedom, for egocentricity, which led to tyranny and demagogy, was the basis of too much centralization. "Freedom," he wrote, "is in the heart of every man and interest in man is not a detractor of his

¹⁷Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 9.

¹⁸Wilhelm von Ketteler, Die Zentrumsfraktion auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage, 4.

freedom."¹⁹ Ketteler criticized the post-1848 Liberals for their objective of a strong central government, which he argued was contrary to their premise of freedom. The Bishop said that federalism gave sincere recognition, not only to individuals who were citizens of the German Empire, but also to the various interest groups within the Empire. This permitted unity within the framework of the law in order that no section of government could practice tyranny.

In order to give more balance to his type of federalism, Ketteler proposed an elected senate, in which each German state had the same representation.²⁰ This was contrary to the actual representation in the existing Imperial Upper House. In order that the executive and legislative branches of the central government could not become too strong, the Bishop advocated an imperial supreme court, which curtailed the power of both the other two branches of the government. Ketteler concluded that the principle of federalism was both Christian and German and represented true freedom. Checks and balances would prevent tyranny on all levels of government.²¹

¹⁹Ibid., 6.

²⁰Ibid., 8.

²¹Ibid., 11-13.

Freedom for All

Bishop Ketteler agreed with the second tenet of pre-1848 German Liberalism: freedom for all. In the funeral sermon, delivered on September 21, 1848, at the burial rites of the assassinated Felix Freiherr von Lichnowsky and General von Auerwald, he said:

I hear the cry for a universal freedom. I hear the cry for freedom and I see men . . . murdered who dared to speak freely. . . . I believe in the truthfulness of the present cause for freedom, justice and humanity.²²

He sought limitations in governmental power which were necessary for the preservation of individual freedom, not, however, those which Ketteler accused the National Liberals of attempting to impose. He wrote that prior to 1848 the Liberals were willing to grant the same freedom to others which they sought for themselves. After 1848 the National Liberals only sought freedom for those who agreed with them; anyone who disagreed opposed humanity, culture and progress. "Liberalism," he wrote, "has declared itself infallible in these areas."²³ National Liberalism concluded, he said, that it was necessary to destroy every institution which did not consider the state absolute. As Ketteler saw it, the National Liberals wished the large financial interests to be the sole institution with political power.

²²The cited sermon, 6-7.

²³Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, 11-12.

This was not the kind of limitation to freedom which the Bishop of Mainz visualized, since, in general, his arguments for the limitation of freedom were based upon the norms of morality. For Ketteler held that God instituted two perfect societies in the world, the Church and the state. When state laws violated God's laws, then "one must obey God more than man."²⁴ If this general norm of morality, which limited freedom, were applied, then "freedom breeds obedience."²⁵ In the same sermon he deduced that, if freedom were practiced in this manner, "disobedience becomes a sign of discontent."

Liberalism, the Father of Socialism

Although Vladimir Soloviev, the Russian philosopher, differed with Ketteler in his idealistic society, in which the orthodox Church dominated the state, they agreed that Liberalism was the father of Socialism.²⁶ The Bishop attempted to show that Socialism carried the premises of Liberalism to their logical conclusions. "We must emphasize," he wrote, "one truth. Socialism . . . is fully justified, if the principles of Liberalism are true."²⁷

²⁴Der Kampf gegen die Kirche, Sermon of November 4, 1872; Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 482.

²⁵Warum der Sohn Gottes Gehorsam--die Menschen Ungehorsam?, Sermon of January 6, 1845.

²⁶Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, 13; also Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 481.

²⁷The Russian Slavophiles used the same argument

The Bishop admitted that he had considered whether an experiment with Socialism "could mellow the misery of humanity in some measure."²⁸ He maintained that as a Christian he possessed the privilege to explore every avenue which might make men materially more successful and progressive.

Socialism Logical on Liberal Premises²⁹

Whereas he maintained that Liberalism contradicted itself, the Bishop credited Socialism at least with logical conclusions. Liberalism made the state represent God as an absolute institution and at the same time spoke of the Christian religion and the Church. "That is definitely absurd," he wrote, "for, if the state is God, then the entire development of the Christian religion is senseless."³⁰ Socialism held the same premise of state absolutism, but "Socialism does not wish to hear about religion, the Church or divine services."³¹

According to Bishop Ketteler, Liberalism held that there was no eternal, divine law above the state: that

against Liberalism.

²⁸Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, 13.

²⁹Ibid., 14-27; all ideas considered from here to p. 94 are based upon this book by Ketteler except where another citation is specified.

³⁰Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 482.

³¹Ibid.

civil law was supreme. The Church, the family, or any other institution of society possessed no other rights than those granted by the state.

Private property, said the Liberal, was an inalienable right, but there were exceptions. The confiscation of Church property was permissible, since property rights rested upon civil law; but the property of the Liberal, financial group was untouchable. The Socialists, on the other hand, logically replied that this was nonsense. They argued that, if the state was the only source of law and rights, it was also the source of the right to possess property. Therefore, whatever the state decided in regard to property was lawful, and the Socialists logically recommended a drastic change of both property and inheritance rights. After all, continued the Socialists, in the present situation total power was in the hands of a few, while the greater part of humanity was in poverty and want. Since this was harsh, inhuman, and a nightmare to the common people, all property should be under the common ownership of all men.

Liberalism, according to Ketteler, ridiculed the idea of eternity and the concern about religion. Liberals said that material pleasures were the only destiny of man. Therefore, the Liberals seized all possible riches in this world in order to accomplish their destiny, which was to obtain as much material goods and pleasures as possible.

This enabled the Liberal to be very selective of his material pleasure, since ninety percent of mankind was denied this, and since the Liberal belonged to the ten percent who possessed more than enough.

In the form of Ketteler's rhetoric the Socialist answered thus to the Liberal: we join you in ridiculing eternity and an eternal reward for the hardships of life; and since you have taught us so well through your press and educational institutions, we also ridicule all clerical deceits. If it is true, however, that there is no eternity; that our entire destination is here; and that the pleasures of life are exclusively here; then, it is an unprecedented crime that ninety percent of mankind is excluded from the accomplishment of their destiny in life. Must this ninety percent sacrifice itself for the pleasures of the ten percent? We Socialists state that everyone must share in the pleasures of life. We Socialists maintain that all must cooperate through an equal share in the work and in the effort and all must share in an equal distribution of the fruits of their labor.

"Of course," Ketteler concluded, "what Liberalism states is untrue."³² If the basic principles of Liberalism were true, the Socialists would possess the logical conclusions. Ketteler wrote that Christianity adhered to an

³²Ibid., 27.

entirely different premise. Christianity denied that material goods and pleasures were the true, highest, and ultimate goal of man, for these could not truly satisfy man. Christianity taught that the possession of God alone constituted man's highest goal and was also the source of all freedom. In Thomistic fashion Ketteler stated that man was more than a material being; he was a rational being with the power of choice.

The Equality of Men

Liberalism wished to make all men equal. But Ketteler argued that, instead of adherence to the principle of total equality, Liberalism established a sharp distinction between men, based upon wealth and economic power. Ketteler argued that, in reality, the class distinctions were greater now than in earlier times, for then, at least, Christianity and "German morals" had compensated for class distinctions.

This phrase, "German morals," is an outburst of Ketteler's nationalism. Such nationalistic statements are sprinkled throughout the Bishop's sermons, speeches, articles, books, and letters. For example, on September 21, 1848, in his famous funeral sermon at Frankfort he declared: "I know what great, noble, and natural tendencies God gave our German people."³³

³³Sermon at the funeral of Lichnowsky and Auerwald, 5.

The reference of Ketteler that Christianity compensated for class distinctions is explained and clarified in several of his sermons. In a sermon of January 1, 1848, Ketteler said that Christ redeemed all, poor and rich alike, and all were equal in the sight of Christ. The rich, to whom Divine Providence gave a surplus of material goods, had to utilize these for the welfare of the world, if they were truly followers of Christ. Christ set the example of a universal love, which placed the love of the poor in the primary position.³⁴ Furthermore, "He [Christ] has elevated human dignity to such a height that He loved His poverty."³⁵ In the same sermon the Bishop reprimanded the state for it "has torn the wonderful task [care of the poor] from the Church and through this has inflicted a deep wound upon the Church." Earlier he said: "I have devoted my entire life to the service of the poor, and the more I learn to know them, the more I learn to love them."³⁶ All his work for the poor was based upon the gospel of St. Matthew, chapter five, verse three: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."³⁷ This was Ketteler's explanation for the statement that the teachings of

³⁴Sermon, Liebe Jesu zur Armuth, December 25, 1847.

³⁵Sermon, Über das Almosengeben, December 9, 1849.

³⁶Funeral sermon, Frankfort, September 21, 1848.

³⁷Sermon, Liebe Jesu zur Armuth, December 25, 1847.

Christianity compensated for earlier class distinctions.

The Inequality of Liberalism

Bishop Ketteler asserted that class distinctions in his day were becoming more and more pronounced because "mankind discriminates on the basis of money." The cry of Liberalism that all men were equal was false, for property in the hands of a few disrupted the equality among men and this in turn disrupted equality on the social and the economic level within every social institution. Liberalism was false for it disrupted equality in the entire political organization, since the right to vote depended upon property and economic power. It disturbed equality through the power which it gave the rich over the ordinary citizen in each and every condition of public and private life. It even ruptured equality before the law, about which Liberalism preached so emphatically, for the wealthy used a different means to protect their rights than did the poor, who frequently were forced to defend their legal rights without assistance or counsel.

As a practical example of this inequality Ketteler utilized universal military service. He wrote that the wealthy were easily able to give a year to the service; the poor could ill afford to do the same. The wealthy conscript was able to purchase his release from a full three-year period of military service, but the poor con-

script had to serve the full term because of lack of money.

He concluded that in reality Liberalism called for an immeasurable inequality in the division and use of earthly possessions. The Bishop emphasized that:

It remains for us, who have their view of equality, to help the unheard mass of mankind, since they (the Liberals) themselves have concentrated power into the hands of a few, who control the economic power of the entire Empire.³⁸

Equality, a Moral Issue

Liberalism and Socialism could not insure equality, Ketteler wrote, since "they cannot arrive at the fullness of truth and understanding" about equality, which essentially lay in the area of morality. Ketteler utilized St. Paul's letter to Philomen to clarify this point: after the baptism of Onesimus, Philomen had to look upon him, not as a slave, but as an equal, as a brother.³⁹

For Ketteler the Christian value of love or charity had to be the basic principle of society.⁴⁰ Charity could be more or less perfect, but the entire moral life of man depended upon its intensity. Since Christians were bound to look upon each other in charity as equal before God and in Christ, they had to accept each other as equal unto themselves--they had to respect each other's intelligence

³⁸Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, 16.

³⁹Epistle of St. Paul to Philomen, verses 10-14.

⁴⁰Sermon, Liebe Jesu zur Armuth, January 1, 1848.

and free will. Every sermon of Ketteler which touched, even remotely, upon the concept of equality contained these ideas. This concept of Christian charity also was the basis of his social system.

If the rich and the poor were to respect each other, they had to assist each other. No individual was ever able to attain the objectives of life alone. This mutual assistance was not a type of paternalism but genuine brotherhood. The fruits of this earth were for the welfare of all and God intended this when He created the earth and its inhabitants. An attempt of charity on the part of everyone produced the greatest amount of earthly happiness. In this all men were equal. Liberalism only sought the welfare of the middle class; Socialism, that of the working class; but Christianity, that of all.

"Liberalism," Ketteler wrote, "has shouted to us for many years: everything through the people," since Hegel wrote that the people as a state were the absolute strength upon the earth. With their password the Liberals fought against the authority of God and scoffed at Christianity's phrase, through God's grace, which they misinterpreted as meaning absolutism. But genuine Christians, Ketteler argued, did not use the principle, that God is the source of all authority, as an argument for absolutism. The Bishop concluded that God was the source of all authority, in so far as every authority exercised its power with-

in the scope of basic, positive laws and natural laws, which gave authority power for the development of mankind.

For Bishop Ketteler the slogan of Liberalism, "everything through the people," was a "formula for a wicked deception." Liberalism had never really maintained this motto, since it merely won influence over a certain social class, and did not represent the lower classes and the poor. Ketteler suggested that the slogan should be: nothing through the people but everything through the ruling Liberals. He added that Socialism logically replied to Liberalism: we are the true leaders of the people; thus you lead your ten percent, the propertied class, and we will lead the ninety percent, the workers.

The Result of German Liberalism

Ketteler warned that, although the National Liberals with their small group were now in power, they would not hold that position very long. For, if the Hegelian idea of the state remained the preponderant philosophy of government in Germany, not only would Socialism seize power from the Liberals, but worse results were in store for Germany. If the Socialists assumed power, they would use their authority for their own welfare, as the Liberals did. This result was in the very nature of things, for false doctrines of state, the Bishop maintained, always led to the absurd.

The will of the people had to possess unity on

certain basic assumptions, Ketteler argued. In order to prevent a certain group from dominating the state, all had to believe in God and place themselves under His law and work within the norms of Christian morality. Without these basic norms egoism became the basic norm of action. "A people rooted in egoism," the Bishop argued, "cannot become strong, because it destroys true social characteristics." Ketteler's conclusion: all nations, founded upon egoism, necessarily fell under the rule of a single party, which then reaped profits only for itself.

In the conclusion of this booklet, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, the Bishop of Mainz exhorted all Germans who loved their country to oppose the German Liberals, since they would eventually destroy Germany. Christians had a moral obligation to combat German Liberals, since by its program of secularization and state absolutism Liberalism would destroy the Christian family. He maintained that all Germans must oppose complete state control of education, since German Liberals would use this means to gain control of German society. Ketteler warned that Germany could only save itself, if every German strove for the preservation of Christian morals, laws, and culture.

Bergsträsser and Pinson agree with Bishop Ketteler that the National Liberal party controlled the finances of Germany. Bergsträsser definitely states that the National Liberals "controlled the finances of Germany."⁴¹ Pinson

⁴¹Bergsträsser, Geschichte der politischen Parteien

remarks that the National Liberals were "a party of bankers and industrialists"⁴² and after 1898 the National Liberals became "increasingly national and less liberal."⁴³

Constitutionalism

While Bishop Ketteler rejected some of Liberalism's principles, he accepted their insistence upon constitutionalism, suffrage, and representative government. But he had a different objective, for Ketteler strove to safeguard the freedom of the Church from state interference and to protect the poor from the rich.

The "Conflict of Cologne" inaugurated Ketteler on the road to the priesthood, in which office he felt that he could best proceed to the defense of the Church. It was in this spirit that he exhorted his readers that Christians must never give up politics "while the right of the Church and Christ is oppressed."⁴⁴ It was for an assurance of the Church's freedom that he admonished German Catholics to support "unity through the channels which events have shaped."⁴⁵

In addition Ketteler held that a constitution was

in Deutschland, 142.

⁴²Pinson, op. cit., 169.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche, 164.

⁴⁵Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 11.

necessary to preserve order in society and in the state. Although the preservation of the rights of the Catholic Church through a constitution dominated his thoughts, Ketteler believed that a just constitution prevented state absolutism of any kind. He wrote: "Nothing corrupts a people so much as absolutism in whatever form it appears. The history of the past three hundred years proves this."⁴⁶

Bishop Ketteler desired a happy medium. On the one extreme, he opposed state absolutism, which he defined as the misuse of state power, and which was detrimental to personal freedom. On the other extreme, he opposed the spirit of revolution and demagoguery, which, he held, carried the idea of freedom too far. The principle upon which the Bishop based his constitutionalism was the protection of the rights and freedom of the individual. His basic norm was that the state existed for the welfare of individuals and not individuals for the state.⁴⁷

In a practical manner, Ketteler assisted the Center party in establishing a Catholic agency within the Imperial Ministry of Interior and adopting articles fifteen and eighteen of the Prussian constitution into the Imperial constitution. Article fifteen guaranteed that "the Protestant and the Roman Church as well as any other religious

⁴⁶Ibid., 30.

⁴⁷Ibid.

group freely regulates and administers its own affairs."⁴⁸

Article eighteen read:

The right of nomination, presentation, election, or confirmation in connection with the filling of ecclesiastical offices, in so far as it does not pertain to the state as such, and is not based upon patronage or special legal titles, is abrogated.⁴⁹

By this last article bishops appointed pastors without government interference; but all university professors needed governmental approval after their nomination, since the government paid their salaries.

In his program for German Catholics Ketteler insisted that the adoption of article fifteen of the Prussian constitution by the Empire was a necessity.⁵⁰ According to the Bishop, these two articles, fifteen and eighteen, guaranteed the autonomy of the Roman Catholic Church. In his book, Die Zentrumsparthei in der ersten deutschen Reichstage, Ketteler emphasized the proceedings of the constitutional sessions of the German Reichstag which took place during March and April, 1871. Most of his ideas concerning constitutionalism, federalism, suffrage, and representation are clarified by his activities in the Center party.

During the two months of the constitutional ses-

⁴⁸P. Schubart, Die Verfassung und Verwaltung des deutschen Reich und des preussischen Staates (Breslau: Verlag von Wilh. Gottl. Korn, 1900), appendix, 20.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 69.

sions the Centrists made a concerted effort to incorporate the guarantees of the Prussian constitution of 1850 into the Imperial constitution. In the middle of March, 1871, Peter Reichensperger, the spokesman for the Catholics, presented a long motion to the assembly. The resolution proposed the incorporation of articles fifteen and eighteen into the German constitution.⁵¹ For article two of the German constitution the motion proposed that:

Every German has the right by speech, writing, print or pictures, freely to manifest his opinions. No censorship will be enforced; any necessary law concerning the freedom of the press will be placed in the by-laws.⁵²

Freedom of speech and press, as this motion proposed, were ideals of Ketteler, and he insisted that these two freedoms preserved the freedom of religion.⁵³

Freedom of Press and Speech

In the introduction of his book, Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche, Bishop Ketteler complained that the enemies of the Church utilized the press and speech as weapons against Catholics. He admonished Catholics to use these freedoms in order to defend their Church. The insurance and preservation of these two freedoms necessitated

⁵¹Die Zentrumsparthei in der ersten deutschen Reichstage, 29-33.

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 483; Windell, op. cit., 51.

that the Catholic press promote the freedom and equality of everyone and represent the principles of progress, enlightenment, and brotherhood. Ketteler believed that the Catholic press was bound to defend every suppressed right and every oppressed person.

There were two methods, which could prevent state absolutism, either a representative or a constitutional government. Ketteler adhered to a combination of the two methods. However, he admonished the Catholic press in 1862 to encourage a thorough discussion in order to investigate the facets of both methods. In the same exhortation he warned Catholics that they should not seek a privileged position for the Church in the state:

The Church doesn't need a privileged position but its freedom should always be constitutionally recognized when the state guarantees freedom of thought and press, freedom of assembly and the freedom to enter the religious life convent or monastery.⁵⁴

Throughout the debates of the constitutional sessions of the Reichstag, Bishop Ketteler also maintained the protection of the rights of the individual,⁵⁵ to which Peter Reichensperger added:

We have done a great deal since 1866, but only for unity. It is now time to think of the demands of the people for freedom.⁵⁶

⁵⁴Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, introduction, iii.

⁵⁵Bachem, op. cit., III, 16.

⁵⁶Ibid., 157.

Ketteler's general objectives of constitutionalism and law were the guarantees of rights, the recognition of duties, and the attainment and maintenance of peace within the state. Natural law, according to Ketteler, was the basis of human rights, but positive civil law specified these in such a manner that a change in state ministers did not endanger fundamental rights. In a speech in the Reichstag on March 16, 1871, he said that "we must guarantee the rights of the people."⁵⁷ With every right, however, each citizen possessed a twofold duty: to work for the common welfare and to protect the rights of others.

Prior to the formulation of the German penal code Ketteler demanded that the constitutional assembly define the limits of governmental powers to protect individual citizens from an indiscriminate use of that power. When the Reichstag debated the adoption of the proposed penal code and its relationship to the constitution, he remonstrated: "It is a grave duty to pass a law; it is a double and even a triple duty to pass a basic law for the penal code."⁵⁸

The final objective which Ketteler desired from a constitution was internal peace. He expressed this in the Reichstag with an inherent threat: ". . . the best way to

⁵⁷Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 111.

⁵⁸Ibid., 481.

internal peace in a state is that the state passes no laws against the laws of God; then we also will never rebel against state laws."⁵⁹

England: Ketteler's Ideal

Since England approached his ideal, Ketteler believed Germany might follow England's example. There is no evidence that he ever visited England. Ketteler received his information concerning the English legal and political system from secondary sources. Probably his friendship with the English convert, George Phillips, influenced him. Whatever the case, Ketteler approved of the English system and declared in the Reichstag:

England has given the world the real spirit of freedom, i.e. the freedom of the individual, of the family, of the group; freedom which is an ordered one through basic laws, a freedom which strives for equality. God grant that this German Reichstag will also fight for these basic freedoms.⁶⁰

A year later he wrote that he believed in the English process for obtaining political redress:

If an ancient law should be repealed in England, because it is held to be unjust or unsuitable; or if a new law is sought, then compatible men meet and often after years of discussion they finally reach a conclusion. Through this kind of procedure the most important laws in England have been passed.⁶¹

⁵⁹Ibid., 479.

⁶⁰Ibid., 482.

⁶¹Das Reichsgesetz von Juli 4, 1872, betreffend den Orden der Gesellschaft Jesu, 14-15.

Ketteler also approved the process in England whereby a citizen possessed the right to form an association in order to convince members of Parliament of the correctness or justice of a desired law. According to the Bishop, this association collected money to have literature printed and distributed to convince the public. This process enabled any minority group in England to attempt an alleviation of an injustice. He emphasized that the Germans should adopt this process.⁶²

Freedom for All Although Misused

What were the freedoms which Ketteler specifically wished to guarantee through the constitution and to whom were these freedoms granted? In Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche he wrote that: "All political rights which I recommend for Catholics in the German Empire, I also advocate for all other religious sects."⁶³ He concluded the introduction with the hope that "the program I recommend for Catholics will become a program for all Christians in Germany."⁶⁴

Bishop Ketteler considered equality before the law the basic freedom for all Germans.⁶⁵ He complained that

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 70.

⁶⁴Ibid., ii.

⁶⁵Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 482.

many of the poor received no assistance or counsel in the courts of law because of lack of money.

Being a realist, the Bishop of Mainz was not unmindful of the possibility that freedoms, which the constitution granted, could be misused. When this argument arose in the Reichstag, he expressed his awareness that anyone could misuse any one of the granted freedoms. Despite this, he argued that "we must grant these the best way possible."⁶⁶ The freedom which he considered had the greatest possibility for misuse was that of the press.

The Press

In Ketteler's mind, the Catholic press should do more than freely express Catholic doctrine. He advocated a Catholic press which opened its pages to a free discussion of all political and social questions, but would limit itself to a Christian approach to these questions. In the introduction to Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche, Ketteler expressed his norms for the Catholic press. His emphasis was upon instruction but not upon the swaying of public opinion. He opposed a free press which dominated a political assembly. He exclaimed in the Reichstag that freedom of the press was a necessity, but "the opinions of the press should not irrationally sway a political assembly."⁶⁷

⁶⁶Ibid., II, 111.

⁶⁷Ibid., IV, 481.

In the same speech he declared that: "Freedom of press should be granted, although misuse will result."⁶⁸

Freedom of Religion

In spoken and written words the Bishop emphasized the relationship between the freedoms of assembly, speech, and press, to the freedom of religion. In a Reichstag speech he said that:

The state has the duty to protect the right of the people to assemble for the worship of God. And the state must never threaten this right of religious assembly in order to bring any group into line.⁶⁹

Later in the speech he declared that:

As long as we Christians still have the right to exist in Germany so long should preachers have the right to preach the word of God without interference.⁷⁰

Ketteler advised Catholics to make their political program public and openly discuss political questions.⁷¹ If this advice were followed--as he had demanded of the freemasons--it would allay suspicion; open discussion fostered understanding and the clarification of ideas.⁷²

In Ketteler's political program for the Catholics

⁶⁸Ibid., 483.

⁶⁹Ibid., 480.

⁷⁰Ibid., 482.

⁷¹Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 2.

⁷²Ibid.

of Germany, he devoted much space to the freedom of religion. In the introduction of this booklet he declared that: "all rights which Catholics seek for themselves should be sought for all religions."⁷³ Several years earlier, the Bishop begged the Archduke of Baden to grant a constitution, similar to Prussia's, in order to guarantee religious freedom, as well as the other basic freedoms.⁷⁴ In the fifth article of his program for German Catholics, Ketteler defined his meaning of religious freedom: the government should recognize all Christian religions and not endorse any particular sect. The freedom of religion excluded state intervention in the sect's practices and beliefs, as long as these did not interfere with other religious groups.⁷⁵ The Bishop seemed at times to over-emphasize the freedom of religion for Christians. In a speech to the Reichstag he said that: "Freedom of religion is necessary for all Protestants and Catholics."⁷⁶ He made no allusions to freedom for non-Christians, except in a brief for the Prussian Bar Examination in which he advocated more freedom for the Jews. The only religious or semi-religious group which Bishop Ketteler explicitly condemned

⁷³Ibid., 3.

⁷⁴Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, 119.

⁷⁵Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 6.

⁷⁶Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, II, 112; Windell, op. cit., 162-66.

was freemasonry. The final statement on his outlined program for German Catholics was: "Legal prohibition of all secret societies, especially the Freemasons."⁷⁷ In 1866 he had explained that: "We do not demand that the state suppress freemasonry, but only that they are forced to make public their political program in order that they will combat us publicly and openly."⁷⁸

Hate and dissension could only disappear, so the Bishop argued, in an atmosphere of religious freedom. Ketteler held that it was necessary that religious hate and dissension disappear in Germany in order that Germany might possess strong unity. Since this would strengthen the Empire, it was, therefore, for the better interest of all to grant freedom of religion.⁷⁹

Freedom of Assembly and Speech

For the Bishop freedom of assembly and freedom of speech were integrally involved in the freedom of religion. However, at no time did he underestimate the need for these freedoms in the political arena, for Ketteler believed these were needed for the development of the German nation. In his student days at Munich he became a member of the

⁷⁷Wolfgang Treue, Deutsche Parteienprogramme, 1861-1954 (Göttingen: Musterschmidt Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1954), 58.

⁷⁸Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, 115-16.

⁷⁹Ibid., 25.

discussion group which freely debated political and social questions. In 1848 as a member of the Frankfurt Parliament, Ketteler joined the "Catholic Club," a group of Catholic representatives who discussed the Catholic viewpoint of the Parliament's agenda. When he assumed his duties as Bishop of Mainz in 1850, Ketteler immediately organized lay discussion groups throughout his diocese. These organizations did not only discuss religion, but also the political and social problems which confronted Germany. The editors of the Historisch-Politische Blätter in July, 1853, praised the work of the Bishop of Mainz in this and encouraged other German Catholic dioceses to imitate Mainz.⁸⁰ The Catholic periodical, Katholik, in 1856 asked other Catholic communities to follow the example of "progressive Mainz."⁸¹ In 1861 Dr. Heinrich in the Mainzer Journal praised Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler for his accomplishments in this kind of work within the diocese of Mainz.⁸²

Although the Bishop urged the right of religious freedom and the exercise of the freedoms of speech and press, he opposed the involvement of religious differences in the field of politics.⁸³ The discussion of religious

⁸⁰Historisch-Politische Blätter, 32, 844; cf. p. 33.

⁸¹Katholik, I (1856), 190.

⁸²Mainzer Journal, No. 186 (August 11, 1861), 6.

⁸³Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, II, 112.

differences was relegated to the religious sphere. With the exception of general guiding principles, religion should not dictate political opinion. This was emphasized by the Bishop of Mainz after the First Vatican Council which defined papal infallibility. In reply to the accusations that all devout Catholics were now obliged to follow the Vatican's decisions even in the political sphere, Ketteler issued a pastoral letter in his diocese which separated religion from politics. He reiterated this in the Reichstag, when he declared that Catholics were free to express themselves in political matters; that infallibility referred only to matters of faith and morals ex cathedra and not to political and social matters.⁸⁴

Pronouncements made in matters of faith and morals ex cathedra are actually very rare. Since the First Vatican Council only one dogma, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, was defined ex cathedra. The essential element is ex cathedra which means that the pope officially and intentionally with the prescribed ceremonies defines a matter of faith and morals to the Catholic world.⁸⁵

Suffrage

Inherent in the freedoms of expression was the practical, political action of the right to vote. As a

⁸⁴Ibid., IV, 586; Windell, op. cit., 218-20.

⁸⁵Cf. Parente and others, op. cit., 29.

Thomist, Ketteler believed that all of the freedoms were based upon man's ability to acquire knowledge, to utilize reason, and to exercise the power of free will. On every level of his discussion groups in the diocese of Mainz, Ketteler exemplified his belief that knowledge and ideas were important to solve society's problems. He encouraged a Catholic press in order to promulgate ideas, to stimulate thought, and, thereby, to seek better solutions to the problems which beset German society. With this in mind he advocated universal manhood suffrage, but hinted that education was necessary to utilize wisely the right to vote.

In Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, Ketteler declared that Windthorst and he agreed on a direct voting system according to the principles of democratic Liberalism. The Bishop, in a speech to the Reichstag on November 2, 1871, reasoned that a direct electoral system gave a truer representation of the people than an indirect one. Windthorst and Ketteler never relinquished their position on a direct, universal manhood electoral system. With few exceptions the Center party accepted the identical position.⁸⁶ There was also a political and practical reason for this principle.

Before the elections of 1874, Windthorst decided

⁸⁶Bachem, op. cit., III, 284.

that more Centrists might be elected to the Prussian Lower House if the suffrage's property and tax requirements were lowered. In Bavaria these requirements were lowered in 1867 and Catholics received a greater representation in the Bavarian Parliament.

As soon as the autumn session of the Prussian Lower House opened in 1873, Windthorst introduced a motion to abolish the three-class, indirect electoral system.⁸⁷ Thus, the poorest class of voters would gain more political power. Introducing the motion on November 26, 1873, he declared that: "As I see the situation at present, I am convinced that the voice of the third class pronounces a more masterly love of justice than that of the first or second class."⁸⁸ He added that it was wise to place more responsibility of political consequence upon the poorer classes.

This motion and the accompanying speech embarrassed the Liberals. The motion contained a primary principle of theirs. But, since the German Liberal interchanged this primary principle for that of German unity under Bismark, unity was their dominant watchword.⁸⁹ Accordingly they were

⁸⁷Ibid., 283-85; this concurs with Ketteler's speech in Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 112.

⁸⁸Bachem, op. cit., III, 284.

⁸⁹Hans Kohn, Prophets and Peoples (New York: Colliers Books, 1946), 108.

in a dilemma, either to break with Bismark or to violate a principle. Therefore, since they were in a majority, the measure was tabled for further study.

This example shows some of the influence which Ketteler had upon Windthorst, since Windthorst's words were the facsimile of the Bishop's pronouncements. Furthermore, Ketteler always encouraged the use of political expediency to confound the enemy.

Representation

Bishop Ketteler outlined a plan for representative government in his program for German Catholics.⁹⁰ The plan called for assemblies for towns, cities, districts, and a national parliament. The national parliament was divided into a senate and a lower house, which the Bishop called the "Peoples House." He advocated universal manhood suffrage for all of the assemblies except the national senate. He proposed educational requirements for both the electorate and the members of the senate. The Bishop did not outline what these educational requirements were; he merely made the general suggestion.

Federalism

In the Imperial constitutional sessions of March-April, 1871, the activities of the Center party emphasized

⁹⁰Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 60-70.

two objectives: (1) the defense and the protection of the Roman Catholic Church; and (2) a type of federalism which gave the central government only those powers which were necessary to preserve unity.⁹¹ Ketteler wrote that too much centralization was based upon egocentricity which was the cornerstone of tyranny and demagoguery. "Freedom," he wrote: "is in the heart of every man and interest in man is not a detraction of his freedom."⁹² Strong centralization would threaten this individual freedom, according to the Bishop. Federalism according to Ketteler's plan gave recognition of freedom for all who belonged to the German Empire and it permitted unity within the framework of the law.⁹³

The Center party and Ketteler wanted the individual German states to relinquish only those rights which were absolutely necessary for German unity and the advancement of all German states. Particularism was not a part of the program of the Centrists and of Ketteler.⁹⁴ If necessary, each member of the Center party would offer the supreme sacrifice for the Empire.⁹⁵ The Bavarian Patriotic party,

⁹¹Wilhelm von Ketteler, Die Zentrumsfraktion auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage, 4.

⁹²Ibid., 6.

⁹³Bachem, op. cit., III, 116.

⁹⁴Die Zentrumsfraktion auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage, 11-13; Löwenstein, op. cit., 321.

⁹⁵Ibid.

although Catholic, did not join the Center until 1889 because of this. Ketteler and the Centrists did not attempt to compromise with the Bavarians but the Bishop did write Die Zentrumsfraktion auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage to encourage their entrance. Through Federalism, Bundesstaat, the Centrists and Ketteler wished to insure Catholic autonomy in areas where the Catholic population was a majority.⁹⁶ According to this type of federalism, the powers which were to remain in the hands of each state were police, the judiciary, education, and fiscal matters.

Education⁹⁷

Two primary sources of conflict between the German states and the Catholic Church during the nineteenth century concerned education and marriage. With secularization this conflict was accentuated. On the one extreme, the advocates of secularization desired that the state completely dominate the Church on these matters; on the other extreme, ardent Catholics felt that the Church should have complete jurisdiction in education and marriage. Ketteler and the Center party opposed both extremes. Both Ketteler and the Center party felt that a careful delineation of jurisdiction was necessary in these areas in order to protect individual freedom and to preserve constitutionalism

⁹⁶Pinson, op. cit., 157.

⁹⁷PfUlf, op. cit., 330-44.

and federalism.

Education played an important role in the plan of Bismark for the consolidation of Germany under Prussia. This meant the extension of the Prussian system of education to all of Germany.⁹⁸ Education, carefully fostered by the government, would do the government's work. Treitschke advocated that a devout and earnest attachment to the state, necessary for the realization of German ideals, had to be inculcated into the hearts of the younger generation. Textbooks and instruction would enforce upon the younger generation the Prussian ideals of efficiency, order, and force.⁹⁹

The federalism and decentralization which Ketteler advocated opposed this ideal. Furthermore, the Bishop held that Catholic parents had the right to educate their children as Catholics. Therefore, religious schools whether Catholic or not had the right of existence.¹⁰⁰ Ketteler wrote that the involvement of the Church in education was a part of its nature. The state possessed no monopoly in this area, since parents had the first right of education. The important duty of the state in education was that it

⁹⁸H. G. Good, History of Western Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948), 326-27; Ellwood Cubberley, History of Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920), 584-86.

⁹⁹Smith, op. cit., 148; Kohn, Prophets, 110-112.

¹⁰⁰Bachem, op. cit., 111, 101.

make educational facilities available for all citizens.¹⁰¹

Marriage¹⁰²

As a Catholic bishop Ketteler adhered to the traditional teaching of the Church concerning marriage: marriage had God as its author. Marriage was a contract that was essentially sacred by its very nature, but it also was a contract that of necessity possessed civil and temporal effects, such as property, investments, etc. Marriage was the basis for a family and the family was the basis of society.

The Church, therefore, recognized that the state possessed an interest in marriage, but the state had duties as well as rights. Generally, the state possessed the duty to safeguard the temporal welfare of marriage. The sphere of the state's action was distinct from that of the Church and each was entirely free in its own sphere.

The primary points of conflict involved the marriage ceremony and mixed marriages. Ketteler and the Centrists wished that a Catholic priest be recognized as a state official when he officiated at a marriage and wished the canon law incorporated into German civil law.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, 27 (?); also cf. pp. 40 and 87.

¹⁰²All these concepts on marriage from Hughes, op. cit., 168-74.

¹⁰³Cf. p. 15.

Church-State Relationship¹⁰⁴

The ideas of Bishop Ketteler portray in practical terms his concept of Church-state relationship. As in social theory, the Bishop in this instance was the precursor of Pope Leo XIII. For both, the Church and the state were two perfect societies that were bound to fulfill the requirements of human society. The state's area was predominantly in the material or temporal realm; the Church, in the spiritual one. In his actions Ketteler showed his awareness that in certain areas their respective jurisdictions overlapped. In a letter to Cardinal Reisach, his former spiritual advisor, dated December 4, 1856, Bishop Ketteler suggested that in the case of overlapping jurisdictions the ecclesiastical and secular officials should arrive at mutual agreements by discussions.

Immediately upon his installation as Bishop of Mainz in 1850, Ketteler proceeded to put his principle into practice and completely ignored the Hesse government in the administration of his diocese. By this complete disregard for the Hesse government, he seemed to desire and to force the conflicting issues to come to a climax and to force a conference for their solution.

The Hesse government required all candidates for the Catholic priesthood to attend the theological school

¹⁰⁴pfulf, op. cit., I, 344-66; cf. pp. 31-32.

at the University of Giessen. In Ketteler's first move, he recalled all of his theological students from the university and established a seminary of his own. Furthermore, the government of Hesse exercised the privilege to confirm pastoral appointments. Without permission of the government, Ketteler convoked a meeting of the priests of his diocese and filled all vacant pastorates.

Shortly after, Minister Dalwigk of Hesse and the Bishop's representative, Christoph Moufang, met and outlined the limits of their respective jurisdictions in the Mainz-Darmstädter convention. By this agreement the Bishop freely administered his diocese in strictly religious matters. Ketteler obtained complete freedom in pastoral appointments and the Hesse government recognized the canon law on marriage. On the issue of the new seminary at Mainz, they reached a compromise, based upon Ketteler's concepts of educational jurisdiction. The Bishop recognized the norms set by the Hesse government; such as examinations, curriculum, class schedules, buildings, etc. The Bishop of Mainz received the exclusive right to appoint the faculty and religious and disciplinary jurisdiction over the students. Subsequent issues of the Katholik, a Catholic journal of the diocese, annually published the reports on the seminary of the government inspectors of Hesse.

Conclusions

The principal argument of Bishop Ketteler against the absolute control of education by the state was that it endangered freedom. The state possessed no right to impose only its ideas upon the youth, for this could become the backbone of state absolutism. At no time did he oppose the state's right to maintain order in education and to provide opportunities for education. Ketteler insisted that the state had the duty to insist that parents did not misuse the right to educate their children. Above all, it was the duty of the state to enable parents to fulfill their obligation for the education of their children.¹⁰⁵

In presenting the arguments for the adoption of article fifteen of the Prussian constitution by the Imperial Reichstag he outlined his principles for Church-state relationship.¹⁰⁶ The Church and state must have separated jurisdictions. If the state did not violate or oppose the divine laws, opposition of the Church to the state was not permissible. If the Church exercised its jurisdiction completely in ecclesiastical or spiritual affairs, the state must not oppose the Church. Each must respect the other's jurisdiction. When Ketteler defended papal infallibility, he emphasized that in political matters which did not touch

¹⁰⁵Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 35-39.

¹⁰⁶Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, II, 112-14.

faith or morals the Church did not possess the right of interference.¹⁰⁷

Bishop Ketteler was not averse to the Liberal ideas of constitutionalism, universal manhood suffrage, the basic political freedoms, and the protection of the basic rights of man. He expressed opposition to the tenets of secularization of schools, marriage, and the complete separation of Church and state. This last point did not exclude legal safeguards in order that the Church might function efficiently and possess the legal protection of the state which any worthwhile social institution should receive.

Ketteler did not believe in the fundamental arguments of the Liberalism of his day. He was a progressive, in so far as he fostered an exchange of political ideas, discussion, and held that all political elements in society should strive for the common welfare. For Ketteler no single group possessed the right to dominate the political scene, but all groups should cooperate for the welfare of all of the people. As he stated in a Reichstag speech, he looked upon Liberalism as "nothing more than the substitution of one group, the nobility, with another, the middle class, as absolute rulers."¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷Die Zentrumsfraktion in der ersten deutschen Reichstage, 42.

¹⁰⁸Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 481.

The basis of Ketteler's political thought was Christianity. For him it presented a basic principle for social and political unity in its concept of Christian charity, the equality of man before God and in Christ.

CHAPTER IV

KETTELER'S SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Introduction

Ketteler held that German Liberalism "sinned" through a lack of Christian principles. In his book, Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart, Ketteler established the basis of a Christian social and political system.

Ketteler realized that a dominant factor in an industrial age was its economic system; for every aspect of the system reacted upon the life and spirit of society. He was not an economic determinist. Unlike Karl Marx, he did not see history as dependent solely on the means of production. For Bishop Ketteler, man was a complex being and, therefore, the society which comprised mankind was complex. Economics was only one determining factor, although an important one.

Although the Bishop of Mainz recognized the importance of the economic factor in the development of history and in the prosperity of society, the dangers of an overemphasis concerned him mostly. The material needs of man were important but he foresaw a danger in the

exaggeration of these. As a result of his religious convictions, Bishop Ketteler looked upon the material elements of life with suspicion. In his minimization of life's temporalities he formulated an economic and social viewpoint, rooted in a spiritual and moral way of life. *The more the Bishop recognized the critical social distress,* the more emphasis he placed upon the religious and moral values in society. Yet he remained alert to the meaning of the material environment in which society strove for its spiritual end. Although Bishop Ketteler was a religious leader, he did not lose sight of reality, but combined the practical with the ideal.

Christian Charity

Ketteler's social system developed through a period of evolution. He expanded his original viewpoint, expressed in the six sermons which the Bishop delivered at the Mainz Cathedral during Advent of 1848. At that time he promised himself everything "from the invincible strength of Christian teaching and Christian love."¹ In these sermons concerning Catholic and Thomistic teaching on private property, the freedom of man and his destiny, marriage and the family, and the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, Ketteler sought solutions in the spiritual strength of Christianity, in the inner moral transformation of the

¹Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart, 43.

individual, and in a deep sense of Christian charity. At this time he absolutely ignored the assistance of legal means in society. Vigener judges that at this time Ketteler "exhibited no line of communication to the real situation of the workingman."² At this stage of his development Ketteler still lived in the purely theoretical world in which religious means alone fulfilled the social needs.

By 1864 Bishop Ketteler reached his fullest development in the practical aspects of social problems and their solutions.³ His earlier social sermons and writings possess meaning only in so far as they give an insight into the persuasions of Ketteler. These manifest that for the Bishop the eight-hour day and higher wages were not the only aspects of the modern labor problem. There still remained the rights and value of the human personality, the freedom of the workingman to unite in a labor movement, and the right of private property.⁴

Upon this basis Bishop Ketteler built his social system. Because of practical experience with the laboring class and the poor through the years of 1848 to 1864, the social viewpoint of the Bishop evolved from broad, idealistic principles to particular, practical ideas.⁵ But

²Vigener, op. cit., 107.

³Cf. pp. 32-39.

⁴Ludwig Lenhart, Seelennot aus Lebensenge (Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1933), 7.

⁵Cf. pp. 32-39.

throughout his life Ketteler held a firm conviction that unhealthy social conditions always led to a spiritual and moral decay--that moral need evolved from social need.

This principle was enunciated in a lecture of 1869: Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit.

The Church's Duty

The classical formula which the Bishop urged for the solution of the social problem found its imprint under several moral theological principles which he enunciated at the Fulda Conference of German Bishops in 1869. In this allocution the social problem appeared strictly as a moral issue. Ketteler concluded that:

Moral decay and the need of moral healing power shapes the nucleus of the social question, and for that reason Christian help alone can work in this area, because it is the only strength which penetrates to the very soul of man in order to heal it, to renew the inner life of the mass of the people.⁶

Ketteler emphasized the social duty of the Church in a sharp manner and demanded that the Church fulfill that duty, as an ecclesiastic of any rank had never demanded:

If the Church wishes to communicate her mission from Christ and to carry out the salvation of mankind, she must obtain an extraordinary method, which must be applied to the large number of the workingclasses. The Church must strive with all her power to free them from the occasio proxima

⁶Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, sermon delivered to the Fulda Conference of Bishops, 1869, 4.

peccandi⁷ in which they are found or driven into and to free them from the impossibility to fulfill their Christian and moral duties.⁸

Already in 1866 Ketteler referred to the duty which Catholics had to recognize the need of God in society.⁹ In Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum he wrote that Christianity possessed the duty to offer remedies to society, since it alone had the means "to improve the welfare of the working-class."¹⁰ All of this emphasized his general social diagnosis that: "economic tension leads to spiritual and moral tension,"¹¹ but, on the other hand, "a healthy environment produces Christian piety in its strongest form."¹²

A temptation presents itself to place Bishop Ketteler in the category of a Christian idealist, such as Vladimir Soloviev, a Russian theologian and philosopher, who planned an ideal Christian society. However, Ketteler understood human nature too well to fall into idealism. The Bishop possessed an ideal, but this ideal was a criteria. Society could never fully realize the ideal but had

⁷"Proximate occasion to sin" is a technical term in Catholic Moral Theology which signifies that a person is living under conditions which easily lead to sin.

⁸Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, sermon delivered at Fulda, 1869, 4.

⁹Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, 172.

¹⁰Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 49.

¹¹Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, sermon delivered at Fulda, 1869.

¹²Lenhart, op. cit., 9.

to strive toward it in order to improve society progressively. For Ketteler this ideal evolved from the Church's duty to attempt always to elevate society, to save souls, and "to alleviate at least some suffering in society."¹³

Basic Concepts of Christianity Applied
to Modern Problems

This emphasis upon the duty of the Church and her obligations to the workingclasses was so clear in Ketteler's life that Vigener argues that: "the Bishop really never developed one independent thought nor developed an independent system." Ketteler's ideas were not new to Catholic thinking.¹⁴ Ketteler's system did not present any entirely new concept which some previous Catholic philosopher or theologian, especially Thomas Aquinas, did not express. However, the formulation of these various concepts into a system of social thought and its application to modern society was new.

The arguments which Bishop Ketteler used for the right of private property are found in the works of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonse Liguori.¹⁵ The laws of

¹³Letter to Justice Thüffling of Warendorf, autumn, 1848; R8th, op. cit., 90.

¹⁴Vigener, op. cit., 418.

¹⁵Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart, 35, where Ketteler stated that his ideas were from Aquinas and Liguori. Alphonse Liguori's ideas on justice and private property are found in any Catholic Moral Theology manual.

justice and charity are found scattered throughout the pages of the history of Christian moral theology as far back as the gospels themselves. But, Ketteler's practical defense of the laboring classes was a new departure for a member of the Catholic hierarchy.¹⁶

Bishop Ketteler did not wish a dull resignation to, nor merely a destructive criticism of, the ills of society. Neither did he desire a calm traditionalism nor a critic-free revolution. But the Bishop called for fraternal charity, legal justice, and the protection of the unprotected. Ketteler wished to discover a Christian solution to the great industrial and social problems of his time. Furthermore, Ketteler considered this concern for social justice as a part of his priestly duties, which the new economic system placed upon him. Ketteler summarized this duty to the German Bishops Conference at Fulda in 1869 thus:

If it is not even evident that the principles of modern economic studies, which one encounters as the conflict of all against all, is considered within the laws of nature, and within the teachings of Christian brotherly love, yet in open contradiction to it, it is a known fact that in

The best of these is Karl Noldin, Theologica Morales (4 vols.; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlungen, 1932), all of Vol. II; St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica and Contra Gentiles (18 vols.; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956); Summa Theologica, 2, 1, q.105, a2 to a6; 2, 2, q.66, a1 and a2; 2, 2, q.118, a1 and a2; Contra Gentiles, all of Chapter 134. Any of the editions of St. Thomas' works may be used for these citations.

¹⁶Lenhart, op. cit., 13-16.

countries where this system has evolved to a higher degree there is a material, spiritual and moral deformation. The Grace of Christianity should draw freely to itself the industrial workers with interior necessity. . . . For Christian charity is not only a command imposed upon an individual but upon the entire society.¹⁷

Ketteler was not a romanticist who wished a return to the past; he appreciated technical progress. The Bishop was rather optimistic in his belief of the possibility to renovate the capitalistic mentality with a Christian attitude. He recognized that no strength on earth could stop the progress of the modern political economy and of mass production. Bishop Ketteler did not seek the destruction of the entire system of capitalism, but wished to mellow the system in such a fashion that the worker could obtain justice and his fair share.¹⁸

When Ketteler used such drastic phrases as "the Godlessness of capital which must be destroyed," he desired the destruction of the immoral elements within the system. He firmly believed in the essence of capitalism, but not in the ills which men suffered from the capitalistic spirit. Ketteler fought for a moral reform of the capitalistic system for: "one does not destroy the sinner but the sin" was the principle which he applied and which he derived from the gospel.¹⁹

¹⁷Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, sermon delivered at Fulda, 1869.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

Economic Isolation of the Workingclass

According to Bishop Ketteler one of the "sins" of capitalism was the economic isolation of the workingclass; for capitalism tended to divide society into two major groups. These two groups were the "haves," which he called the financial powers, and the "have-nots." Concerning the financial group he wrote that:

. . . in the same degree there is a danger to the worker, as it [capitalism] is his possessor without a conscience, without religion, and thereby only takes advantage of the freedom of egoism. The foundations of the modern, public economy has a definite reaction to the human force of the worker against the financial power of capitalism. The worker becomes isolated with his strength; the financial power centralized against this. The position of the worker becomes reduced to a separate public work, which was impossible; the financial power divides itself but not into a reasonable division of capital. On the contrary it gathers itself more and more into larger and more unreasonable proportions.²⁰

The danger with the accumulation of wealth was the beginning of immense power, resulting in despotic economic domination. Because the financial powers held and controlled money and property, they controlled the life-blood of the entire economic body and through this they jeopardized the freedom of the workingclass.²¹

²⁰Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit, sermon delivered in Mainz, July 25, 1869.

²¹Ibid.

The Dangers of Mechanization

Bishop Ketteler feared that the danger of mechanization lay in the possibility of ignoring the values of the human personality. He warned that:

. . . finally all religion, all politics, all human relations and all of humanity will be reduced to addition, subtraction, multiplication and division--all humanity reduced to atoms.²²

Any price was cheap to pay in order to prevent the degradation of man to the level of pure matter. For Ketteler the only manner to avoid this was to emphasize the fundamental principles of Christianity. In this he followed the concepts of St. Thomas Aquinas; Man was a rational, volitional creature whose objective was the fulfillment of his potential as far as possible.²³ Bishop Ketteler followed the concept of Christ that a man has infinite value. In order for society to attain this high ideal of man, it was necessary that spiritual values were "victorious over material values." This was only possible if the workingman was "always given the greatest freedom from material want and slavery."²⁴ Mercy and charity had to safeguard this: "What will become of things, if this machine-based, modern economy with an entirely unmerciful procedure, which is

²²Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 49.

²³Gredt, op. cit., II, 696 ff.; and Aquinas, Summa Theologica, I, I, q.96, a4.

²⁴Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 135.

inherent in it, dominates society?"²⁵ If the worker remained the unmerciful slave of mechanization, he could certainly lose his identity as a person.

"Seeking and applying the truths of Christianity" contained Ketteler's solution to the problem.²⁶ The correct understanding of the new situations of modern life lay within the duties of his priestly work, which Bishop Ketteler placed in a new form within modern society. According to his conviction the first duty which he had as a priest, was to understand the practical problems of society and then to act with all of his power to assist in alleviating these difficulties.²⁷ This firm conviction to duty led Bishop Ketteler to the leadership of Catholic social thought in Germany and a precursor in modern Roman Catholic social philosophy.

Class Cooperation

For Bishop Ketteler the command of Christ to love one's neighbor was most essential to modern society. Ketteler's total opposition to class conflict is apparent from the following statement:

If it should not always be evident that the principle of modern economics, which one characterizes as the war of all against all, is in open contra-

²⁵Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 21.

²⁶Die Modernen Ideen im Lichte des Glaubens, 11.

²⁷Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 4.

diction with the natural law and with the Christian doctrine of love of neighbor, . . .

This love of neighbor must permeate the entire organization of society.²⁸

That society could not cure its ills by a return to the dreams of Romanticism was a conviction of Ketteler. For that reason Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart shows that the Bishop, already in 1848, formulated the worker problem in this manner: How can the destiny of the workers be tempered on the basis of the present social and economic order within capitalism?²⁹

A Defender of the Essence of Capitalism

The Bishop of Mainz believed in the possibility of improving the mentality of the capitalistic age. "Do not destroy the system but lessen its ill effects and find means to remedy these."³⁰ The worker, in so far as possible, should participate in the blessings of the system. Ketteler did not suggest a utopia, but he suggested a rational attack upon the ills of the capitalistic system. When he shouted against the ungodliness of capitalism, he referred to the misuse of the powers of the system. Ketteler realized that the techniques and methods of pro-

²⁸Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 21.

²⁹Cited work, 17.

³⁰Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 21.

duction, utilized by capitalism, were necessary for the economic development of modern society. Capitalism meant a better and fuller material way of life for humanity; but for the Bishop it had to provide a fuller life for each member of society and this included the interior man. This was the identical approach used by Pope Leo XIII in Rerum Novarum (1891) and Pope Pius XI in Quadragesimo Anno (1931).

Ketteler and Karl Marx

By the time Ketteler reached the zenith in understanding the social problem, the important work of Karl Marx had not appeared. Bishop Ketteler read Das Kapital of Karl Marx on a trip to Rome in the autumn of 1869. Ketteler and Marx almost stood at opposite poles. Bishop Ketteler directed his attacks against the spirit of capitalism and Marx against the matter of capitalism. Whereas Marx attempted to destroy capitalism through a scientific method by the utilization of natural law; Ketteler attempted its rectification through natural law and the divine positive law of Christian charity. Both desired to drive the "money changers from the temple"--Marx wished to replace them; Ketteler wished to change them morally and spiritually.

Man-power vs Economic-power

Concerning the "financial-powers" Ketteler said

that they were dangerous to the worker, since they were "without conscience and without religion and concerned themselves only with the satisfaction of their egoism."³¹ The basic principles of the modern, political economy placed the man-power of the workingclass in opposition to the financial and economic power of the capitalists. The strength of the workingclass was isolated; the financial powers in opposition to the workingclass was highly centralized. The division into noisy, separated workers, where everyone was powerless, was the condition of the workingclass. On the other hand the financial powers were undivided into reasonable capital factions, but, on the contrary, were united into great and overpowering groups.³²

If nothing were done to alleviate the ills of capitalism, Ketteler predicted that the workingman would lose, in his own eyes as well as in the view of society, his humanity, his religion, his political entity, his wisdom, and his culture. In their place he would become merely an individual number.³³ The Bishop firmly believed that this view of the workingman opposed the natural law and divine providence. He recognized the tendency of modern mass production to overlook the value of the indi-

³¹ ibid.

³² ibid.

³³ Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 53.

vidual worker--the tendency to look upon the workingclass as an impersonal mass. Thus, as he declared to the Bishops Conference at Fulda, the workingman felt more and more a part of a machine.³⁴ the worker became hardhearted and his spirit was killed. At the same time Ketteler made it clear that he did not oppose mechanization. The Bishop desired a victory of the spiritual over the material; a utilization of the machine to free man from need and want, for the machine must serve all mankind.³⁵ The machine must not enslave the workingclass.

Just Wages

Ketteler pointed out that, as he saw it, prices on products were set upon the basis of the costs of the equipment and of the raw materials used for production. Ketteler did not deny that the laws of supply and demand played a part in the regulation of the price of the product. However, he emphasized that the price of the product should also include a favorable cost for labor, since the laborer "is worthy of his hire."³⁶ The workingman possessed a right to a suitable return on the product which he produced. The workingman had a right to a suitable life as a free

³⁴Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 20.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 25.

man in a free society.³⁷ Only in this manner could the workingman develop his full personality, which was his God-given right.

One of Ketteler's greatest fears was that the modern workingman did not possess the ability to develop his personality; that under the system of capitalism, as practiced in his era, society considered the workingman less and less as a person. "The workingman," he wrote, "is a human being, as I am, with a soul, a body and a heart."³⁸ The worker accomplished his economy through his own labor as a man in the service of society.³⁹ It was a duty of society to present the possibility to the workingman to fulfill his purpose in life. Ketteler argued that this would make the workingman happier, since he could work willingly in order to attain his purpose as a man. That the workingman retain his self-respect was the correct procedure. The Bishop of Mainz feared the machine age, for it possessed the possibility of the destruction of the ideal for man. The machine age might eventually look upon the worker as a part of the machine. He stressed that acknowledgment of the intellectual and volitional essence of the workingman was absolutely necessary. He declared that the pillar of

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

any society was the acknowledgment of the value of the human personality.⁴⁰ Modern society built upon the false premise that labor was strictly a commodity which was bought and sold at will. In a speech at the Fulda Conference of German Bishops, Ketteler characterized this attitude as "the slavemarket of our liberal Europe."⁴¹

The Economic Instability of the Worker

In the modern economic system Ketteler recognized, as Lassalle did, a deep tragedy in the conditions of the workingclass. He considered it a deeper tragedy that society seemed unconcerned about these conditions. For him the "economic laws" of the classical economists chained the workingman, from which the workingman could not free himself without assistance. For Ketteler the stigma was this: that the destiny of the workingman possessed no objective in the modern epoch and that a spiritual revival was necessary to establish the rightful status of the workingman in society. He wrote that the worker lacked the hope of elevating himself without assistance.⁴² To the bishops assembled at Fulda he declared that the workingman did not even possess guarantees for the security of

⁴⁰Ibid., 17.

⁴¹Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 11.

⁴²Ibid., 7.

his "painful existence."⁴³ He argued that "by recessions in business, by sickness and accidents, by the weakness of old age, the workingman is left without wages and is a lost man."⁴⁴ The ordinary man was able to carry many burdens and to suffer much, if he could foresee its end either with him or his children. But Ketteler held that, if nothing were done, the workingman would not even possess that consolation, for his children would have the same type of life as he did. Therefore, "the hopelessness for the betterment of his plight, the uncertainty of the future, and the helplessness in his isolated position robs him [the workingman] of every manly courage."⁴⁵ What was the result? "All self-confidence and security leaves him, and the workingman becomes filled with bitterness and hatred."⁴⁶ If this condition persisted, "it will destroy all humanity in the workingman."⁴⁷

The Church and the Worker

Ketteler argued at length before the assembled German Catholic bishops in 1869 that concern for the workingclass was a right of the Church. Already in 1848 at

⁴³Ibid., 11.

⁴⁴Ibid., 12.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid.

the General Congress of the Catholic Associations of Germany he stated: "It will be conclusively shown that the Catholic Church in the final analysis is the institution to solve the social problems."⁴⁸ The difficulties of the workingman struck at the inner man and destroyed the moral fibre which humanized a man. Since she dealt with the inner man, the spiritual man, the social welfare of the workingclass was a moral obligation of the Church.

The Value of the Worker

It was Ketteler's conviction that all the difficulties of the workingman led to the murder of his spiritual elements and completely dulled him to the beauties of life as well as the potentialities and purposes of life. Bishop Ketteler believed that the pressures upon the worker were entirely unnecessary and could be eliminated. The causes of the emotional depression of the laborer necessitated removal;⁴⁹ his personality recognized;⁵⁰ the values of his strength weighed;⁵¹ and his body no longer considered a piece of machinery.⁵²

⁴⁸Sermon to the Generalversammlung der katholischen Vereine Deutschlands, Mainz, October, 1848.

⁴⁹Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 17.

⁵⁰PfUlf, op. cit., III, 110.

⁵¹Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 8.

⁵²Ibid.

Since Christ exemplified by word and deed the value of one individual, Ketteler placed a high value upon a man. As Christ loved the poor, so Ketteler tried to love the poor. The reasons for the recognition of the personal value of each workingman lay in this faith of Ketteler.

But since Ketteler was a Thomist, he was also convinced philosophically of the inherent value of each human being as an intelligent and volitional being.⁵³ In his sociology Ketteler thought it absolutely necessary that society solve its problems in order that each member have the least hindrance toward the fulfillment of his potential. For the Bishop this was no mere dream, for he believed that this objective could be reached although imperfectly. Because of the value of each individual the attempt was imperative.⁵⁴ These were the basic concepts which he expressed throughout his booklet, Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum. This was also the basis of private property, which was necessary for man's fulfillment.

Private Property

Ketteler began his career as a social reformer in

⁵³Aquinas, Summa Theologica, 1, 1, q.9, a3 to 5; 1, 1, q.113, a10; 1, 2, q.2, a1; 1, 2, q.4, a7; 1, 2, q.7; 1, 2, q.114, a10; also Chapter III of this thesis, pp. 68-74.

⁵⁴Die Sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 9-10.

1848. In the same year Ketteler was elected to the Frankfurt Parliament, where he spoke learnedly on the social question. In October, 1848, Ketteler addressed a general meeting of German Catholics at Mainz upon freedom and the duties of Catholics toward the social questions. This address served as an introduction to the six sermons on the social order which he preached two months later at the Mainz Cathedral. These sermons laid the basic framework of Ketteler's ideas on modern society and were published in a book in March, 1849, entitled Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart. The first chapters of this booklet dealt with the right of private property.

For the Bishop the right of private property was the cornerstone of the individual's freedom and its preservation, as well as the individual's means of fulfillment.⁵⁵ The entire exposition of the topic followed the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas, for Ketteler himself declared that: "We wish to elaborate upon and explain the right of private property based upon St. Thomas Aquinas who explained it six hundred years ago."⁵⁶

Natural law possessed the basic arguments: the nature of the individual person required private property

⁵⁵Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart, 35-37; also Die katholische Lehre vom Eigenthum, sermon delivered at the Mainz Cathedral, November 19, 1848, and part II on December 3, 1848.

⁵⁶Ibid., 35.

and the nature of the relationship between the individual and society necessitated it. Continuing the argument of Aquinas, Ketteler said that certain pillars supported a Christian society and one of these was the right of private property.⁵⁷

The fundamental principle was that "God is the true and absolute owner of all things" and He wishes to distribute it among all of His children."⁵⁸ Ketteler continued that God instilled into the very nature of man the right of private property.⁵⁹ Man was created a social being in order to mature and attain his purpose in life through society. Almost in terms of a modern psychologist, the Bishop emphasized again and again that a man possessed a natural desire and a natural need for security and belongingness. When an individual possessed property, he felt secure and ascertained that he belonged to the human race. This gave an individual a feeling of security, because in ownership he had equality with others. This enhanced his possibility for freedom. Since the very essence of Christianity was charity, the Christian man was obligated to assist others. But above this, Ketteler continued the argument of St. Thomas, man's very nature disposed him

⁵⁷Ibid., 36.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., 35-43.

to help his fellow man.⁶⁰ Man could only fulfill this natural desire through private ownership, for only then could he feel secure in the assistance which he gave others.⁶¹

Ketteler further argued that the Creator also meant for man to fulfill his material purposes in life. The Bishop concurred with Thomas Aquinas that it was irrational to consider man's present nature without the right and means to attain his purpose in life.⁶² Since man was a spiritual-material being, the only manner in which he attained his material ends was through the right of private property.⁶³

Ketteler argued that private ownership was necessary to establish and to support a family. To establish a family was a natural right of every individual man and woman. But every domestic establishment needed security in order to attain its purpose, to educate children, to alleviate family discord, and to provide for future independence.

Bishop Ketteler had a happy family life in his youth and with the Thomists believed that a close-knit family was the basic unit of society. Frequently throughout his works

⁶⁰Supra pp. 119-120, fn. 15 of this chapter.

⁶¹Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart, 39 and 57.

⁶²Ibid., 38.

⁶³Ibid., 39.

he referred to the Christian family and its value to the individual and to society.⁶⁴ The family was important in his social system, for he devoted the fifth sermon (or chapter) Die katholische Lehre von der Ehe und Familie of Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart to it.⁶⁵ He issued several pastoral letters on the same topic. Some of his solutions to problems of modern society were based upon his ideal family, e. g. women and children laborers.

The Bishop also considered the right of private property necessary for peace and progress in society. Socialism, he said, was incorrect because it advocated the nationalization of all property. In practical terms, Ketteler advised that this solved nothing, for disputes would arise concerning the control and distribution of goods. Not every individual could give the same benefits to the common welfare; each worker could not provide the same energy for the production of goods. The great emphasis of the Bishop was that the personal interest of the individual worker was necessary to produce the best work and to insure progress and efficiency.⁶⁶

Society by its very nature was a diversified

⁶⁴Ibid., 95-107; Pflichten der Eltern, entire pamphlet; Sermons: Die Christliche Idee von der Ehe und der Familie über die gemischten Ehen.

⁶⁵Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart, 95-107.

⁶⁶Ibid., 46.

organism. Its goal was the cooperation of its members for the attainment of their existential purposes by virtue of self-responsibility. The individuals of society worked for self and one another, not for a government which equally distributed the sum total of production.⁶⁷ A social structure which was based upon Socialism destroyed freedom completely, because it demanded an absolute government. It destroyed equality, since those in government wielded a new type of absolutism. This kind of absolutism would be more firmly entrenched in the old type, since its grasp over the masses was not only political but economic and social. As long as law protected the right of each citizen to own property, he possessed a far better chance of resisting the absolutism of political authority. The group which controlled the economy of a country, in the form of all property, necessarily controlled the political life of that country. History, Ketteler concluded, proved that private property tended toward the distribution of political power in a society.⁶⁸

The goods of the earth were to serve all men for their utilization in the fulfillment of their existence upon the earth.⁶⁹ Ketteler saw the danger in Germany that

⁶⁷Ibid., 53.

⁶⁸Ibid., 52.

⁶⁹Ibid., 47.

the financial class would dominate the country. This was a complete violation of justice and charity according to Bishop Ketteler. This was one of the reasons for his strong opposition to the German National Liberal Party, since Ketteler saw it as a political party which strove merely to protect its own economic interests.

Bishop Ketteler seemed to agree that the Socialists possessed the ideal final objective, but he entirely disagreed with their methods. Socialism, he maintained, relegated the individual into the background and made society absolute. For Ketteler, as a Catholic and as a Thomist, an interplay of rights and duties existed between society and the individual.⁷⁰ Society was obliged to assist the individual and was not imposed upon the individual. Society was established for the welfare of each person, and not the individual for society. For Ketteler all were bound in justice to seek the common welfare.⁷¹

The Bishop did not believe in the absolute right of private ownership. Duties curtailed this right, for in Thomistic tradition he held that every right entailed a duty. Regarding private property the general duty of the individual owner was to promote the common welfare. Thus, one who possessed goods and property had to assist, as far

⁷⁰Ibid., 48-49.

⁷¹Ibid., 51-55.

as possible, those who were in need. Ketteler presented his mother as an example of one who gave assistance to the poor, and frequently he preached to his people of the necessity of charity in the form of almsdeeds.⁷²

Over and above the duty of assistance to the poor for the common welfare, Ketteler believed in the nationalization of certain enterprises to promote the common welfare. Thus, he recommended the nationalization of the railroads in Germany for the better welfare of all German citizens.⁷³ The general public possessed the right, he argued, of convenience of travel. There was also a political reason which Ketteler brought forward. He believed that the nationalization of railroads assisted the unification of Germany. It also assisted in giving freedom of movement to the general public of Germany, since government-owned railroads should be an enterprise of public service, not profit.

Women Laborers and Child Laborers

Bishop Ketteler's deep respect for family life and for the human person permeated his regard for women workers and child laborers. Again Ketteler based his argument upon the natural law. The Bishop declared that natural law

⁷²Ibid., 60-63; Der Armuth Jesu, sermon delivered on Christmas, 1849, and Christmas, 1876.

⁷³Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, IV (all of the chapter).

completely forbade the performance of industrial labor by women and children.⁷⁴ For, he argued, that this manifested no regard for the human person, when factory and mine owners employed women and child workers in order to obtain maximum profits.⁷⁵ Ketteler vigorously opposed the employment of a wife or mother. He wrote that:

A wife, who has become a laborer, is no longer a wife; she no longer leads an obscure, protected and proper life. . . . A family life which is not only pleasing to a wife but also very fortunate for the family is the pillar for a Christian society.⁷⁶

As early as 1867 Ketteler took this position in articles written for the Mainzer Journal.⁷⁷ He definitely felt that the home was the place for a woman.

He remained rather obstinate in this viewpoint, for Ketteler felt that women laborers fostered a moral decline in the world of women. Women workers were also an indictment of the economic order for he was convinced that a workingman's family should support itself without the necessity of women wage earners. Ketteler strove for the rehabilitation of womanhood to her dignity at least by an adjustment of the environment in which the woman laborer worked in order to safeguard her feminine individuality.

⁷⁴Hirtenbrief Über die christliche Arbeit, 4.

⁷⁵Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit, 4.

⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷Mainzer Journal, Nos. 284, 285, 287, and 288 (1867).

He also felt that women should possess a deep sense of duty toward the family.⁷⁸

In a pastoral letter Ketteler condemned the practice of women laborers, especially young girls. In these young girls the Bishop saw potential mothers and the soul of a family. The high purpose of the feminine disposition in society was precisely fundamental in the entire natural gift of the wife. According to Ketteler this primary disposition was ordered in the secondary duties of life. But the modern way of society revolted against this, for the fatal economic practice of harnessing the woman in the same manner as man actually was widespread in industry.⁷⁹

Bishop Ketteler saw in every girl a potential mother and in every woman the soul of a family. He maintained that this purpose constituted the entire personality of the woman. In women factory laborers Ketteler saw an imposition upon their purpose in life, and this was a violation of the natural law. Therefore, the Bishop reasoned that it was a moral issue. He wrote that it was easy to adopt immorality and impudence to the factory system.⁸⁰ In his program for German Catholics Ketteler pointed out that "through statistics it is a well estab-

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Hirtenbrief über die christliche Arbeit, 5.

⁸⁰Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit, 6.

lished fact, that in all instances where women work in factories, the death rate among infants is high because of lack of attention and care."⁸¹ He concluded that this inhuman situation approached murder.

Ketteler considered child labor more irrational than women workers and wrote against the practice in strong terms. He maintained that "industrial labor for children is the most horrible thing in our time."⁸² He continued that his heart ached with love for the souls of these children; and he demanded that religion with its love for children take the initiative to insist that child labor was outlawed.

In the periodical Katholik in 1839 Archbishop von Rouen had written an article, which Bishop Ketteler quoted: "What is the lot of these children? Open your eyes and see!"⁸³ With Rouen's words Ketteler warned that parents and masters would certainly be punished for the use and harsh treatment of child laborers. He reiterated Archbishop Rouen's demand for the enactment and strict enforcement of laws to protect children from such a "disaster."⁸⁴

⁸¹Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 91.

⁸²Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit, 22.

⁸³Katholik, Vol. 71 (1839), 21.

⁸⁴Ibid., and used by Ketteler in Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit, 23.

Ketteler always led in proposing legislation against woman and child labor and the Center party adopted these suggestions. Not only did the Bishop seek legal means to stop this practice, but in his own diocese of Mainz he personally visited industrialists in an attempt to convince them to stop the practice. Through pastoral letters Ketteler pleaded with Catholic parents not to permit their children to work in industry. The Bishop attempted to obtain moral action and leadership against this practice on the part of the Fulda Conference of Bishops. He devoted much space in his report to the conference, Die sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, in which he pleaded with the bishops to take action.

Shorter Work Hours

The ultimate objective of Ketteler was the humanization of industrial practices. Thus, his arguments for a shorter work-day and a shorter work-week fall into the same category as his arguments against woman and child labor. The Bishop argued that the long work hours, then in practice, endangered the health of the laboring man. He wrote that the laboring man possessed the right to oppose strenuously this practice and to unite in order to alleviate this immoral procedure of the financial interests.⁸⁵ Here again the Center party adopted his suggested

⁸⁵Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 36.

legislative program.

The long work-week not only endangered the health of the workingman, but according to Ketteler it violated one of the fundamental rights of the worker as a man. Long work hours prevented the laborer from enjoying life as a human being, and he repeated that the workingman was not a machine. Even a machine could not operate continuously. Long work hours prevented the laborer from enjoying the cultural, educational, and moral values in society. In an emphatic manner he wrote that:

. . . work is an essential part of the personality of a man. For this reason it must be protected in a civilized state by laws. Where this is not the case, where work is approached as a commodity, where work is exploited by capitalism because of egoism, the laborer is slowly murdered . . . it is a form of barbarity.⁸⁶

Since Ketteler saw no other means available in 1869 to curtail this evil, he suggested that the Fulda Bishops Conference give moral support at least for: "laws concerning shorter work hours and Sunday rest."⁸⁷

The third commandment of God was not the only basis for Ketteler's argument against Sunday work. He wrote that: "Sunday rest is not only a divine law but also a natural law. It is in the same category as nightly rest and preserves the health and strength of the workingman."⁸⁸

⁸⁶Mainzer Journal, No. 287 (1867), 3.

⁸⁷Die sozial-Karitative Fürsorge der Kirche für die Arbeiterschaft, 9.

⁸⁸Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 93.

The Just Wage and Human Values

Ketteler's arguments against woman and child labor and against long work hours were based upon his sense of morality. So were his arguments and recommendations for a just wage. Here he approached the problem in a practical manner. In the appendix to Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, Ketteler showed the statistics which he gathered on wages and the cost of living for German, British, and French workers. In his arguments for a just wage Ketteler agreed with Lassalle that the worker should share in his product.⁸⁹ However, in his arguments the Bishop utilized natural law more than did Lassalle.

In agreement with Lassalle Ketteler maintained that in his day the only law applied to wages was the law of supply and demand. Wages were regarded as any other commodity which production demanded. Since, in most cases, the supply of labor was greater than the demand, "the workingman's present wages cannot even purchase the necessities of life."⁹⁰ Thus, "the workingman cannot elevate his position in life above that of mere existence with the result that he is despondent and loses all confidence in life."⁹¹

⁸⁹Lenhart, op. cit., 85.

⁹⁰Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 16.

⁹¹Ibid.; and Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 85.

The workingman was not merely a commodity; he was a person and a member of society. The preservation of life was a duty of every individual. Therefore, each individual had the right to procure the requirements for existence; and the workingman accomplished this only by work and wages. These wages had to procure more than the necessities of life--those necessary for mere existence. The natural laws of justice demanded a reasonable and frugal comfort in the life of the workingman.⁹² Therefore, Ketteler argued that other norms were necessary to regulate wages than were utilized to calculate the value of a machine.⁹³ The Bishop demanded that the workingclass have at least the ability to acquire, what he termed, "Kulturminimum,"⁹⁴ which included the right of the workingman to live a happy, healthy, and worthwhile life,⁹⁵ to establish and educate a family and to possess security in old age and from accidents.⁹⁶ All these were rights of the workingman.⁹⁷

⁹²Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 30.

⁹³Ibid., 25.

⁹⁴Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben im Verhältnis zur Religion und Sittlichkeit, 24.

⁹⁵Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, 13.

⁹⁶Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 20-23.

⁹⁷Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, all of Chapter IV.

Christianity reinforced all the arguments from natural law. In the natural order justice was the bond of society, and Christianity presented western civilization with another bond, the law of charity. Bishop Ketteler frequently referred to this concept of St. Thomas Aquinas and explicitly applied it to the problem of wages.⁹⁸

Right of Workingmen's Associations⁹⁹

Ketteler agreed with Lassalle that the worker had a right to organize in order to obtain a just wage and the adjustment of other grievances. As a friend of the workingman, Ketteler could not avoid recognition of this incalculable need. This included co-operatives as well as trade unions, which were the only means which the workingman had to help himself. According to the Bishop, an individual worker could not conquer the economic weaknesses of his position. "Isolation," he wrote, "is a weakness. The individual workingman is weak and I do not mean the child laborer and the workingwoman but also the workingman."¹⁰⁰ Ketteler declared that the Prussian law of July 4, 1868, which gave workingmen the right of association, was "a small beginning to free the laborer from a desperate isolation to which the economic legislation of the modern

⁹⁸Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 9.

⁹⁹Golo Mann, Deutsche Geschichte (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag, 1960), 269.

¹⁰⁰Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 86.

state transfers him."¹⁰¹ The strength of unions was the only practical and real way to help the worker's position.

A natural and basic law of humanity and Christianity was the basis for workingmen's associations. Everyone should encourage these in support of the worker. He wrote that: "it would be a grave mistake, if we held ourselves aloof from this endeavor."¹⁰² The Bishop emphasized this effort was most necessary for Christian workers, so that the multitude of the workingmen would not remain as "prey to the men who are strangers to Christianity."¹⁰³

Co-operatives¹⁰⁴

Ketteler used the identical arguments for co-operatives which he used for unions. He firmly believed that co-operatives were one of the better means through which the workingman helped himself. Ketteler maintained that the co-operative system was based upon the divine order and was essentially Christian, even if men did not adhere "to God's will or violate it." He continued that the co-operative system was not only just, and worthy of the support of the Roman Catholic Church, but that Christianity alone possessed the strength among social institutions

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 129.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Pfulf, op. cit., II, 183-201.

which was necessary for the success and the prosperity of co-operatives. The reason for his position was Christianity's high evaluation of the individual person. Co-operatives had to have a strong spiritual bond, which Christianity alone provided.¹⁰⁵ He elaborated upon his argument that:

A more welcome piece of advice and a higher thought on man's spirituality does not exist than the commandment: love your neighbor as you love yourself; or in the words of the golden rule: do unto others as you wish them to do unto you. The entire teaching of Christianity is merely a clarification of this commandment. . . . This commandment must be the basic Christian principle which governs every co-operative system and the system must be permeated with this spirit.¹⁰⁶

It was just as necessary for Ketteler that workingmen unite for their material needs as for their moral strength. Since the Bishop firmly believed this, his only alternative was to advocate both co-operatives and unions. He praised Kolping's efforts to organize the Catholic workingman into unions.¹⁰⁷

Trade Unions

In the outline of an unpublished book which Ketteler was preparing in the year of his death, 1877, he showed concern about the position of the Christian working-

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 130-33.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 134.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 136-38.

man in the workingclass movement. In notes for the book he wrote that:

In trade unions a kernel is found, which at least shows the way in which a universal organization may come into existence. In this is also found the possibility of a workingman's organization which can be formed among the different occupations. Over the local trade unions there should be a district union. On the local level the various trades may be separated; but on the district level all unions should work together. True, there is a danger that this closely-knit association could be the nucleus of revolutionary activities. If, however, the leaders of the district were limited in their powers and were forbidden to become involved in politics, this danger would be greatly alleviated.¹⁰⁸

Already in 1865 Bishop von Ketteler had clearly defined the objective which trade unions and co-operatives should fulfill:¹⁰⁹

1. Co-operatives should make the workingman depend upon himself, but without the exclusion of reasonable support from the state.
2. It was necessary for all workingmen to belong to an organization.
3. Trade unions must have a workable constitution.
4. The workingman had the right to choose his work and the trade union to which he wished to join.
5. The trade union should protect its members materially and morally in the sense of co-operative independence.

The workingman needed real freedom, since "it were better to eat merely potatoes and clothe oneself with animal skins

¹⁰⁸ Pfulf, op. cit., III, 300.

¹⁰⁹ ibid., 299-302.

and possess freedom than to have all the progress of industry and be a slave."¹¹⁰ Therefore, trade unions had to foster freedom for the workingclass, for "as long as a man has freedom to exercise his rights, even though he is poor, he is still a man."¹¹¹

The chief dangers to trade unionism, which Ketteler perceived, were liberalism, communism, and atheism. Liberalism was a danger because it was controlled by the financial groups who had no other interest in the workingman than exploitation. Communism took away the workingman's independence and private property was necessary for independence. Atheism was a danger because a strong and just unity needed Christian charity.

In order to guard against these dangers Christianity, but not necessarily Catholicism, was basic for trade unions. In the concluding remark in Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum Ketteler wrote that: "Everything, which I have written here, I have not based only upon Catholicism but upon the judgment of those who have the welfare of the workingclass at heart and who believe in Christ, the Son of God."¹¹²

¹¹⁰Ibid., 302.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum, 160.

Ketteler and Lassalle

There was one exception to Bishop von Ketteler's condemnation of Socialist leadership, and this was Ferdinand Lassalle. Catholic writers recognized the importance of Lassalle's principle that German laborers should become conscious of their historical role and organize themselves into an independent political party. Catholic leaders recognized his vigorous assault upon economic liberalism with delight. "Bishop von Ketteler openly acknowledges his indebtedness to the theories of Lassalle."¹¹³ Joseph Edmund Jörg, the editor of the Historisch-Politische Blätter, wrote almost in the same frame of mind as Ketteler:

This man [Lassalle] never for a moment stood on a Christian foundation but . . . he illuminated the darkest depths of modern cultural history with the lightning strokes of his spirit and often spoke a language that was not unworthy of a Christian seer and social philosopher. . . . No one can ignore him, no one can dispute his fame to have been one of the greatest geniuses of the century.¹¹⁴

Bishop Wilhelm von Ketteler wrote Lassalle but did not sign the letter. He wrote: "I sent this letter anonymously and congratulate your warm interest for the working-class. . . . My position which I have in life makes it impossible to state my name."¹¹⁵ To this Lassalle replied on January 21, 1864: "Is your position so well-disposed

¹¹³Koppel S. Pinson, Modern Germany (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), 203 and 594.

¹¹⁴As quoted in Pinson, op. cit., 594.

¹¹⁵PfÜlf, op. cit., II, 183 ff.

that, whatever position you take, always redounds to your rank."¹¹⁶ Lassalle knew the author of the letter.

Many fables arose concerning the relationship of Bishop Ketteler and Lassalle after the latter's death. An article in the Nationalzeitung (No. 54, 1873) accused Ketteler of being a more shameless and dangerous demagogue than Lassalle. It also accused Ketteler of having baptized Lassalle and before Lassalle's death of having secretly married Lassalle to Fräulein von Doenniges. Ketteler replied to these statements that he had never met Lassalle, had never spoken to Lassalle, and, indeed, never baptized Lassalle.¹¹⁷

Lassalle's Labor Unions and Ketteler's Thought

The Catholic workers of Aachen inquired of Bishop Ketteler whether they could join the Labor Unions founded by Lassalle. Ketteler began his reply with a recommendation that they investigate the principles of the union they wished to join as well as the union leaders themselves; and then take this information to their own bishop for a decision. Their own bishop could then intelligently decide whether they could join the respective union and still remain practicing Catholics. However, Bishop Ketteler stated that he conveyed his personal ideas concerning the

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷Ibid., III, 260 ff.

Lassallian Labor Unions, so that they might use his letter as a basis for their own investigation.

The socialism of Lassalle had several tenets with which Ketteler agreed. These were a just wage, shorter hours, and the right of a universal, direct suffrage. Ketteler especially emphasized that he also agreed with the right of the workingmen to unite into unions and to apply political pressure in order to obtain their rights. Then the workingmen could use their political power to force the state to correct the injustices against their own class.

Ketteler then attacked the Social Democrats for their stand upon religion. He stated that he believed that Lassalle himself was not an enemy of Christianity or Catholicism. "Certainly," the Bishop wrote, "he [Lassalle] took a position sometimes far from Christianity, but he was not an enemy of it." Ketteler attacked an article in Der Sozialdemokrat (No. 95) which accused the Habsburgs of being under the influence of the "cult of Jesuitism" to such an extent that the Jesuits symbolized the Habsburg states. Ketteler wrote that this showed the anti-Catholic attitude of many of Lassalle's followers. It further showed, he wrote, that the German union of workingmen was in great danger. The danger consisted, not in a true interest in the welfare of the German workingman through combat with the capitalist powers, such as Lassalle himself had, but in a

"certain fanaticism for disbelief in religion." In this respect Bishop Ketteler wrote that Der Sozialdemokrat should not call itself the organ of the Social Democratic Labor Party but the organ of a power-hungry, fanatical, and irreligious sect.

The Bishop chastized a certain Herr Schmelzer who compared Lassalle and Luther to Jesus Christ in a speech to a gathering of workingmen at Elberfeld. The idea was that Luther and Lassalle fought for the common people, as Christ had done. This comparison provoked Ketteler and most of this letter to the Catholic workingmen of Aachen dealt with this statement. Ketteler's conclusion about this simile was that this definitely signified that the leaders of the Social Democratic Labor Party did not wish Catholic workingmen to join their unions. However, the Bishop of Mainz concluded that he did not deny Herr Schmelzer the right to such an opinion, but such an opinion was not conducive to the formation of a universal, national labor union, which the German workingmen had a right to join.

He admonished the Aachen Catholic workingmen to study his booklet, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum. Ketteler reiterated that:

The egoism of capitalism, or in other words the power of money in the hands of unbelieving, selfish men, is also the means to suppress our workingclasses and to make them a machine in the power of capitalists. This egoism is not only found in capitalists but in all men, who are not converted to the way of Christ, and is also present in the leaders of the

German Workingmen's Union and the Social Democrats.
 If men could become good through scolding others,
 then the Social Democrats would be the best.¹¹⁸

Therefore, Ketteler concluded that there was essentially no difference between the leaders of the Social Democrats and the leaders of the capitalist groups. In order to organize successfully the German workingmen, in order to attain the common welfare, and in order to prevent a change of absolute power from one group to another, demanded justice and Christian charity. On this note Bishop Ketteler concluded his letter.

Conclusion

Bishop Ketteler left a lot unsaid in order to touch upon the major social problems of his time and to awaken Catholics to the major ills of capitalism. He did not consider all of the ills of capitalism, but only those which he considered the more important. The Bishop popularized, at least among the German Catholics, the Thomistic arguments for private property and, as a Catholic, reiterated that the Christian family was the cornerstone of a Christian society. Ketteler laid down the broad Christian principles through which any society progressed, which were the infinite value of a human being, and the high value of justice and charity in human relations. According to Ketteler, in the application of these principles society would eventually

¹¹⁸Mundwiler, op. cit., 140.

progress for the welfare of all.

In the more practical aspects Ketteler called for co-operatives, unions, a just wage, shorter working hours, the prohibition of work on Sundays, and the prohibition of women and children workers. He was a Christian humanitarian. Ketteler was somewhat of an idealist, since his objective was a society in which most of the people were happy and in which the majority of their needs were satisfied.

The means to attain these desired ends changed during Ketteler's lifetime. At first he thought that a mere education of the elite could bring about renewal; then Ketteler elicited the Church as the vehicle. Without completely dropping these ideas, Ketteler added the idea of political pressure in which case the state directed some of the reforms.

The social philosophy of Ketteler at the time of its promulgation was something new for Catholics. Today it is not because of the efforts of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI. Probably this overshadows Ketteler's real worth to the development of Catholic social thought. But Bishop Ketteler definitely was the leader of Catholic social-politics in Germany. If he had done nothing more than make German Catholics aware of social problems and their duty to assist in their solution, Ketteler would remain the outstanding German Catholic leader of the nineteenth century.

Ketteler was filled with a personal love of the workingman and this he passed on to those who came in contact with him.¹¹⁹ This Ketteler attempted to convey to German Catholics through their associations and through his work for the Center party.

¹¹⁹Bachem, op. cit., 11, 57-58.

CHAPTER V

BISHOP KETTELER AND THE CENTER PARTY

Throughout his public career Bishop Ketteler was not only a theorist on political and social questions, but also an activist in the promotion of his theories. By 1864 Ketteler was recognized as the German Catholic political leader "to whom all of Catholic Germany looked with respect."¹ It seems that even Bismark realized this, for he states in his memoirs that in 1865 he wished to nominate Ketteler for the archdiocese of Posen-Gnesen² and Karl Bachem adds that Bismark wished to have Bishop Ketteler designated Primate of Germany in 1867 as a reward for his patriotism and as a safeguard for the patriotism of Prussian Catholics.³

At no time did Bishop Ketteler maintain that his position in politics and sociology was the only correct one. As long as the position of anyone was in conformity

¹Bachem, op. cit., III, 2-3.

²Fürst von Bismark, Gedanken und Erinnerungen, II, 125.

³Bachem, op. cit., III, 180.

with the fundamental principles of Christianity, he agreed that this might be the framework of any correct political system. Above all, Ketteler believed in political action in order to defend justice, rights, the common welfare, and Christianity, especially Roman Catholicism. In order to accomplish these ends Bishop Ketteler continually encouraged competent Catholic laymen to follow a political career. Bachem states that, as a precursor of the Center party, Ketteler's work from 1848 to 1866 cannot receive enough prominence.⁴ "Although Bishop von Ketteler had no direct connection with the organization of the new faction [Center party], his influence pervaded it then and later."⁵ Another historian calls Ketteler the "founder of a political party based upon the Gospel."⁶

A Catholic Political Party

As early as the Frankfort Parliament the Bishop discussed the feasibility of a Catholic political party in correspondence with his two brothers, Wilderich and Richard. In a letter, written to Richard on July 12, 1848, he presented a positive argument for a Catholic political party: "I feel it necessary to form a political party so that Catholics will not be considered indifferent

⁴ibid., 7.

⁵Windell, op. cit., 284-85.

⁶Mann, op. cit., 415.

to German politics."⁷ However, in a letter to Wilderich a short time later the Bishop expressed doubts about the advisability of a strictly Catholic political party. Ketteler stated that these arose from his conviction that most Germans had deep prejudices about their religion. Ketteler did not believe in combining religion with politics, although he held that the framework of any political system should have Christian principles as its basis. Several years after this letter he stated in the Reichstag that the problem of religious differences should be excluded from politics.⁸

Only when it finally was apparent to Bishop Ketteler that the anti-Catholic tendencies of the National Liberal Party, the anti-Catholic attitudes of the governments of the various German principalities, and the indications of an anti-Catholic policy of the imperial government necessitated some kind of bulwark to safeguard the rights of German Catholics, did he recommend and foster the formation of a Catholic political party.⁹ Immediately prior to the convening of the first session of the Reichstag he wrote: "We Catholics will be as effective in the new German Empire as we are effectively and well-organized

⁷Cited in R8th, op. cit., 80.

⁸Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, IV, 480.

⁹Mann, op. cit., 415.

among ourselves."¹⁰ Ketteler explained what he meant by the statement, "effectively and well-organized," when he wrote that his ideal was a strong political party, organized in such a manner, that it could include all classes from a nobleman to a peasant. His conviction was that, if Catholics discussed their political viewpoint openly, they would be effective in the political world.

The Bishop of Mainz asked himself the question: What can a Catholic political party do under the present circumstances? His reply was that it could: (1) recognize evils and work "to root them out"; (2) guard against state absolutism; (3) safeguard the natural rights of social institutions as Church, family, and education; and (4) protect the freedom of the individual.¹¹

However, when Ketteler was convinced of the necessity of a Catholic political party, he recommended a platform so broad that Protestants could conscientiously join the party. He wrote that the program of the Catholic party should be such that "all Christians and all rational Germans can accept it and only modern German Liberals cannot."¹² His ideal was not realized until almost a century later, although at times a Protestant did join the Catholic party.

¹⁰Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 2.

¹¹Ibid., 60.

¹²Ibid., 62.

For example, a von Schierstedt, a Protestant, was a charter member of the Center party.¹³ Furthermore, when Ketteler resigned from the Reichstag, because of his episcopal duties, he supported a Protestant, Dr. Ludwig Schulz of Heidelberg, as his successor in the Reichstag.¹⁴ Dr. Schulz immediately joined the Centrists upon his arrival in Berlin.¹⁵

Time after time Ketteler reiterated that the Center party was for Protestants and Catholics.¹⁶ For this reason he praised those who were responsible for the title, Center, and was happy that the term, Catholic, was omitted from the title of the party.¹⁷ He invited Protestants to join the Center party in 1872 so that all Germans "may live together peacefully."¹⁸

If this was his ideal, why did Ketteler advocate a Catholic political party in 1870? His reply was: "Because at this time there still is too much animosity between Protestants and Catholics."¹⁹ But Ketteler added that he

¹³Bachem, op. cit., III, 134.

¹⁴Ibid., II, 69, and IV, 364.

¹⁵Pfaff, op. cit., III, 167.

¹⁶Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 17.

¹⁷Katholik, I (1871), 258.

¹⁸Die Zentrumsfraktion in ersten deutschen Reichstage, 34-35.

¹⁹Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 3.

sincerely hoped this animosity would disappear in the course of time.

The Center Party and German Catholics

Not all German Catholic politicians or Catholic political groups were members of the Center party after its organization. During the initial days of the Empire one of the more notable Catholic politicians, Prince Hohenlohe of Bavaria, was not a Centrist. The southern German Catholics did not join the Center party as a group. The reasons for this are not too apparent, but southern German Catholics still hesitated to trust the Prussians, whether Catholic or Protestant. Ketteler indicated this, for he warned Catholics of the other parts of Germany that they should not be misled by those "who tag Prussian Catholics as a group."²⁰ Ketteler strongly appealed to the southern Germans to join the Center in order that the freedom of the Church would be guaranteed by imperial laws.²¹ Ketteler especially attempted to convince the Catholic elements of Baden and Bavaria. Bachem believes that Bishop Ketteler wrote the book, Die Zentrumsfraktion in dem ersten deutschen Reichstage, in 1872 in order to define clearly the position of the Centrists and to defend that position in order to win the support of the southern

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Bachem, op. cit., III, 118.

German Catholics.²² The Baden Catholic deputies joined the Center in 1877, but the Bavarians did not until 1894 and broke that affiliation in 1920.

This problem of political unity among the Catholics of Germany was not confined to the Prussian Catholics and the southern German Catholics as groups. A sharp, often jarring divergence of political opinion appeared within the Center party, although the party initially comprised principally north Germans. An example of this strong variance of opinion was the break of Freiherr von Schorlemer-Alst and a few other Centrists with the party in 1884 over a program concerning agriculture. Schorlemer-Alst wanted the Center party to adopt officially his program for the German peasant. The fundamental points of his program were the establishment: (1) of savings and loan banks for the peasants; (2) of agricultural experiment stations; (3) of peasants' liability insurance; (4) of Boards of Arbitration; and (5) of a peasants' legal bureau. The Center party was unprepared to adopt such a proposed peasant's program.²³

Thus the question was: could this eclectic group, the Center party, formulate a unified political program? There was but one unifying element, Catholicism; one unifying purpose, the defense of the Catholic Church.²⁴ However,

²²Ibid., 158-59.

²³John J. Horgan, Great Catholic Laymen (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1905), 268.

²⁴Karl Buchheim, Geschichte der christlichen

German Catholics.²² The Baden Catholic deputies joined the Center in 1877, but the Bavarians did not until 1894 and broke that affiliation in 1920.

This problem of political unity among the Catholics of Germany was not confined to the Prussian Catholics and the southern German Catholics as groups. A sharp, often jarring divergence of political opinion appeared within the Center party, although the party initially comprised principally north Germans. An example of this strong variance of opinion was the break of Freiherr von Schorlemer-Alst and a few other Centrists with the party in 1884 over a program concerning agriculture. Schorlemer-Alst wanted the Center party to adopt officially his program for the German peasant. The fundamental points of his program were the establishment: (1) of savings and loan banks for the peasants; (2) of agricultural experiment stations; (3) of peasants' liability insurance; (4) of Boards of Arbitration; and (5) of a peasants' legal bureau. The Center party was unprepared to adopt such a proposed peasant's program.²³

Thus the question was: could this eclectic group, the Center party, formulate a unified political program? There was but one unifying element, Catholicism; one unifying purpose, the defense of the Catholic Church.²⁴ However,

²²Ibid., 158-59.

²³John J. Horgan, Great Catholic Laymen (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1905), 268.

²⁴Karl Buchheim, Geschichte der christlichen

this did not seem to be sufficient to unite all Catholics under the banner of the Center party. The old Catholic party of Prussia leaned toward liberalism. After the Syllabus of 1864 and the first Vatican Council (1869-70), the Catholics of the German Empire seemed to lean toward conservatism.

German liberalism of the 1860's and 70's moved from constitutionalism and progressivism toward secularism and anti-clericalism.²⁵ If one considers liberalism as constitutionalism and progressivism, then the program of Ketteler and the Center party appears as inclined toward liberalism. Ludwig Windthorst indicated this when he stated on April 27, 1871: "I have joined the Center Party, although I am conservative by nature."²⁶

Catholics from the various sections of Germany differed in their political tendencies. The Bavarian Catholics were more conservative and authoritarian, while those from the Rhine provinces and Westphalia were more liberal and progressive. This second region was influenced by the principles of the French Revolution and was closer to the source of western liberalism. Likewise, this region comprised the industrial area of Prussia where the Catholics of Prussia

Parteien in Deutschland (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1953), 88.

²⁵At least Ketteler thought this true. Cf. Chapter I, pp. 26-29.

²⁶Pinson, op. cit., 181.

had a minority status.

In Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche (1862) Ketteler noted the inclination of German Catholics toward reaction and conservatism. He wished to counteract this tendency and reminded Catholics that they must never disavow political agitation for freedom. He wrote that not only did Christianity possess a duty toward freedom, but it had to be truer to freedom than any other group.²⁷ In order for Catholics to accomplish this purpose, Bishop Ketteler presented a program in Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche: Entwurf zu einem politischen Programm.

The Center Party's General Program

Several of the tenets of the Center party were common principles of German Catholicism taken from Görres and the German Catholic Romanticists. Bishop Ketteler wrote about them and supported them, but so did every other Catholic leader of Germany. Professor F. J. Buss, a German Catholic publicist from Freiburg im Breisgau, in 1851 summarized Catholic politics.²⁸ The major points of Catholic politics in 1851 were that: (1) Catholicism strove for freedom, but a freedom limited by morality; (2) Catholicism desired order, not the order of a police state, but an order

²⁷Buchheim, Geschichte der christlichen Parteien in Deutschland, 162; Chapter I, p. 26, and Chapter III, pp. 99-101.

²⁸Bergsträsser, Der politische Katholismus (2 vols.; München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1921-23), 183-85.

of the institutions of family, church, school, and state; (3) Catholicism wished for decentralization of public administration, the easing of state burdens, and the granting of the most feasible amount of freedom to the people.

The concrete demands of Catholicism at the Frankfurt Parliament were: (1) the freedom and autonomy of the Church; (2) decentralization of governmental powers through federalism; and (3) freedom for religious education.²⁹ On March 4, 1848, the Katholik of Mainz proposed for the first time in Germany a Catholic political party in order to defend the Church from state interference and to obtain equal rights for all.³⁰ On April 30, a group of Catholics from Cologne published a list of objectives for their delegates at the Frankfurt Parliament:

- 1) a liberal constitution for Germany;
- 2) freedom of religion;
- 3) freedom for private schools;
- 4) freedom of speech, press, petition, assembly, association;
- 5) a constitutional monarchy;
- 6) popular representation;
- 7) right of initiative.³¹

The purpose of the older Prussian Catholic party (1852-66), founded by August and Peter Reichensperger and Hermann von Mallinckrodt, was to maintain the freedom of

²⁹Veit Valentin, 1848: Chapters in German History (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1965), 381-87.

³⁰Ludwig Bergsträsser, Studien zur Vorgeschichte des Zentrums (Tübingen: Mohr Verlag, 1910), 63.

³¹Bachem, op. cit., II, 24-27.

the Catholic Church from state interference through articles fifteen and eighteen of the Prussian constitution.

All three of these men had similar backgrounds and all three are important in the early days of the German Center party. All came from the Rhineland; Mallinckrodt, from Westphalia and the Reichensperger brothers from Cologne. All possessed degrees in law from the University of Berlin. Of the three, Mallinckrodt was the most conservative and the most devoted to the Catholic Church. The Reichensperger brothers championed religious freedom, a constitutional monarchy, and a direct, universal manhood suffrage. Mallinckrodt was pro-Austrian (Grossdeutsch) and desired a German confederation with a weak federal government. These three men, with Bishop Ketteler and his brother, Father Wilderich Ketteler, formed the Board of Directors of the Prussian Catholic party. This board formulated the policy of the party.³²

Other principles in which Ketteler did not directly influence the Centrists were opposition to the secularization of marriage and to Prussian militarism. Their Catholic faith influenced the Centrists on marriage as it had on education. Most of the Center party's membership came from

³²Hermann Cardauns, "August Reichensperger," The Catholic Encyclopedia, XII (1908), 723-24; Hermann Cardauns, "Peter Reichensperger," The Catholic Encyclopedia, XII (1908), 724; Klemens Löffler, "Hermann von Mallinckrodt," The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX (1908), 571.

territories annexed by Prussia; none was from the Junker class. All of them despised militarism.³³ All that Bishop Ketteler did regarding this nineteenth-century, German Catholic tradition was to restate it and encourage Catholics to retain it. His social program in Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866, Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, and other sources, were entirely new to Catholic political and social policy.

The Official Program of the Center Party

From the beginning the Centrists accepted the principles of nineteenth-century Catholic tradition as the cornerstone of their program. The original leadership of the party was primarily responsible for this broad and general program in order to entice Protestants and non-Prussian Catholics to join the new political party. Bishop Ketteler was not directly involved in this.

Except for these general principles, the National Center party permitted open discussion at party caucuses where majority rule determined the party's policy. Therefore, the third party statute is important in the organization, procedure, and program of the Centrists, for the legislation which the party proposed, voted for and against in the Reichstag tells more about the program of the Center party than do the various programs. Here the influence of

³³Buchheim, Ultramontanismus und Demokratie, 81.

Ketteler's ideas was dominant and the social legislative program and record of the Centrists followed the concepts of Ketteler, as "Christianity follows the ideas of the New Testament."³⁴

The adoption of a broad program and of the party's procedure is attested by the official program which the Center presented and recorded at the opening session of the Reichstag in late April, 1871:

Justice is the foundation of authority. The Center Party of the German Reichstag has adopted the following principles for its activities: (1) The character of the Reich should be a confederation. Accordingly we shall strive for a federal character of the Reich's constitution, for the self-determination and spontaneous operation of each state and no more of its sovereignty shall be taken away than is necessary for the welfare of the entire Reich. (2) We shall strive to strengthen the moral and material welfare of all classes; to work for political and religious freedom for all who belong to the Reich and especially to protect legally the rights of all religious groups. (3) This party will work for these fundamental principles above all other matters in discussions, debates, and considerations before the Reichstag.

The statutes adopted by the German Center party were:

- Preamble: All members have the freedom to speak for themselves and vote as they please.
1. A Board of Directors of 12 with a chairman and a secretary shall conduct the affairs of the Party. This board shall be elected.
 2. In regard to all party personnel a secret vote shall be taken, if any deputy requests this.
 3. Independent motions or interpolations must not be made without previous discussion with the Party, or approval of the Party. This approval was obtained from the Board of Directors, if it was impossible to await the next Party

³⁴Ibid., 155-68, the quote on p. 168.

caucus.³⁵

In this broad program the Centrists followed nineteenth-century German Catholic tradition. Bishop Ketteler may have strengthened them in this tradition, but did not directly influence them. The first chairman of the German Center party was Hermann von Mallinckrodt, the author of the Soester Program.³⁶

Hermann von Mallinckrodt was a very close friend of Father Wilderich von Ketteler, the brother of Bishop Ketteler. After 1866 Ketteler's book, Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866, was Mallinckrodt's political "bible."³⁷ Mallinckrodt was the originator of the Soester conferences and Father Wilderich Ketteler was a charter member of the conferences. Father Ketteler and Bishop Ketteler carried on regular correspondence on political and social matters throughout their lives. When Prussian Catholic leaders discussed the feasibility of a Catholic political party, Mallinckrodt brought the conclusions of the Soester conferences to Berlin. The Prussian Center party adopted this program for the Prussian Lower House election campaign in the autumn of 1870. This was several months after the Essen Program appeared.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Cf. Chapter II, pp. 56-57, on Soester Conferences.

³⁷PfUlf, op. cit., III, 249.

During these months it was still undecided whether the Generalversammlung Katholischenverein im Deutschland would become an integral part of the future Catholic political party. The Central Committee of the Catholic Associations of Germany prepared a political program, the Essen Program, to present to the next general assembly of the association and released it to the public on June 30, 1870. Bishop Ketteler was a member of the Central Committee.³⁸ Since the General Assembly in its autumn meeting decided on a separation from the future political party, the program was not voted upon. Therefore, this program was not the official program of the Center party. After this decision the Prussian Center adopted the Soester Program.

There is no relationship between the Soester and Essen Programs and the Mainz Program. The Mainz Program was the campaign program of Christoph Moufang, the rector of Ketteler's seminary in Mainz,³⁹ and after his election represented Mainz in the German Reichstag. In a campaign speech on March 2, 1871, in Mainz Moufang presented this program and stated that his program was Ketteler's program. Here is the reason for its prominence in the history of the Center party.

Historians do not agree on these programs of the

³⁸Buchheim, Ultramontanismus und Demokratie, 219.

³⁹Ibid., 220-21.

Center. The principal ones on this problem, Karl Bachem, Wolfgang Treue, and Ludwig Bergsträsser present all five: the Outlined Program of Ketteler (1867 and published in 1873 in book form with the Bishop's commentary); the Essen Program (June 30, 1870); the Soester Program (October 28, 1870); the Mainz Program (March 2, 1871); and the Reichstag Program (April 22, 1871). Wolfgang Treue maintains that the Essen and Mainz Programs were the official programs of the Center party, while Bergsträsser believes that the Soester Program was. This position seems to be incorrect, since the Prussian Center party, not the National, adopted the Soester Program and since the German Center presented the Reichstag Program at the opening session of the German Reichstag. Bachem argues that in the final analysis Ketteler's program was the Center's official program. Yet all of these authors agree that the Bishop was the major influence in the social program of the Center party.⁴⁰

The Centrist's Social Legislative Program

The leaders of the Catholic party attest to Ketteler's influence on the party's social program as does the Center's Reichstag record. When the news of Bishop Ketteler's death reached Berlin in July, 1877, Franz Hitze,

⁴⁰Wolfgang Treue, Deutsche Parteiprogramme, 1861-1954 (Göttingen: Musterschmidt Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1954), 56 ff.; Ludwig Bergsträsser, Der politische Katholismus (2 vols.; München: Kösel Verlag, 1921-23), II, 27 ff.; and Bachem, op. cit., III, 146 ff.

chairman of the party's Legislative Committee, stated in the Reichstag:

We will always revert to the constructive Catholic social and political system of Baron von Ketteler and constantly designate him as the one whom we thank for our social program. We will continue to build upon his program, which is our blueprint.⁴¹

In 1888 Ludwig von Windthorst, the leader of the Center party from 1872 to 1901, wrote in the preface to the fourth edition of Ketteler's book, Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum:

It is and it remains to our honor that it was a Catholic Church leader at this time . . . who planted the standard of a Christian social reform. Above all he is the learned teacher and pioneer of Catholic-social aspirations.⁴²

On March 19, 1877, Freiherr von Schorlemer-Alst in his arguments for the legal protection of women and child laborers said that he utilized Ketteler's arguments against women and child laborers verbatim.⁴³

Investigation of the legislative resolutions, voting record, and party activities concerning social problems shows that Bishop Ketteler permeated the Center party with his social ideals and suggestions. From the time that Ketteler summarized his ideas on politics and social legislation in 1873⁴⁴ with the publication of Die Katholiken im

⁴¹As quoted in Reinarz, op. cit., 18.

⁴²Wilhelm von Ketteler, Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum (4th ed.; Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1888), preface, i.

⁴³PfÜlf, op. cit., III, 189.

⁴⁴Ketteler outlined his program in 1867 and wrote

deutschen Reiche, "Catholics in their political activities during the next decades did much to bring the social attitude into the idea of the German state."⁴⁵ Ludwig Windthorst in a party caucus on November 26, 1873, stated: "I look upon the social problem as a serious matter and I believe that it is more significant to occupy ourselves with its solution than that we devote all of our time to Church and school politics."⁴⁶ In his opinion the welfare of the industrial workers had to be improved in order to weaken Socialism and Marxism among the workers. Great concern for the social welfare of the workingclasses was present in the Center party. On January 16, 1885, Freiherr von Hertling made this statement in the Reichstag:

The sickness and accident insurance acts are really a gratifying beginning but a long way from what it should be. It is most serious to be solicitous for the sick workers and workers suffering accidents but, we must also promptly deal with the discontent of the healthy workers. It should greatly concern us that the working man may follow his great vocation undisturbed. We have no fear that the social-democratic ideal will win. It will not actually win, since it goes against the very nature of man, as does the speculation of Karl Marx. But we must fear is the occasional rising of violent discontent.⁴⁷

On the same day Freiherr von Schorlemer-Alst said:

the book in 1870. It was published in 1873.

⁴⁵Treue, op. cit., 14; George Metlake, Christian Social Reform, trans. John Joseph Laux (Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1923), 12.

⁴⁶Bachem, op. cit., III, 330.

⁴⁷Ibid., IV, 105.

On May 17, 1884, I stated relative to this: Nova potentia crescit.⁴⁸ Concerning the interests and welfare of the workers I now state that everything is still to be done, if we really wish to alleviate their condition. If we continue to hinder their welfare, then they will become more embittered and tend toward socialism.⁴⁹

The State and Social Problems

Following the teachings of Bishop Ketteler,⁵⁰ the Center party held that the state had duties toward the solution of the social problems. The state had to insure that its laws and social institutions would promote and safeguard public well-being and private prosperity. The state had to practice moderation and justice in taxation. The duty of the rulers was to act in strict justice and equality toward every class. The state had the duty to protect the right of private property. Laws must not proceed further than was necessary to remedy an evil or to protect the common welfare. The state had to protect the interests of the workingclass and had the duty to regulate working conditions. Labor unions did not derive their right for existence from permission of the government, but from their very nature. To enter into an association of this kind was a natural right, which the government was bound to protect. On

⁴⁸Translated: "New power grows." Schorlemer-Alst referred to the growth of socialism.

⁴⁹Bachem, op. cit., IV, 105.

⁵⁰Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche, 30-35.

January 14, 1885, Freiherr von Hertling uttered the following statement in the Reichstag:

We do not regard social reforms as a favor but we regard them as a right. . . . Here, as in other matters, the laws and the strength of the state must protect rights.⁵¹

He concluded this statement by emphasizing that the workingman was not a machine but a human person and thus should be protected by the state.

Their general objective was to improve the economic position of the workingclass through the right of private property. Ketteler and the Center party maintained the right of private property against the position of the Socialists. Yet, these rights were limited by the common welfare. The right of private property did not include its indiscriminate use for exploitation which was detrimental to the common good.⁵²

The program of the Center party included the establishment of institutions for workers unable to work. Ketteler and the Centrists emphasized the Christian family and Christian marriage as the nucleus of a society in which workers were provided with a Christian culture.⁵³ Both pro-

⁵¹Ibid., 96.

⁵²Georges Goyau, "Ketteler," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VII (1908 ed.), 629-34; cf. Chapter IV of this thesis, pp. 123-24.

⁵³Cf. Chapter I of this thesis, pp. 34-38.

moted the idea of co-operatives among the workingclass without government subsidy.⁵⁴

In 1871 the Center party suggested that the child labor law, which had been passed by the Reichstag of the North German Confederation, should be incorporated into the laws of the German Empire.⁵⁵ This law forbade children under the age of 12 years to work in factories. Children from the ages of 12 to 14 were forbidden to work more than six hours per day; and those from 14 to 16 more than ten hours per day. Also children between the ages of 12 to 16 were forbidden to work on Sundays or at night. This suggestion was adopted as a law of the Empire by the Reichstag.⁵⁶

On March 19, 1877, Graf Ferdinand von Galen introduced the following suggestions in behalf of the Center party for consideration by the Reichstag:

1. This is presented for consideration at the next session of the Reichstag. It is a draft of a proposed law regarding changes in the industrial regulations of July 21, 1869, with the following points:
 - a) The effective protection of the spiritual life of all working people with Sunday, a day of rest.⁵⁷
 - b) The protection and improvement of the laboring class through the lifting of restrictions to exercise a trade; to regulate the relationship between the apprentice and

⁵⁴Goyau, loc. cit.

⁵⁵Cf. Chapter V, pp. 160-61.

⁵⁶Bachem, op. cit., IV, 101.

⁵⁷Cf. Chapter V, p. 163.

- journeyman to the master; to promote co-operatives.⁵⁸
- c) The extension of lawful rules for the protection of the person of the factory worker; to set up norms for factory rules; to forbid the hiring of young factory workers under the age of 14; to protect family life through the prohibition of women workers in factories.⁵⁹
 - d) The introduction of industrial arbitration courts with the cooperation of freely elected representatives of the workers.
 - e) To regulate further the rules concerning concession obligations of industry, especially the management of the restaurant and bar.
2. A revision of the laws referring to the freedom to live where one chooses, also laws referring to liabilities for damages, etc., of the law of July 7, 1871, in reference to the pursuance and suggestions concerning miners and industrial installations.

Graf von Galen concluded his lengthy motion with his reasons for the proposal:

The basic reason for the immediate solution of the social problems is the spirit of Christianity and its laws concerning the dignity of man. This dignity comes from God . . . and must be the underlying principle of the social order and the family.⁶⁰

In the discussions which followed this motion Windthorst stated on April 18:

One of the greatest errors of our epoch is the belief that masters and their workmen must necessarily be enemies. The true interests of the former can

⁵⁸Evidently the medieval guild system had not entirely disappeared in Germany. The guilds exercised very strict regulations for everyone who wished to enter a specific trade. Frequently restrictions kept apprentices and journeymen from becoming masters.

⁵⁹Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 153-54.

⁶⁰Bachem, op. cit., IV, 102-103; cf. Chapter IV, pp. 124-25.

only be maintained when they agree to the real needs of the latter, and both can only have common interests when they are on friendly terms. If both sides could only believe that their interests are really the same, then their differences would come to an end.⁶¹

In the next session the Reichstag failed to consider the suggestions of von Galen's motion.

In a discussion at a party caucus on February 27, 1879, Peter Reichensperger said:

I am of the opinion that in the concept of wages, not only should support for the topical moment of the worker be considered, but that the worker is able to plan his existence for the future.⁶²

The Center opposed the first accident insurance bill which the government proposed to the Reichstag in April of 1881. All workers who were in heavy industry and mining, and who received less than 2000 marks (about \$500 today) in wages per annum had to be insured. The entire structure was administered by a special Imperial Insurance Bureau. In the case of workers who earned less than 750 marks per annum, the government would pay one-third and the employers two-thirds of the premium. In the case of workers whose wages were between 750 and 2000 marks per annum, the employee and employer equally shared the payment of the premiums. The Center party voted against this measure because of the bureaucratic administration of the

⁶¹Horgan, op. cit., 267.

⁶²Bachem, op. cit., IV, 103.

insurance program, which violated their principle regarding centralization of power.⁶³

In November of 1881 Ludwig Windthorst appointed a special committee in the Center party which dealt exclusively with social legislation. Freiherr von Franckenstein was the chairman and Dr. Ernst Lieber and Canon Hitze were the members. The purpose of this committee was threefold:

1. To acquaint the members of the Center Party with all theoretical and practical background knowledge of social problems and social legislation.
2. To work with other political parties in attaining possible compromises.
3. To acquaint themselves with every facet of a proposed item of social legislation and to lead the discussion for the Centrists on the floor of the Reichstag.⁶⁴

In 1883 Bismark introduced a Sickness Insurance Act which made insurance obligatory for all wage earners except professional and white-collar workers. It was administered by the provincial legislatures and the insurance bureaus of each German state. The cost of the premium was shared by the employee and the employer--two-thirds by the employees and one-third by the employer. The principal benefits were: sickness pay for 13 weeks; maturity pay for six weeks after childbirth; free medical attendance, including free medicine during the illness, and in many cases free hospitalization and free care in convalescent homes; and funeral allowances

⁶³Sidney B. Fay, "Bismark's Welfare State," Current History, XVIII (1950), 2-7.

⁶⁴Bachem, op. cit., IV, 89.

in case of death.⁶⁵ Since the imperial government was entirely excluded from the administration of this act, the Center party voted for this insurance bill unanimously. The Centrists voted for the Accident Insurance Act of 1884 and in 1889 for the Old Age and Incapacity Insurance Act. As long as the central government was not the administrator of the benefits, the Center party voted for every welfare benefit for the workingclass.

In November of 1884 the Committee on Social Legislation of the Center party introduced a motion which forbade work on Sundays and holidays, and forbade children and women to work in factories. It also recommended that maximum work hours be set for younger workers. Bishop Ketteler had recommended this in 1871.⁶⁶ The motion failed to pass.⁶⁷

This short resume of the Center's activities on the social legislation of the German Empire indicates that the party had learned its lesson well from Bishop Ketteler. It also indicates that much of the social legislation which the Center proposed was almost verbatim from the propositions of Ketteler and that the remainder was in line with Ketteler's principles. Those items, not directly stated in the Bishop's program for German Catholics, were considered by

⁶⁵Fay, loc. cit.

⁶⁶Bachem, op. cit., IV, 105-14.

⁶⁷Cf. Chapter V, p. 192.

the Center in the light of Ketteler's general principles of government, state, society, and the individual.⁶⁸

A Ketteler-Windthorst Feud?

Very little is actually known about the personal relationship between Bishop von Ketteler and the Center party's leadership. Bachem says that at an early time in the political career of Hermann von Mallinckrodt he had the same viewpoint which Bishop Ketteler presented in his book, Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866, and which Ludwig Windthorst practically followed.⁶⁹

A statement in the memoirs of Prince Chlodwig von Hohenlohe-Schillingfürst cannot be overlooked. It indicates that a quarrel took place between Bishop Ketteler and Windthorst concerning the tactics which were to be used in the Reichstag by the Center during the Constitutional sessions on religious freedom. Windthorst wished to make a "deal" with the Conservatives. There is no evidence of any kind of a "deal." The following quotation was entered in Prince Hohenlohe's diary on April 30, 1871:

Among the Centrists Ketteler and Windthorst have had a quarrel and the Bishop has left. It is said that Ketteler accused Windthorst that he was misusing the Church question for political purposes. Windthorst could have answered the Bishop that he was using his ecclesiastical position for political ends; whether he did, I do not know. In any case Ketteler is

⁶⁸Windell, op. cit., 284-85.

⁶⁹Bachem, op. cit., III, 19; cf. Chapter I, p. 16.

gone--also his loyal squire, Löwenstein. The entire party is annoyed that the alliance with the conservatives has failed. Now new plans will be mapped in secret.⁷⁰

Upon this undetermined basis, which even Prince Hohenlohe gave scanty notice to in his diary, Fritz Vigener, the most recent biographer of Bishop Ketteler, concludes that a deep hostility developed between Ketteler and Windthorst. To bolster his assertions he uses arguments based upon activities in the Reichstag.⁷¹ The result is more scanty than the remarks of Prince Hohenlohe. It produces nothing more than that Ketteler, immediately after the Reichstag proceedings of April 20, 1871, left Berlin for Mainz. As Bishop of Mainz Ketteler had a burdensome task to which he added the duties of a Reichstag deputy. In fact, a few months later Ketteler resigned from the Reichstag because of his many duties as a bishop. Therefore, there probably were other reasons for his return to Mainz than the reported disagreement with Windthorst.⁷²

Vigener contends that Ketteler suffered a keen disappointment in the debate concerning the guarantees in the constitution of the Church's freedom of action. The Bishop believed that all good Catholics were bound in conscience

⁷⁰George W. Chrystal (ed.), Memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe (2 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906), II, 52.

⁷¹Vigener, op. cit., 640 ff.

⁷²Bachem, op. cit., III, 250-56.

to strive for this fundamental constitutional guarantee. Windthorst was a more able politician than Ketteler and there was a basic difference between the two men in regard to the political means to be used in obtaining this constitutional guarantee. This basic difference came to a climax toward the end of April. Windthorst wished to make a "political deal" with the conservatives and Ketteler opposed this.⁷³

The question is this: Where does Vignier obtain his information? Other than his reference to Prince Hohenlohe's memoirs he gives no other sources for his argument than the Reichstag proceedings. It is entirely possible that there was a basic difference in tactics between Ketteler and Windthorst, but it does not follow that this led to a deep misunderstanding between the two men. The following is certain from the Reichstag proceedings. Ketteler followed the constitutional motion, which was presented by Peter Reichensperger, with a speech in defense of the motion and immediately after his speech left for Mainz. He did not remain for Windthorst's speech which followed. Furthermore, there is no basic difference between these three speeches in defense of the motion. To conclude that Ketteler left before Windthorst's speech because he was angry is an assumption.

⁷³Ibid.

It is a bold fact that Prince Hohenlohe was an outspoken foe of the Center Party and its leadership. He was not on friendly terms with either Ketteler or Windthorst. Nothing could have pleased him more than to split the Center and rumors were probably circulated among politicians then, as they are today, in order to obtain a political advantage.

It is possible that Ketteler and Windthorst did not always agree on everything. The two men had the same type of temperament and were opinionated. Both believed in political compromise. Ketteler suggested this to Catholics in his book on a program for German Catholics;⁷⁴ Windthorst frequently used it. In public, at least, both men always recognized each other's abilities and praised each other's successes.⁷⁵ Bachem concludes his account of this episode:

I can only say that, except for Hohenlohe and von Nippold, I have never heard of a deep misunderstanding between Ketteler and Windthorst.⁷⁶

Concerning the beginning of the next session of the Reichstag on October 16, 1871, Vigener makes the following remark: "Ketteler, reconciled with Windthorst, firmly stood in line with the Center Party."⁷⁷ Vigener again fails to cite a source for the fact of reconciliation, since recon-

⁷⁴Die Katholiken im Deutschen Reiche, 73.

⁷⁵Bachem, op. cit., III, 202.

⁷⁶Ibid., 203.

⁷⁷Vigener, op. cit., 659.

ciliation was important, if the argument between Ketteler and Windthorst had caused a deep split. Bachem states that in his investigation of this so-called split he did not discover any evidence of a quarrel or of a reconciliation. Bachem argues that if there was a secret quarrel of any serious consequence, there should be evidence of other Centrists attempting reconciliation or evidence of some kind that Ketteler or Windthorst attempted reconciliation.⁷⁸

Ketteler's Assistance to the Center

From the foundation of the Center party to his death in 1877, Bishop Ketteler supported the Centrists in his speeches and in his writings.⁷⁹ The Bishop actively participated in the Center party only for a short time, while he was a member of the Reichstag. Both his brother, Wilderich, and he were charter members of the party. Later Ketteler wrote: "I became a member of the Center Party as soon as I arrived in Berlin as a member of the Reichstag."⁸⁰ He was especially active during the constitutional sessions of the Reichstag. When the Center party was attacked after the first Vatican Council as a part of an international conspiracy, he defended the party in the Reichstag and among German federal officials.

⁷⁸Cf. Chapter I, p. 44.

⁷⁹Bachem, op. cit., III, 277.

⁸⁰Pfaff, op. cit., III, 147.

The basic tenets of the Center, shown in their programs, essentially followed the social and political ideas of the Bishop. Vigener states that Bishop Ketteler was personally involved in the preparation of the foundation of the Center party.⁸¹ Between 1848 and 1870 Ketteler discussed and, at times, encouraged the formation of a Catholic political party. Before the imperial elections of late 1870 he became politically active and the focal point of Catholic political activity. Since Ketteler was one of the leaders and founders of the Fulda Conference of German Bishops, the following events seem factual and again emphasize his role as the Catholic political leader of Germany. Constantin Bulle reveals the following fact:

All candidates [before the elections of 1870] who wished to have the support of the clergy, had to send a written declaration to Bishop Ketteler of Mainz that they would join the Center Party when it was organized.⁸²

Evidently the Fulda Conference of German Bishops appointed him as a chairman of a political committee. The appointment of a committee by a president of a Catholic bishop's territorial conference, upon private consultation with a majority of the members, is often done and would not necessarily appear in the minutes of the meetings or in private correspondence.

⁸¹Vigener, op. cit., 616.

⁸²Constantin Bulle, Geschichte der neuesten Zeit, 1815-85 (Berlin: Simion Verlag, 1888), 18.

Martin Spahn concurs with this idea:

Through a circular letter encouragement was given to the election of Catholic deputies to the Prussian Parliament and to the Reichstag. Bishop Ketteler in this circular explained preparations to organize a Catholic party in order to promote the adoption of the Prussian Constitution concerning the guarantees of the rights of the Church into the Imperial Constitution.⁸³

This statement gives further evidence that Ketteler was appointed in some capacity as a political chairman by the Fulda Conference of German Bishops, since a bishop of the Catholic Church cannot issue a general circular letter outside of his own diocese without the permission of the other bishops.

Ketteler's Defense of the Center

One of the final activities which the Bishop of Mainz performed for the Center party was to defend it from external attacks. The principal charge against the Centrists was that it was a Catholic party and, therefore, took its orders directly from Rome. In its organizational meetings the members discussed means in order to prevent this charge. It was for this reason that they chose the name, Center. Against the charge that the Center received its directions from Rome, Ketteler wrote a clear and logical denial in the introduction of Die Zentrumsfraktion auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage. He wrote that Rome had only the right to dominate

⁸³Martin Spahn, Das deutsche Zentrum (2 vols.; Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1906-1907), I, 43.

Catholics in faith and morals, in religious beliefs. "In all other items," he wrote, "every Catholic has the right of the fullest independence."⁸⁴ Interference by the Catholic Church in the individual citizen's political freedom was contrary to the Church's very nature and did not belong to the life of the Church.

In a speech to the Reichstag Bishop Ketteler exclaimed to those deputies who accused the Center of ultramontanism: ". . . you look at us with false glasses and deduce that we are as we are not and as you think us to be."⁸⁵ In an earlier speech he stated that the only thing that the Centrists really stood for was "for the freedom of the people but a guaranteed freedom, a just and true freedom."⁸⁶

The opposition insinuated that, in reality, the Center party worked against the German Empire. To this accusation the Bishop of Mainz replied:

I have this firm conviction that there is no party here, which is against the Empire. There is no party which does not wish that the Empire will become strong and powerful. After a public defamation, which I have heard, it is still my opinion that there is no party which desires to control the Empire or to weaken imperial institutions.⁸⁷

⁸⁴Cited work, 2.

⁸⁵Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstages, 4, 480.

⁸⁶Ibid., 112.

⁸⁷Ibid., 481.

Bishop Ketteler defended the Center party in private as well as in public. When the dogma of Papal infallibility was promulgated and when accusations were made of an international Catholic conspiracy against Prussia, Bishop Ketteler had a private conference with Chancellor Bismark and a private audience with Emperor William I.⁸⁸ In both instances he attempted to clarify the dogma and to prove that no Catholic international conspiracy existed.⁸⁹

Conclusion⁹⁰

Bishop Ketteler was the leader of Catholicism in Germany from 1848 to 1877 and has influenced Catholic social and political ideals to the present. In actual political activity within the Center party he took very little part and only for a short duration. However, Ketteler prepared the way for the Center party in his political and social philosophy, which he aptly promulgated to German Catholics, and utilized his position in the Fulda Conference of German Bishops to pave the way for the Centrists. The Center party's social philosophy followed Bishop Ketteler's social system. By his defense of the Center party he greatly en-

⁸⁸Cf. Chapter I.

⁸⁹Ludwig Pastor, August Reichensperger (2 vols.; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1904), 49 ff.; based upon the diary of August Reichensperger.

⁹⁰Windell, op. cit., 280-87; Mann, op. cit., 415; Bachem, op. cit., Vols. I, II, and III.

hanced the reputation of the party among Catholics and Protestants alike. Because of this the Center party of Germany was Ketteler's party, for he made its existence easier, he assisted in its successes, and he gave it vitality.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

There was nothing spectacular in the life of Wilhelm von Ketteler, the Bishop of Mainz. It was an ordinary life filled with conviction, determination, love of Germany, love of the poor, and the spirit of the Gospels. The characteristic which differentiated him was the tremendous energy with which the Bishop worked, as well as his deep insight into the nature of modern society and its ills. This understanding and his spirit of initiative made Bishop Ketteler an outstanding Catholic leader.

Bishop Ketteler was not averse to many of the ideas of Liberalism, such as constitutionalism, universal manhood suffrage, the basic political freedoms and the protection of the basic rights of man. He opposed Liberalism's tenets of complete secularization of education, marriage, and the complete separation of Church and state. On this last concept Ketteler emphasized legal safeguards in order that the Church might function efficiently and possess the legal position which the state should give to any worthwhile institution of society.

Ketteler did not believe in the premises of the Liberalism of his era. He was, however, a progressive in so far as he promoted the exchange of ideas in public discussion. The Bishop of Mainz held that all political groups in a society should foster the common welfare. He looked upon Liberalism as nothing more than a substitution of the middle class for the nobility as absolute rulers. For Ketteler no single group should dominate the political scene, but all groups should cooperate for the welfare of all.

Cooperation and patriotism were Ketteler's watchwords for every German whether of royal blood or not. His patriotism, which he desired every German Catholic to emulate, was frequently expressed by such phrases as: "true sons of the Fatherland"; "a united, great, strong and glorious Germany"; "the spirit of the German people"; and "noble Germans." His patriotism was of the deepest kind; he wrote that after his Catholic faith Germany had his deepest affiliation and that he would sacrifice all of his personal accomplishments for his country's welfare.

Bishop Ketteler's ideal was a completely unified Germany which included all German people. If Germany could only become united, although only partially, under Prussian dominance, then he would still remain a most loyal subject. He advocated close cultural and political ties with Austria and Germans outside of the second Reich. Although he desired unity of any type, Ketteler opposed

absolutism of any kind and continually strove for freedom and the safeguards of freedom. He was concerned about the individual welfare and freedom of each and every German. If any accusation may be made against Ketteler's nationalism, it would be his overemphasis upon the love of country and the patriotism, which he wished every German to have.

Ketteler left many things unsaid in his exposition of the social problems of his era, but he wished to awaken Germans, especially Catholics, to the major ills of capitalism. Therefore, he emphasized the basic concepts and dealt with the more important problems which then confronted Germany in the beginning of its industrialization. Among German-Catholics the Bishop popularized the Thomistic arguments for the right of private property, social justice, and the rights of the workingclass and reiterated that the Christian family was the cornerstone of a Christian society. He laid down the broad Christian principles of the infinite value of the human personality and the high value of justice and charity in human relations. According to Ketteler, if these principles were applied to society, it would eventually progress for the welfare of all.

In a more practical manner Ketteler called for co-operatives, trade unions, a just wage, shorter work hours, and a law which prohibited work on Sundays. He was a humanitarian in seeking legislation against women and children factory workers. The Bishop was somewhat of an

idealist in so far as his objective was a society in which most of the people had an opportunity for happiness and in which the needs of the majority were satisfied.

The means which he proposed to obtain these desired ends slowly evolved during Ketteler's lifetime. In the early part of his career he advocated mere education in order to renew society. Then he elicited the Church as the vehicle. Without dropping both previous means, Ketteler added the idea of political pressure on the government for action by the state to direct reforms. The means proposed in this final stage of development is shown by Ketteler's activities in the Center party and his influence upon that political group in its social philosophy.

The social philosophy of Bishop Ketteler at the time of its promulgation was something new for Catholics. Because of the efforts of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI his basic ideas were promulgated throughout the Catholic world. This fact at times overshadows the influence of Ketteler in the development of modern Catholic sociology. This much cannot be denied: the Bishop began something new in social-politics in Germany!¹ If he had done nothing more than awaken German Catholics to the social problems and their duty to assist in their solution, Ketteler would still remain one of the outstanding German Catholic leaders of

¹Mann, op. cit., 417.

the nineteenth century. Ketteler was filled with a personal love of mankind, especially the workingman and this he passed on to those Catholics who came in contact with him either through his works or activities.

At no time did Bishop Ketteler maintain that his position was the only correct one in politics or in sociology. As long as the position of anyone was in conformity with the fundamental principles of Christianity, the recommendations might be more correct than his. Above all the Bishop believed in political action to defend justice, rights, the common welfare, and Christianity, especially Roman Catholicism. In order to accomplish these ends he encouraged competent Catholic laymen to enter politics.

Bishop Ketteler was the leader of Catholicism in Germany from 1848 to 1877 and has influenced Catholic political and social policies in Germany to the present. In actual political activity within the Center party he took very little part and then only for short duration. However, Ketteler prepared the way for the Center party in his social and political philosophy, which he aptly promulgated to German Catholics, and used his position within the Fulda Conference of German Bishops actively to pave the way for the Centrists. By his defense of the Center party he greatly enhanced the reputation of the party among Catholics and Protestants alike. The Center party's social platform was essentially taken from Bishop Ketteler's thought. Because of this it may be

said that the Center party of Germany was Ketteler's party, for he made its existence easier, he made its successes possible, and he gave it vitality.²

²Windell, op. cit., 270-85; Bachem, op. cit., I and II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books

Dupanloup, Felix. Die Convention von 15 Dezember und die Encyclica vom 8 Dezember. Trans. from French into German unknown. Augsburg: Franzfelderische Buchhandlung, 1865.

Biedermann, Karl. Errinnerungen aus der Paulskirche. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1849.

Bismark, Otto von. Gedanken und Erinnerungen. 2 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1898.

Buss, Franz Josef. Die deutsche Einheit und die Preussensliebe. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1849.

_____. Die Aufgabe des katholischen Teils deutschen Nation in der Gegenwart oder der katholische Verein Deutschlands. Regensburg: Pustet Verlag, 1851.

Collectio Lacensis: Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum. 7 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1870-90.

Errinnerungsblätter an Freiherr Reinhard von Dalwigh zu Lichtenfels. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1861.

Errinnerungen von Georg von Hertling. Munich: Verlag von Josef Kösel, 1919.

Errinnerungen von Fuerst Chlodwig von Hohenlohe. English trans. by George W. Chrystal. Memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906.

Errinnerungen Herzog von Paul Nathan. Bamberger, Ludwig, ed. Berlin: Verlag von Simion, 1899.

Friederich, Johann. Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870. Noerdlingen: C. H. Beckische Buchhandlung, 1871.

Heinrich, J. B. Trauerrede bei der Bestattung des hochseligen Bischofs Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler, gehalten am 18 Juli im Dome zu Mainz. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1877.

Ketteler, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von. Das Allgemeine Concil und seine Bedeutung für unser Zeit. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1869.

_____. Die Angriffe gegen Gurn's Moral-Theologie in der "Main-Beitung" und der Kammer zu Darmstadt--zur Beleuchtung der neusten Kampfweise gegen die katholische Kirche für alle redlichen und unparteiischen Männer. 2nd ed. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim Verlag, 1869.

_____. Die Anschauungen des Kulturministers Herrn Dr. Falk über die katholische Kirche nach dessen Rede von 10 Dezember 1873. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1874.

_____. Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentums. 1st ed. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1864. 3rd ed. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1864.

_____. Die Arbeiterbewegung und Streben in Verhältnis zu Religion und Sittlichkeit. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim Verlag, 1869.

_____. Der Bruch des religioes Friedens und der einzige Weg zu seiner Wiederherstellung. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1875.

_____. Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1867.

_____. Erklärungen in Betreff des Concils. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim Verlag, 1870.

_____. Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1862.

_____. Die Gefahren der neuen Schulgesetzgebung für die religiössittliche Erziehung der Kinder in den Volksschulen, ein Wort der Belehrung und Ermahnung an die Eltern. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1876.

- _____. Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1849.
- _____. (trans.). Gulielmus Beraldus, Die Pflichten des Adels: Eine Stimme aus den Tagen des heiligen Thomas von Aquin. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim Verlag, 1868.
- _____. Ist das Gesetz das öffentliche Gewissen? Frankfurt on the Main: Verlag fuer Kunst und Wessenschaft G. Hamacher, 1865. 2nd ed., 1866.
- _____. Die Jesuiten in Mainz und die Beschwerde des Gemeinderates bei den hohen Ständes gegen deren Auferhalt in der Pfarrwahlung zu St. Christoph. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1864.
- _____. Kann ein Jesuit von seinem Orderem in einer Sünde verpflichtete werden? Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1874.
- _____. Kann ein Christ Freimaurer sein? Antwort an den Herrn Dr. Rudolph Sendel. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1865.
- _____. Die katholische Kirche und Forderungen der Jetztzeit. Cologne: Verlag von Lengfeld, 1849.
- _____. Der Kampf gegen die Kirche. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1872.
- _____. Die katholiken im deutsche Reiche: Entwurf zu einem politischen Programm. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1873.
- _____. Die Kulturkampf gegen die katholischen Kirche und die neuen Kirchen-gesetz-Würfe für Hessen. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1874.
- _____. Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1871.
- _____. Leichenrede gesprochen am Grabe der 18 September zu Frankfurt a M. gewaltsam Ermordeten und der im Kampfe gegen die Aufständischen gefallen. Leipzig: Hermann Fritsche, 1848.
- _____. Die modern Tendenz-Wissenschaft: Beleuchtet am Exempel des Herrn Professor Dr. Emil Friedberg. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1873.

- _____. Pflichten der Eltern und des Elternhauses unter dem modernen Schulverhältnissen. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1877.
- _____. Die preussischen Gesetzenwuer über die Stellung der Kirche zum Staat. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1873.
- _____. Das Recht der Dom Kapitel und das Veto der Regierungen bei Bischofswählen in preussischen und oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1868.
- _____. Das Recht und das Rechtschutz der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland mit besonder Rücksicht auf die Forderungen des oberrheinischen Episkopates und der gegenwaertigen kirchlichen Conflict. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1854.
- _____. Das Reichsgesetz vom 4 Juli 1872 betreffend den Orden der Gesellschaft Jesu und Ausführungamasregeln dieses Gesetzes. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1872.
- _____. Soziale Schriften: Neue Auswahl. Essen-Ruhr: Verlag Frededül und Rönen, 1908.
- _____. Soll die Kirche allein rechtlos sein? Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1861.
- _____. Stellung und Pflicht der Katholiken im Kampf der Gegenwart. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1868.
- _____. Die tatsächliche Einführung des bekenntnislosen Protestantismus in die katholische Kirche. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1877.
- _____. Die Trennung der Schule von der Kirche. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1873.
- _____. Das unfehlbare Leharnt des Paptes nach des vaticanischen Concils. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1871.
- _____. Die Unwahrheiten der römischen Briefe vom Concil in der Allgemeinen Zeitung. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1870.
- _____. Die wahren Grundlagen des religiösen Friedens. 2nd ed. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1868.

_____. Warum können wir zur Ausführung der Kirchengesetze nicht mitwirken? Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1876.

_____. Worte, Belehrung und Ermahnung an alle christliche Eltern über ihre Pflichten bei der Vorbereitung ihrer Kinder zur ersten heiligen Kommunion. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1881.

_____. Die Zentrumsfraktion auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1872.

_____. Zur Charakteristik Jesuiten und ihrer Gegner. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1866.

Verhandlungen der ersten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1848 zu Mainz. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim und Schott, 1848.

Verhandlungen der zweiten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1849 zu Breslau. Breslau: Georg Philipp Aderholz, 1849.

Verhandlungen der dritten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1849 zu Regensburg. Regensburg: Verlag von Fr. Pustet, 1849.

Verhandlungen der vierten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1850 zu Linz. Regensburg: Verlag von Fr. Pustet, 1850.

Verhandlungen der fünften Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1852 zu Mainz. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1852.

Verhandlungen der zehnten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1859 zu Köln. Köln: J. P. Bachem, 1859.

Verhandlungen der elften Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1860 zu Freiburg im Breisgau. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1860.

Verhandlungen der zwölften Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1861 zu Prag. Köln: J. P. Bachem, 1861.

Verhandlungen der dreizehnten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1861 zu München. München: J. G. Weiss, 1862.

Verhandlungen der vierzehnten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1863 zu München. Regensburg: Verlag von Georg Josef Manz, 1863.

Verhandlungen der sechzehnten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1864 zu Würzburg. Würzburg: Verlag der stahelischen Kunsthandlung, 1864.

Verhandlungen der achtzehnten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1867 zu Innsbruck. Innsbruck: Vereins Buchdruckerei, 1867.

Verhandlungen der neunzehnten Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1868 zu Bamberg. Bamberg: Verlag von Otto Reindl, 1868.

Verhandlungen der XXII Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1872 zu Breslau. Breslau: C. P. Aderholz, 1872.

Verhandlungen der XXIII Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1875 zu Freiburg im Breisgau. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1875.

Verhandlungen der XXIV Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands 1876 zu München. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1876.

Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages. Vols. II and IV.

Sermons by Bishop Wilhelm Emmanuel Ketteler
(all published separately by Franz Kirchheim)

Über die Gefahren der Zeit. Ansprache an die versammelten Mitglieder des Katholiken-Verein. Delivered at Rochusberg bei Bingen on June 17, 1874.

Von dem Zwecke den Hindernissen und Hiftsmitteln dieses Vereins. Stiftungsfest des Gesellen-Vereins zu Mainz. Delivered at St. Peters Church, Mainz, November 20, 1876.

Die christliche Idee von Rechte des Eigenthums. Delivered at St. Peter's Church, Mainz, on November 19, 1848.

Die Pflicht der christlichen Barmherzigkeit. Delivered at the Mainz Cathedral on December 3, 1848.

Die Christliche Idee von der Freiheit des Menschen. Delivered at the Cathedral of Mainz on December 17, 1848.

Die christliche Idee von der Bestimmung des Menschen. Delivered at the Mainz Cathedral on December 18, 1848.

Die christliche Idee von der Ehe und der Familie. Delivered at the Mainz Cathedral on December 19, 1848.

Von der Autorität der katholischen Kirche. Delivered at the Mainz Cathedral on December 20, 1848.

Predigt bei Erlössung des allgemeinen Gebeter für die Ansiegen der Kirche. Delivered at the Mainz Cathedral on November 4, 1872.

Die Festigkeit und Daür der katholischen Kirche. Delivered at the Prague Cathedral on August 31, 1873.

Über das Almosengeben. Delivered in the Berlin Cathedral on December 9, 1849.

Liebe Jesu zur Armuth, Part I. Delivered in the parish church at Hopsten on December 25, 1847.

Liebe Jesu zur Armuth, Part II. Delivered at the parish church of Hopsten on December 26, 1847.

Liebe Jesu zur Armuth, Part III. Delivered at the parish church in Hopsten on January 1, 1848.

Warum der Sohn Gottes gehorsam--die Menschen ungehorsam? Delivered at the parish church in Bochum on January 9, 1845.

Episcopal Letters of Bishop Ketteler
(all published separately by Franz Kirchheim)

Bei dem Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1851, Über den Deutsch-katholizismus, February 23, 1851.

Bei dem Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1852, Über den Deutsch-katholizismus und die Freiheit der Kirche, February 4, 1852.

Beim Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1858, Der Religionsunterricht in der Volksschule, February 4, 1858.

Beim Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1862, Vorwurf der Intoleranz; Vereine und Presse, February 14, 1862.

Beim Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1865, Über die Encyklika vom 8 Dezember 1864, February 2, 1865.

Beim Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1867, Über die gemischten Ehen,
February 15, 1867.

Über die an dem Heiligen Vater begangene Gewalttat und die
Anliegen unseres Vaterlands, October 15, 1870.

Über die Wahlen zum deutschen Reichstag, February 13, 1871.

Über die gegenwärtige Lage der katholischen Kirche im
deutschen Reiche, September 20, 1872.

Denkschrift des gesamten katholischen Episcopats im
Königreich Preussen, January 30, 1873.

Beim Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1873, Über die Trennung der
Schule von der Kirche, February 15, 1873.

Über die Stellung der Bischöfe zur kirchenpolitischen
Gesetzgebung, February 20, 1874.

Beim Anfange der Fastenzeit, 1875, Über die neuen hessischen
Kirchengesetze und den Hauptgrund, welcher der Kirche
die Annahme solcher Gesetze unmöglich macht, January
16, 1875.

Personal Letters of Bishop Ketteler

Mss in monastic library at Eichstätt; also reproduced in
J. M. Raich, Briefe von und an Wilhelm Emmanuel
Freiherr von Ketteler. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag,
1879.

An das Grossherzogliche Staatsministerium in Darmstadt,
September 24, 1874.

Letter to Herr von Mon in Innsbruck, April 2, 1862.

Letter to Herr Lasalle, the socialist leader, January 22,
1864.

Letter to Cardinal Reisach, December 4, 1865.

Periodicals

Historisch-Politische Blätter. Munchen. "Glossen zur
Lagesgeschichte," XXII (July, 1848), 261-70; "Die
Fahnenweihe in Finten am Dez. 3, 1848," XXIII
(January, 1849), 301-37; "Karl Ernst Jareke," XXXI
(January, 1853), 277-90; "Briefliche Mittelheilungen
aus Rheinhessen," XXXII (July, 1853), 840-46;
"Katholismus und Heidentum," XXXIII (January, 1854),
839-51; "Das Oesterreichische Concordat," XXXVI
(July, 1855), 1037-44; "Die Herren im Sprechsaal,"
XXXVII (January, 1856), 39-90; "Ein bischöfliches

Wort über die politischen Probleme der Gegenwart," XLIX (January, 1862), 518-32; "Der Bischof von Mainz über unsere gegenwärtige Lage," LIX (January, 1867), 454-68; "Aus der Diözese Rottenburg," LXII (July, 1868), 855-89, 938 ff.; "Aus der Diözese Rottenburg," LXIII (January, 1869), 75-91, 270-80, 417-44; "Die deutschen Mächte im Revolutions-Krieg," LXV (January, 1870), 321-37; "Liberalismus und Nationalismus," LXVII (January, 1871), 536-47; Part II (cont.), LXVIII (July, 1871), 1-18; "Der Abschied des Bischofs von Mainz aus dem deutschen Reichstag," LXIX (January, 1872), 626-35.

Der Katholik: Zeitschrift für katholische Wissenschaft und kirchlicher Leben. Mainz: the official diocesan journal of the Diocese of Mainz, published twice a year. I (1849), 588; II (1850), 95, 237, 379, 525; I (1851), 141, 235, 287, 336, 428-30, 476; II (1851), 428-30, 529, 574; I (1852), 143-48, 288, 524, 572; II (1852), 334-38; I (1853), 288, 431; II (1853), 336, 384, 432; II (1854), 49-62, 84-96, 384; I (1855), 538-634; II (1855), 240, 288; I (1856), 48, 190-91; II (1857), 96, 239; I (1860), 1-16, 128, 640; II (1860), 510-11; I (1861), 510, 223-34, 562; I (1863), 543-62; II (1863), 757-59; I (1866), 242-53; I (1869), 82-90; I (1870), 766; II (1877), 231; I (1890), 478-91; II (1890), 480; I (1891), 285-305, 406.

Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Maria-Laach: Benedictiner Abtei Maria-Laach, 1869. New Series, Vol. VI, 175.

Newspapers

Baden-Boden Badischer Beobachter, Nos. 66-75, 1866.

Augsburg und Stuttgart Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 129, May 9, 1850; No. 159, June 8, 1850; No. 355, December 21, 1851; No. 159, June 8, 1855; No. 160, June 9, 1855; No. 163, June 12, 1855; No. 170, June 19, 1855; No. 300, October 27, 1863; No. 291, October 18, 1866; No. 192, July 11, 1867; No. 268, September 25, 1869; No. 27, January 27, 1870; No. 51, February 19, 1870; No. 155, June 5, 1870; No. 366, December 31, 1872; No. 34, February 3, 1874; No. 238, August 26, 1874; No. 241, August 29, 1874; No. 280, October 7, 1875; No. 195, July 14, 1877; No. 198, July 17, 1877.

Darmstadt Darmstädter Zeitung, No. 193, July 14, 1869.

Frankfort am Main Frankfort Journal, No. 126, May 7, 1861.

Freiburg im Breisgau Freiburger Katholisches Kirchenblatt, No. 32, August 8, 1877.

Berlin Germania, No. 124, June 5, 1872; No. 146, July 30, 1871; No. 242, October 21, 1872; No. 65, March 10, 1873; No. 39, February 16, 1873.

Karlsruhe Karlsruhe Zeitung, Nos. 66-68, 1866.

München Katholische Sonntagsblätter, No. 27, July 4, 1852; Nos. 50 and 52, December, 1848.

München Katholische Volksblatt, No. 39, 1889; No. 44, 1892.

Augsburg Katholische Stimme, No. 15, 1877.

Mainz Kirchliches Amtsblatt für die Diözese Mainz, No. 11, August 17, 1865; No. 9, 1863; No. 5, 1863; No. 4, 1863; No. 7, 1863; No. 10, 1862; No. 6, 1860; No. 11, 1862; No. 18, 1871; No. 9, 1872; No. 7, 1873; No. 3, 1875; No. 3, 1876.

Köln Kölnische Blätter, No. 57, February 25, 1867.

Köln Kölnische Volkszeitung, No. 323, March 3, 1868; No. 37, February 6, 1873.

Mainz Mainzer Abendblatt, Vol. 1, December 28, 1864.

Mainz Der Mainzer Journal, April 28, 1850; October 4, 1860; April 3, 1861; August 11, 1861; August 28, 1862; March 6, 1863; June 19, 1863; December 17, 1867; January 15, 1868.

Münster Sonntagsblatt, No. 52, December 28, 1862.

Secondary Sources

Books

Alexander, Edgar. Catholic Social and Political Movements: 1789-1950. "Church and Society in Germany." Edited by Joseph N. Moody. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1953.

Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. 55 vols. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1875-1910.

- Anonymous. Preussens Unberuf: eine aus dem englischen Übersetzte Kritik der von Kettelerischen Schrift: "Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866". Munich: Verlag von Lentner, 1867.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologica et Contra Gentiles. 18 vols. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- Bachem, Karl. Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumsparthei. 9 vols. Cologne: Julius Bachem Verlag, 1927-32.
- Baudri, Friedrich. Der Erzbischof von Köln, Johannes Cardinal von Geissel und seine Zeit. Cologne: Verlag Julius Bachem, 1881.
- Birlmeter, Karl, and Tuechle, Herman. Kirchengeschichte. 3 vols. 17th ed. Paderborn: Verlag von Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1961.
- Bergstraesser, Ludwig. Der politische Katholismus: Dokumente seiner Entwicklung. 2 vols. Munich: Koesel Verlag, 1921-23.
- _____. Geschichte der politischen Parteien in Deutschland. 7th ed. Munich: Verlag Dr. Gunter Olzog, 1952.
- _____. Studien zur Vorgeschichte des Zentrumsparthei. Tübingen: Mohr Verlag, 1910.
- Brandes, Georg Morris Cohen. Ferdinand Lassalle. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1911.
- _____. Ferdinand Lassalle. 2nd ed. New York: Bernard G. Richards Co., 1925.
- Braumann, Friedrich. Die Programme der Reichstagsparteien. Magdeburg: Beck Verlag, 1912.
- Brecht, Arnold. Federalism and Regionalism in Germany. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Brueck, Heinrich. Adam Franz Lennig. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1870.
- _____. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19 Jahrhundert. 2 vols. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1887-1889-1896.
- _____. Die oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1875.

- Brunstaed, Friedrich. Die Staats ideen der politischen Parteien. Berlin: Simion Verlag, 1920.
- Buchheim, Karl. Geschichte der christlichen Parteien in Deutschland. Munich: Koesel Verlag, 1953.
- _____. Ultramontanismus und Demokratie. Munich: Koesel Verlag, 1963.
- Bulle, Constantin. Geschichte der neuesten Zeit, 1815-85. Berlin: Simion Verlag, 1888.
- Butler, Cuthbert. The Vatican Council: The Story told from inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Dru, Alexander. The Contribution of German Catholicism. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1963.
- Deuerlein, Ernst von. Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler: Soziale Gerechtigkeit. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch Verlag, 1950.
- _____. (ed.). Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler: Die grossen sozialen Fragen der Gegenwart. Mainz: Matthias-Gruenewald Verlag, 1948.
- Eberhardt, Newman E. A Summary of Catholic History. 2 vols. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1961.
- Eberl, Friedrich. Die Kirche und die Association der Arbeiter. Passau: 1866.
- Ferber, Walter. Der Foederalismus. Augsburg: Naumann, 1946.
- Footman, David. Ferdinand Lassalle, Romantic Revolutionary. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Forschner, Karl. Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1911.
- Franz, Albert. Der soziale Katholismus in Deutschland bis zum Tode Kettelers. Gladbach: Volksvereinverlag, 1914.
- Friedberg, Emil. Der Staat und die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1874.
- Friedjung, Heinrich. Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Deutschland, 1859-66. 2 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1912-13.

Friedrich, Johannes. Geschichte des Vatikan Concils. 3 vols. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber Verlag, 1883.

———. Ignaz von Doellinger. 3 vols. Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1899-1901.

Garofalo, Salvatori. See Parente.

Gasparri, Petro Cardinal (ed.). Codex Juris Canonici. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Book Shop, 1946.

Granderath, Theodor. Geschichte des Vatikanischen Concils. 3 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1903-1906.

Greiffenrath, Franz. Bischof Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler und die deutsche Sozialreform. Frankfurt on the Main: Verlag von A. Foesser Nachfolger, 1893.

Gredt, Johann. De Elementa Philosophicae. 2 vols. Rome: Vatican Press, 1926.

Haneberg, Daniel Bonifatius von, and Holzmarth, F. J. Pre-
digten zur Feier des fünf und zwanzigjährigen
Bischofs-jubiläums des hochwürdigsten Bischofs von
Mainz, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler,
gehalten am 25 U. 26 Juli, 1875. Mainz: Franz
Kirchheim Verlag, 1875.

Hanson, Josef. Preussen und Rheinland von 1815 bis 1915. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber Verlag, 1918.

Hase, Karl. Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik gegen
die römisch-katholische Kirche. 4 vols. Leipzig:
Luncker und Humblat, 1878.

Hatschek, Julius. Deutsches und preussisches Staatsrecht. 2 vols. Berlin: Simion Verlag, 1922-23.

Heinrich, J. B. Des seligen Bischofs von Mainz, Wilhelm
Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler, erste Anzeichen von
Beginn seiner theologische Studien. Mainz: Franz
Kirchheim Verlag, 1877.

Heinrich, Johannes. Die Reaktion des sogenannten Fortschritts
gegen die Freiheit der Kirche. Mainz: Franz Kirch-
heim Verlag, 1863.

Hertling, Georg. Kleine Schriften zur Zeitgeschichte und
Politik. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buch-
handlung, 1897.

- Herwig, Roman von Franz. Der Grosse Bischof. (This is a novel based upon the life of Bishop Ketteler.) Munich: Verlag Josef Kösel und Friedrich Pustet, 1930.
- Holzmarth, F. J. See Haneberg.
- Horgan, John J. Great Catholic Laymen. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1905.
- Hubers, V. A. Ausgewählte Schriften über Sozialreform und Genossenschaftswegen. Berlin: Simion Verlag, 1894.
- Hughes, Philip. The Popes' New Order. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944.
- Jarcke, Karl Ernst. Vermischte Schriften. 3 vols. Munich: Verlag von Oldenbourg, 1893.
- Joas, Josef. Die Politische Ideenwelt des Zentrums. Karlsruhe: 1928.
- Kampe, Ferdinand. Geschichte der religiösen Bewegung der neuer Zeit, 1848-1858. 4 vols. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1852-1853-1856-1860.
- Kaster, Johannes. Die Stellung der deutschen Katholiken zur Gewerkschaftsfrage. Gladbach: Volksvereinverlag, 1921.
- Kaufhold, Josef. Die Geschichte des Deutschen Parteienwesens. Berlin: n. p., n. d.
- Kilzer, Ernest, and others. The History of Western Social Thought. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1959.
- Kremer, Hermann von. Actenstücke zur Geschichte des Verhältnisses zwischen Staat und Kirche im 19 Jahrhundert. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1873.
- Lassalle, Ferdinand Johann Gottlieb. Auswahl von Reden und Schriften nebst kurzer Biographie und geschichtlicher Einführung von Karl Renner. Berlin: J.H.W. Dietz Nachf., 1923.
- _____. What is Capital? Trans. F. Kedell. New York: New York Labor News Co., 1900.
- Laube, Heinrich. Das erste deutsche Parlament. 3 vols. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1849.

- Laurentius, Josef. Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler, Bischof von Mainz und die Jesuiten. Cologne: Verlag des Verbandes der Windthorstbunde Deutschlands, 1912.
- Lempp, Richard. Die Frage der Trennung von Kirche und Staat im Frankfurter Parlament. Tübingen: Mohr Verlag, 1913.
- Lenhart, Ludwig (ed.). Universitas: Dienst an Wahrheit und Leben: Festschrift für Bischof Dr. Albert Stohr im Auftrag der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz. 2 vols. Mainz: Matthias-Gruenewald Verlag, 1960.
- Liesen, Bernhard. Letzte Lebenswochen des hochseligen Bischofs von Mainz, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler. Mainz: Faber'sche Buchhandlung, 1877.
- _____. Bischof Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler und soziale Frage. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1879.
- Löwenstein, Prince Hubertus zu. Deutsche Geschichte. Berlin: Haude und Spenersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
- _____. The Germans in History. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Maas, Heinrich. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im Grossherzogthum Baden. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1891.
- Mahler, Karl. Die Programme der politischen Parteien in Deutschland. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1911.
- Majunke, Paul. Geschichte des Kulturkampfes in Preussen-Deutschland. Paderborn: Verlag von Ferdinand Schoenigh, 1902.
- Mann, Golo. Deutsche Geschichte. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1960.
- Manning, Timothy Cardinal. The True Story of the Vatican Council. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1877.
- Marriot, J.A.R., and Robertson, Charles Grant. The Evolution of Prussia. Revised ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.
- McCarthy, Justin. Pope Leo XIII. 2nd ed. New York: F. Warne Co., 1899.

- Messner, Johannes. Die Soziale Frage. 6th ed. revised. Innsbruck: Tyrolia Verlag, 1956.
- Metlake, Georg. Christian Social Reform. Trans. from German by John Joseph Laux. Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1923.
- Meyer, Max H. Die Weltanschauung des Zentrums in ihren Grundlinien. Leipzig: Luncker und Humblat, 1919.
- Mosse, George. The Culture of Western Europe. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961.
- Moufang, Christoph. Die katholischen Pfarrschulen in der Stadt Mainz. Mainz: Franz Kirchheim Verlag, 1863.
- Mumbauer, Johannes. Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler's Schriften. 3 vols. 1st ed. Munich: Verlag der Jos. Kösel, 1911. 2nd ed. Munich: Verlag der Jos. Kösel, 1924.
- Mundweiler, Johannes. Bischof von Ketteler als Vorkämpfer der christlichen Sozialreform. Munich: Buchhandlung des Verbandes süddeutscher katholischer Arbeiterverein, 1911.
- Naumann, Friederich. Die politischen Parteien. Berlin: Hilfe Verlag, 1910.
- Neuefeind, Maria M. Bischof Ketteler und die soziale Frage seiner Zeit. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1921.
- Nippold, Friedrich. Kleine Schriften zur inneren Geschichte des Katholismus. 2 vols. Jena: 1899.
- Oncken, Hermann. Lasalle. 3 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag, 1920.
- O'Reilly, Bernard. Life of Leo XIII. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Co., 1903.
- Parente, Pietro, Piolanti, Antonio, and Garofalo, Salvatori. Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1951.
- Pastor, Ludwig. August Reichensperger: 1808-95. 2 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder Verlag, 1899.
- Pfälf, Otto. Bischof von Ketteler: 1811-77. 3 vols. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1899.

- _____. Cardinal von Geissel. 2 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1895.
- _____. Hermann von Mallinckrodt. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1891.
- _____. Des hochseligen Bischofs von Mainz, Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler, Beispiel und Belehrung für die Andacht zum göttlichen Herzen Jesu. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1899.
- Pinson, Koppel. Modern Germany. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.
- Piolanti, Antonio. See Parenti.
- Poschinger, Hermann von. Preussen im Bundestag. 4 vols. Leipzig: Hermann Fritzsche Verlag, 1882-84.
- Politisches Jahrbuch der C.D.U. und C.S.U. Frankfurt on the Main: K. G. Lohse, 1950.
- Raich, J. M. (private secretary to Bishop Ketteler). Briefe von und an Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1879.
- _____. Predigten von Ketteler. Kirchheim Verlag, 1878.
- Reinarz, Heinrich. Von Ketteler und Leo XIII: der soziale Bischof und der soziale Papst des 19 Jahrhunderts. Düsseldorf: Druck und Verlag von L. Schwann, 1926.
- Reiser, Adam. Dr. Heinrich Bone: Ein Lebensbild. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1897.
- Robertson, Charles Grant. See Marriot.
- Rössler, Hellmuth von. Grösse und Tragik des christlichen Europa. Berlin: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1956.
- Röth, Karl. Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler: Ein Lebensbild. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdische Buchhandlung, 1912.
- Ruggiero, Guido de. The History of European Liberalism. Trans. R. G. Collingwood. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1959.
- Schauff, Johannes. Die deutschen Katholiken und die Zentrumsparthei: Eine politisch-statistische Untersuchung der Reichstagswahlen zeit 1871. Cologne: Julius Bachem Verlag, 1928.

- Schmid, Heinrich. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands: 1850-74. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1874.
- Schmidt, Arthur. Kirchenrechtliche Quellen des Grossherzogtums. Giessen: 1891.
- Schnabel, Franz. Der Zusammenschluss des politischen Katholismus in Deutschland im Jahre 1848. Heidelberg: 1910.
- _____. Deutsche Geschichte im XIX Jahrhundert. 4 vols. Vienna: Herder Book Co., 1929.
- Schubart, P. Die Verfassung und Verwaltung des deutschen Reich und des preussischen Staates. Breslau: Verlag von Wilh. Gottl. Korn, 1900.
- Schuessler, Wilhelm. Hessen-Darmstadt und die deutschen Grossmächte 1850. Darmstadt: 1919.
- Seitz, Ernst. Die katholische Kirchengelagegenheit im Grossherzogthum Hessen. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1861.
- Sheehan, James. The Career of Lujo Brentano. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Smith, G. Burrell. Germany: 1815-90. London: Edward Arnold and Co., 1940.
- Spahn, Martin. Das Deutsche Zentrum. 2 vols. Mainz: Kirchheim Verlag, 1906-1907.
- Treitschke, Heinrich. History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century. Trans. Eden and Cedar Paul. London: Jarrold and Sons, 1919.
- Treue, Wolfgang. Deutsche Parteiprogramme: 1861-1954. Göttingen: Musterschmidt Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1954.
- Tüchle, Hermann. See Birlmeter.
- Vigener, Fritz. Ketteler. Munich: Verlag von R. Oldenbourg, 1924.
- _____. Ketteler und das Vaticanum. Munich: Verlag von R. Oldenbourg, 1922.
- Waffenburg, Philip. Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler. Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim, 1877.

- Walter, A. F. Fontis Juris Ecclesiastici. Regensburg: Pustet Verlag, 1893.
- Wallace, Lillian Parker. The Papacy and European Diplomacy, 1869-78. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.
- Ward, Adolphus. Germany. 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1917.
- Wilson, Edmund. To the Finland Station. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1940.
- Windell, George. The Catholics and German Unity, 1866-1871. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Articles and Periodicals

- Benigni, Ulrich. "Ultramontanism," The Catholic Encyclopedia, XV (1908 ed.), 125.
- Fanning, William. "Mixed Marriages," The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX (1908 ed.), 698.
- Fay, Sidney B. "Bismark's Welfare State," Current History, XVIII (1950), 2-7.
- Frank, J. "Ketteler," in Allgemeine deutsche Biographie (56 vols.; Leipzig: 1875-1912), XV, 670.
- Goyau, Georges. "Ketteler," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VII (1908 ed.), 629-34.
- Kirsch, J. P. "Görres," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VI (1908 ed.), 652-54.
- Lauchert, Friederich, "Febronianism," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VI (1908 ed.), 23-25.
- Liesen, Bernhardt. "Bischof Wilhelm von Ketteler und die soziale Frage," in Frankfurter Zeitgenosse Broschüren (Paul Haffner, ed.), Vol. III, No. 12 (1881-82), 353-88.
- Mann, Golo von. "Görres," Die grossen Deutschen: Deutsche Biographie. 5 vols. Berlin: In propylaen Verlag bei Ullstein, 1955. II, 518-31.

Scheeben, M. J. "Fünfundzwanzig Jahre eines deutschen Episcopat (Lehre und Werken des hochseligen Bischofs von Mainz, Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler)," in Periodische Blätter der religiösen Fragen der Gegenwart, Vol. VIII (Regensburg: 1879), 385-94, 481-517; Vol. IX (Regensburg: 1880), 365-405, 450-68, 503-16, 551-66.

Spahn, Martin. "Frankfort Assembly," in The Catholic Encyclopedia, VI (1908 ed.), 1908.

APPENDIX I

A COMPARISON OF FERDINAND LASSALLE AND BISHOP KETTELER¹

Ferdinand Lassalle was born in Breslau in 1825 of Jewish parents. Judaism made a deep impression upon him in his youth, for he dreamed of becoming a great Jewish leader in order to lead his people to independence and freedom. But this was of short duration for he soon expressed hatred and resentment for his Jewish ancestry.

Lassalle studied philosophy first at the University of Breslau and then at the University of Berlin. It was at the University of Berlin that he came in contact with the left Hegelians and under the influence of the philosophic interpretation of Hegel by Feuerbach. He did not complete his studies at Berlin because he accepted the

¹Based upon: Georg Morris Cohen Brandes, Ferdinand Lassalle (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1911); Ferdinand Lassalle (2nd ed.; New York: Bernard G. Richards Co., 1925); David Footman, Ferdinand Lassalle: Romantic Revolutionary (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947); Ferdinand Johann Gottlieb Lassalle, Auswahl von Reden und Schriften nebst kurzer Biographie und geschichtlicher Einführung von Karl Renner (Berlin: J.H.W. Dietz Nachf., 1923); Edmund Wilson, To The Finland Station (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1940); Pinson, op. cit., 197-202; and this thesis.

marital cause of Countess von Hatzfeldt, defending her with energy and passion. In 1854 he finally succeeded in obtaining a divorce for her. This case earned him a great deal of notoriety. His own defense for revolutionary activities before a government tribunal in Cologne in 1848 even moved the members of that court, for it only sentenced him to a six months' prison term.

Through his pamphlets and his speeches he became one of the outstanding leaders of modern Germany. As a result of his revolutionary renown, the workers of Leipzig requested Lassalle to organize a general workingmen's association. On May 23, 1863, he founded the Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein, the first political organization of the German workingclass. Marx did not like Lassalle. This seems to have several possible reasons: Lassalle was too popular for Marx, he was too jovial for Karl Marx, and Lassalle did not entirely agree with Marx on the cooperation with existing political elements in order to attain rights for the workingman. Lassalle's association of workers developed into the German Social Democratic party. Lassalle died on August 31, 1864, from the wounds received in a duel on August 28.

Lassalle's most important theoretical and practical work, which contains the basic principles for the German Socialist party, is his book, Offenes Antwort-Schreiben, published on March 1, 1863.

There are many similarities of character between Lassalle and Ketteler. Both were stubborn, energetic, and possessed a strong desire to fight for the poor and the oppressed. Both had all the qualifications for leadership. Lassalle and Ketteler were accomplished orators, prolific writers, and influenced the political scene of modern Germany.

The basic disagreements between Lassalle and Ketteler arise from their respective philosophies of life. Lassalle was a convinced left-wing Hegelian, a follower of Feuerbach, and a professed atheist. For him the bond between the individuals in society was the Volks-geist. On the other hand, Ketteler possessed a deep faith in Catholicism and was a convinced Thomist. For the Bishop the bond between the members of society was the natural and divine positive laws. By natural law all men belonged to the family of God; by the divine positive law all Christians were brothers in Christ.

Although these two German leaders differed in their basic philosophy of life, they agreed on the evil results of capitalism and industrialization for the workingclass. They perceived the evils and agreed that these were immoral. Lassalle and Ketteler desired to elevate the social, economic, and political standards of the workingclass. In many instances their methods to accomplish this task were identical.

After Ketteler's system matured in 1869, they agreed that the state assist the individual citizens to achieve what he could not achieve by himself. However, Ketteler feared state absolutism and always proposed methods whereby the power of the state was restricted, yet could accomplish its purpose. Lassalle did not fear state absolutism, but believed in the Hegelian type of state.

They also disagreed on the purpose or objective of each citizen. For Lassalle the ultimate objective was the material benefit of the citizen. The ultimate end encompassed the entire development of the individual for Bishop Ketteler.

Neither of the two were republicans, for both men believed in a benevolent, popular monarchy. However, Lassalle wanted the crown to be the natural bearer of a social dictatorship. Here the Socialist leader again shows the influence of Hegel. Lassalle exemplified this dictatorial attitude by the vast power which the president of the German Workers' Association possessed. (Of course, the president was Lassalle.) On the other hand, because Ketteler was a Catholic and a Thomist, the power of the state was relative. Natural and divine positive law restricted the power of the state. A constitution had little value for Lassalle. For Ketteler a constitution, based upon justice and rights, was a guarantee against absolutism.

Lassalle held that the mission of the workingclass

was to ensure that the state work actively for the utmost well-being of every member of the community. Ketteler agreed but expanded this as the mission of all classes. They agreed that the workers had to exercise their political rights and powers and that this could only be accomplished through universal suffrage, which opened the way to freedom and unity for the workingclass. However, Ketteler did not agree that the workingclass found a political party of their own. Lassalle wished to base the political power of the workingclass upon the Marxist principle of class conflict and, in general, make the Marxist principles effective in practical politics. Bishop Ketteler was diametrically opposed to the Marxist principles of class conflict and atheism.

Both men accepted the idea that the freedom and equality of all was the foundation of German unity. Both accepted the leadership of Prussia in Germany. Lassalle did this with more conviction than Ketteler, yet both were extreme German nationalists, through which they possessed a high regard for the basics of German law. However, Ketteler did accept some of the basic principles of Roman law. The two German leaders differed on the type of German unity, for Lassalle desired a strong central government. On the other hand, Ketteler believed in federalism with just enough power for the central government in order to maintain unity.

Lassalle permitted the cooperation of the working-class with the bourgeois liberals for the sake of political expediency, even to the point of partially and temporarily sacrificing some basic principle. Ketteler also believed in political expediency, but within the limitations of his principles. Essentially, therefore, both opposed German liberalism.

Differing with Karl Marx, Lassalle held that the world of ideas was not entirely determined by economics and class relationship. However, he did not agree with Ketteler that divine providence was the determining factor in the world of ideas. This disagreement on divine providence also differentiated their philosophy of history, which, for Lassalle, was the development of freedom.

There was a distinct difference between the two in their concept of rights. For Bishop Ketteler the only source for a right was the natural law and the divine law, through which God was the author of all rights. On the other hand, Lassalle, following Hegel, held that the only source of a right was the common consciousness of the whole people, the universal Geist. Lassalle concluded that for the concept of right it was only necessary that public opinion, the people, should have informed the sphere of right. Furthermore, Lassalle held that individual acts of the will in harmony with the ascertained and expressed Volks-geist produced acquired rights. Ketteler argued that

individual acts of the will in harmony with the laws of God produced acquired rights.

One of the basic differences between Ketteler and Lassalle was their concepts concerning property. However, Ketteler agreed that, if the state were absolute, the socialism of Lassalle would be logical in its concepts concerning common property. The Bishop gave Lassalle credit for being logical but disagreed with the basic premise of Lassalle that the state was absolute. Lassalle argued that the abolition of private property was necessary to alleviate the sufferings of the workingclass and was based upon natural law. Also utilizing the natural law Ketteler argued that it demanded private property as the cornerstone of individual freedom and the individual's means of fulfillment. Ketteler emphasized the individual; Lassalle, society. Both utilized the natural law in their arguments.

They also differed concerning the ideal binding force of society. Ketteler held the conviction that Christian charity, fraternal love, would bind society together and change society. Lassalle held that brotherly love through socialism would transform society.

Both believed in freedom and equality but differed in regard to its application to women. Lassalle advocated the equality of women in every facet of life. Although Ketteler held women in high regard, he did not advocate

individual acts of the will in harmony with the laws of God produced acquired rights.

One of the basic differences between Ketteler and Lassalle was their concepts concerning property. However, Ketteler agreed that, if the state were absolute, the socialism of Lassalle would be logical in its concepts concerning common property. The Bishop gave Lassalle credit for being logical but disagreed with the basic premise of Lassalle that the state was absolute. Lassalle argued that the abolition of private property was necessary to alleviate the sufferings of the workingclass and was based upon natural law. Also utilizing the natural law Ketteler argued that it demanded private property as the cornerstone of individual freedom and the individual's means of fulfillment. Ketteler emphasized the individual; Lassalle, society. Both utilized the natural law in their arguments.

They also differed concerning the ideal binding force of society. Ketteler held the conviction that Christian charity, fraternal love, would bind society together and change society. Lassalle held that brotherly love through socialism would transform society.

Both believed in freedom and equality but differed in regard to its application to women. Lassalle advocated the equality of women in every facet of life. Although Ketteler held women in high regard, he did not advocate

public careers for women, but relegated their place to the home.

Ketteler had enough in common with Lassalle, so that rightist groups called him a socialist. A letter of Bishop Ketteler to the Catholic workers of Aachen² and his book, Liberalismus, Socialismus und Christentum, emphasize the basic differences between himself and Lassalle.

In a letter to his sister Sophie Ketteler wrote:

I have a keen interest in Lassalle. I have learned very much from him, for I studied his entire social system and followed his social endeavors. Although I cannot agree with him concerning religion and private property, he has many excellent ideas to offer in regard to our social problems.³

Summary: Principal Areas of Agreement

1. State participation was necessary for the welfare of the workingclass.

2. The mission of the workingclass was to insure that the state would work actively for the welfare of every member of the community.

3. The workingclass could only attain its end by the use of its political rights and power.

4. Universal suffrage would open the way to freedom and unity for the workingclass.

5. The state should sponsor co-operatives among the workers.

6. The better form of government for Germany was a benevolent, popular monarchy, but Lassalle wished the crown to be the natural bearer of a social dictatorship.

²Cf. Chapter V.

³As quoted in Pfulf, op. cit., III, 189.

7. Both men opposed the German National Liberal, but believed in political expediency.

8. Lassalle and Ketteler possessed a high regard for German law.

9. Both were German nationalists.

10. German unity had to be founded upon freedom and equality.

11. Individual acts of the will produced acquired rights; Lassalle added in harmony with the Volks-geist; Ketteler, divine law.

12. The world of ideas was not entirely determined by economics and class relations. Ketteler was further removed from determinism than Lassalle.

13. After 1866 both agreed on Prussian leadership in Germany.

14. They agreed on the Iron Law of Wages.

Principal Areas of Disagreement

1. When Lassalle drew up the constitution for the German Workers' Association, he gave the president dictatorial powers; and advocated dictatorial powers for a benevolent monarch.

2. Lassalle was completely opposed to Roman law.

3. For the Socialist leader the only source of rights was the common consciousness of the whole people, the universal Geist.

4. Lassalle held that acquired rights are brought about by individual acts of the will in harmony with the ascertained and expressed Volks-geist.

5. With Hegel and Feuerbach, Ferdinand Lassalle held that the state was absolute, if all of the people participated.

6. Lassalle desired a strong central government.

7. Lassalle declared that the Prussian constitution had no value for the people at large.

8. Lassalle desired the full equality of women.

9. According to the Socialist leader history was the development of freedom.

10. In general, Lassalle wished to make the Marxist principles effective in practical politics.

11. Ferdinand Lassalle desired that the Socialist virtue of brotherly love bind society.

12. The Socialist leader believed in common ownership of property.

13. Lassalle professed atheism.

APPENDIX II

SUMMARY OF THE ENCYCLICAL, RERUM NOVARUM, OF POPE LEO XIII

On the fifteenth of May, 1891, Pope Leo issued his famous encyclical, Rerum Novarum. In the introduction he states the reason for the encyclical:

It is no easy matter to define the relative rights and duties of the wealthy and of the poor, of capital and of labor. . . . But all agree, and there can be no question about it, that some remedy must be found, and found quickly, for the misery and wretchedness pressing so heavily and so unjustly, even at this moment, upon the vast majority of the working classes. . . . The custom of working by contract, and the concentration of many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, have brought about a condition of things, by which a small number of very rich have been able to lay upon the masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.

Leo deals first of all with the suggested remedy of the Socialists, the abolition of private property, and the principle that individual possessions should come into the common ownership of all, to be administered by the state. Leo XIII puts aside these propositions as powerless and which would increase the suffering of the workingman. Private property, the Pope states, is the natural

right of man: "When a man engages in remunerative labor, the impelling reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and thereafter to hold it as his own."

All this Leo contends is correct:

To affirm that God has given the earth for the use and enjoyment of the entire human race, is not to deny that private property is lawful. The earth has been granted to mankind in general, not in the sense that all, without distinction, can deal with it as they like, but rather that no part of it has been assigned forever to anyone in particular, and that the limits of private property have been left to be fixed by man's own initiative and by the laws of individual nations. . . . The soil, which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill, utterly changes its condition. It was wild before, now it is fruitful; it was barren, now it brings forth in abundance. That which thus altered and improved the land becomes truly part of itself. Is it just that the fruit of man's own sweat and labor should be possessed and enjoyed by someone else? As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to those who have bestowed the labor.

The Pope holds that the main tenet of Socialism, common ownership of everything, must be rejected, since it only injures those whom it was meant to benefit, since it is directly contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and since it would introduce confusion and disorder into society. Pope Leo held that it was impossible to reduce society to one level. Socialists might do their utmost to that purpose, but all such striving was against the nature of man and society was in vain. He held that there naturally existed manifold differences of the most important type. People differed in capacity, skill, health, strength;

and unequal fortune was a necessary result of unequal conditions. All this, the Pope goes on to explain, was part of the lot of humanity and was to be accepted as such.

Leo XIII utterly condemns the notion that class is naturally hostile to class, and that the capitalist and the laborer are intended by nature to live in conflict. Capital cannot survive without labor or labor without capital. The Pope declares that in the divine precepts are found the guides of each class with regard to its duties toward the others. Divine precept teaches the laboring man to carry out honestly and justly all equitable agreements freely entered into; never to injure the property of another, or to attack the person of an employer; never to resort to violence or to engage in riots and disorders. Religion teaches the wealthy owner and the employer that their workmen are not to be considered as their bondsmen and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men as chattels in order to exploit for the sake of profit and that it is unnatural to look upon their workmen as mere physical power. The employer must never tax his workers beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuitable for their age and sex. All masters of labor "should be mindful of this, that to exercise pressure upon the indigent and destitute for the sake of gain, and to make profit out of the needs of another, is condemned by all laws human and divine."

Then the Pope asks whether, if these precepts were

carefully obeyed, they would be enough to keep down all strife. He replies that nobody could possibly deny that, if such precepts were obeyed, there would be no conflict between master and workmen, between capital and labor. So far, the Pope's encyclical is only a sermon to inspire a turn in human affairs.

But Leo XIII was also a practical man and, therefore, proceeds to offer his views as to the manner in which the state ought to deal with the controversies between capital and labor. He writes:

When workmen have recourse to a strike, it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, the work too hard, or the wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this common occurrence should be alleviated by public remedial measures, for such paralysing of labor not only affects the masters and their workmen alike, but is extremely injurious to trade and to the general interests of the public. . . . Moreover, on such occasions violence and disorder are generally not far distant. Thus, it frequently happens that the public peace is seriously imperiled.

The Pope insists that every state should endeavor to pass laws which could forestall and prevent such troubles by lending its influence and authority toward the removal of the causes which led to conflicts between employers and employees. The Pope emphasized that in all agreements between employer and employees there is the expressed or understood condition that proper rest for soul and body be allowed. The Pope declares that the state has the duty to enforce this condition.

Leo XIII then approaches the subject of just wages by stating:

We now approach a subject of great and urgent importance and right principles are absolutely necessary, if extremes are to be avoided. . . . Wages, we are told, are regulated by the free consent of the laborer. Therefore, we are told, that the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has fulfilled his duty and seemingly is not called upon to do anything beyond this.

This kind of reasoning does not satisfy Pope Leo XIII. It cannot, he writes, be convincing to any fair-minded man, for there are important considerations which are totally left out. Leo takes for granted that employees and employers, as a rule, make free contracts and should agree on wages. But he states that it is often forgotten that nature dictates that remuneration must be sufficient to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. The Pope continues: "If, through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the employee accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is simply the victim of force and injustice."

Pope Leo says that in regard to wages, working hours, sanitary conditions, and general working conditions in factories and workshops, "it is advisable in order to prevent undue interference by the state . . . that recourse should be had to associations or unions." The state should only be appealed to as a last resort or for the sanction and protection of these associations or unions. Employers

and employees in such associations can do much, Leo says, by themselves and even afford timely aid to those members in distress. Furthermore, among other benefits these associations would do much to draw the two classes more closely together.

Most important of all, according to the Pope, are labor unions. The Pope then refers to the excellent results of the guilds of the Middle Ages. He says that the guilds were the means of affording not only many advantages to the workingman, but also assisted in the advancement of art. Such unions, of course, should be altered according to the needs of the present age. He adds that it was gratifying to know that there were many associations of this type already in existence, consisting of laborers alone, and some consisting of both employers and employees. But he desired that their number should greatly increase. However, Leo warned:

Let the state watch over these associations of citizens, banded together for the exercise of their rights, but let it not thrust itself into their particular concerns and their organizations; for things that move and live by the spirit inspiring them, may be killed by the rough grasp of a hand from without.

The idea of the Pope is that the state should encourage the formation of labor unions or associations, composed of employers and employees, for the regulation of all differences between capital and labor and for the assistance of workers in distress. The state was not to

interfere in the actual arrangements made by such unions or associations, but to assist in the enforcement of the decisions of the representative majority. In short, Leo desires that the state protect and assist the unions and not dictate policy to the unions.

The general principle of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, apart from its religious and moral precepts, is that the employer and employee should unite to alleviate the conditions of labor. The state should give them encouragement, protect them in their free discussions, and support their authority. All the principles which Leo suggests in this encyclical are based by the Pope upon the natural law of justice and the divine law of Christian charity.

Summary

Pope Leo XIII opposed: (1) Socialism; (2) common ownership; (3) state absolutism; (4) class conflict; (5) strikes and violence; and (6) too much interference by the state in labor-capital relations.

Leo advocated and defended: (1) private property according to natural law; (2) both the employer and the employee possessed rights balanced by related duties; (3) the dignity of the individual man; (4) justice and Christian charity were needed to reform society; and (5) the laboring man possessed the right of unionization, although the Pope preferred associations of employers and employees. In either

case the state was bound to protect them.