

CARL SCHMITT AND *RENOUVEAU CATHOLIQUE* LITERATURE TRACE OF AN 'OUTSIDER' POLITICAL CATHOLICISM

JOANNA PEDDER
UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

ABSTRACT Reinhard Mehring posits in his comprehensive biography that Schmitt was no representative of Political Catholicism. However, a closer inspection of writings such as *Roman Catholicism and Political Form* reveal otherwise. An obscure footnote in this essay presents to us an interest Schmitt has in French Catholic Revival literature, which was characterised by Catholics on the outside fringes of the faith. This author believes Schmitt follows in their political footsteps, with a keen emphasis on dogma and authority: a political Catholicism overlooked by Mehring, which is removed from the more ostensibly mainstream political conservatism of Thomism.

KEYWORDS Revivalism, Literature, Catholicism, Ernest Hello, Reinhard Mehring

INTRODUCTION

Within the pages of Schmitt's 1923 *Roman Catholicism and Political Form* essay we can find a reference to a Breton religious writer called Ernest Hello (1828-1885), who is noted for having a strong mystical orientation to his writings (Vier, 1962, pp. 245-256). The religious nature of this mystical writing in the essay and impact upon Schmitt's comprehension of Catholicism is an area yet to be considered. It is the intention of this essay to focus on how this detail yet to be examined, may affect our understanding of Schmitt in the context of conservative political Catholicism. Particularly, I wish to demonstrate that there is evidence here to defend Schmitt as a representative figure of this tradition. In doing so, I challenge the assertion of Reinhard Mehring, the author of a detailed biography on Schmitt and a contributor to *The Oxford Handbook on Carl Schmitt*, who argues that it is not possible to view

Schmitt as representative of any political Catholicism (2016, pp. 78-80). My contention is that Mehring has only considered a restricted range of theological criteria for grounding his assertion, ignoring other theological details which feature in a branch of conservative Catholic political theory whose proponents considered themselves as ‘outsiders’ to mainstream Catholicism.

Hello is understood to be a key contributor to the *Renouveau Catholique* literature of late 19th century to early 20th century France. Exploring the theo-political nature of this literature, I will provide the central theological and politics elements that constituted this literary movement. This is done with the intention of providing a basis for understanding the nature of the political Catholicism, which I believe Schmitt represents. Schmitt’s usage of Hello’s story will then be examined in closer detail and observe how it illuminates the importance of judgement in Schmitt’s thought. It is his positive endorsement on the role of divine judgement that brings him into this conservative political tradition, reflecting its theo-political nature. The deliberate presence of an obscure figure in Catholicism such as Hello is also an indication of Schmitt identifying with the self-perception of the *Renouveau Catholique* authors as strangers to the Catholic mainstream, a theme which remains evident even towards the end of his life in his final monograph *Political Theology II: The Myth of the Closure of Any Political Theology*.

AGAINST MEHRING: A CASE FOR SCHMITT AND POLITICAL CATHOLICISM

“Schmitt did not represent political Catholicism” is how Mehring surmises Carl Schmitt’s relationship to this political tradition (2016, p. 80). However, I believe there is scope to suggest a contrary position to Mehring’s skeptical interpretation of Schmitt, which recognizes Schmitt as a representative figure in conservative Catholic political theory. Nevertheless, it is Mehring (2016) who provides the initial hints of what this political Catholicism might be: “[a]ccording to contemporary attitudes, his standpoint was probably closest to the French “*renouveau catholique*” and the “*Action Franç[a]ise*” (pp. 78-79). This is coupled with his dismissal of Donoso Cortés as “[t]he “Catholic” author” whom Schmitt would most identify with (p. 78). Absent in Mehring’s subsection of Schmitt’s political Catholicism is a mention of Schmitt’s 1923 essay *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*.¹ It is within *RC* where we can locate the clues to the nature of this political Catholicism which I contend Schmitt represents. Formal recognition of the almost-forgotten Breton writer invoked by Schmitt in *RC* called Ernest Hello, provides us with a key link between Schmitt and conservative political Catholicism.

Ernest Hello was a pivotal early figure in establishing this genre of literature called *Renouveau Catholique*, or in the English, ‘Catholic Revival’,² which has its antecedents in right-wing Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Catholic reactionary figures Joseph de Maistre, Louis Bonald and Juan Donoso Cortés, Schmitt’s supposed Catholic ‘identifier’ (Griffiths, 1966, p. 7). While Mehring doubts the Catholicity of these reactionary figures, Tarragó (1999) however, recognizes a political Catholicism in both de Maistre and Cortés (pp. 166-177),³ allowing further scope to reject Mehring’s skepticism. Moreover, the Donoso Cortés and

¹ Henceforth ‘*RC*’.

² Henceforth ‘Revivalists’.

³ Tarragó’s conclusion deems Cortés to be more Catholic than de Maistre (1999, pp. 174-175).

Renouveau Catholique characterizations of Schmitt that Mehring presents disparately, are as Griffiths (1966) contends in his work on this nineteenth century religious literary phenomenon, part of a continuous political tradition who reject modernity and the trends of “liberal Catholicism” (pp. 4-8). Mehring’s points of reference for rejecting Schmitt as a representative of political Catholicism stem from Schmitt’s disapproval of: Thomism; the *en vogue* Catholic Romanticism popular within contemporary journalistic circles; left-wing political Catholicism and of the Church⁴ against the state as the dominant political authority (2016, p. 78). Evidently, this demonstrates a failure to take seriously the possibility of a conservative Catholic political theology that incorporates Donoso Cortés and Catholic Revival literature. Even though the concept of *ultramontanism*⁵ propagated by de Maistre is rejected by Schmitt in favor of “total state” (see Mehring, 2016, p. 78-80), it would be incorrect to assume that this remains the only defining theological criteria at hand for what Griffiths calls the “reactionary revolution” (1966, pp. 3-4).

RENOUVEAU CATHOLIQUE LITERATURE AND ITS THEO-POLITICAL NATURE

What theological features can we expect in a non-Thomist conservative reactionary Catholicism beyond Papal Supremacy, in a figure such as Ernest Hello? Richard Griffiths (1966) work on the Catholic revival in French literature between 1870-1914 provides both an informative and authoritative analysis of its proponents and the characteristics which underpin their writing (pp. 3-4). He explains that in general, the literature which came to embody the genre including novels, poetry and theatre was “a reaction against positivism, materialism and rationalism” that had been dominant for much of the previous two centuries (p. 3). Griffiths refers directly to our subject Hello, who was a strong influence on one prominent Revivalist writer Léon Bloy, would refuse the “Reign of science” (p. 11). Yet far from confirming this phenomenon as a mainstream trend in Catholicism, he alludes to the ‘outsider’ mentality of the contributing authors, perceiving themselves to be a “minority group”, against other (particularly Liberal) Catholics (p.5). Importantly, Griffiths emphasizes they were not part of the intellectual class, despite viewing the revival of Thomism and scholastic studies positively, they did not engage with these movements and did not regard it as of “use in the present situation” (p. 21).

According to Griffiths (1966) their rejection of intellectualism was rooted in a firm skepticism of human ability (pp. 21-22.). The preference instead, he explains, was towards a “simple religion” which is centered on acts of divine revelation that can be observed (such as miracles) confirming divine authority (pp. 21-22). As Griffiths states, higher status was designated to the mystical dimensions of Catholicism, with Joan of Arc (Jeanne D’Arc) becoming a popular figure for her “intuitive approach” towards religion, having numerous authors within the Revival movement dedicating works to her (p. 60).⁶ Some of the Catholic Revival authors, he notes, would also take a positive view of the peasant; less affected by intellectualism, the peasant stood as a steward of “great principles [of] Tradition, Loyalty, the Family, the Land” and was also lauded as a symbol of “unshakeable faith” (p. 59). Pertinently, he observes this defer-

⁴ ‘Church’ refers to Roman Catholic Church.

⁵ Or supreme Papal authority, that became propagated by de Maistre which resulted in the First Vatican Council (1869-1870) under Pius IX instating Papal Infallibility as official Church doctrine (see Griffiths, 1966, pp.5-6).

⁶ One such notable work on Joan of Arc was Charles Péguy’s “*Mystère de la Charité de Jeanne d’Arc*”.

ence towards mysticism and direct religious experience coupled with the ‘outsider mentality’ in Hello and Bloy took the form of an “obsession with secret messages, with apocalyptic predictions, with allegorical commentaries on holy writings and with mystical experiences” (p. 124). While it would be only Hello and Bloy to take an interest towards these almost heretical dimensions, as Griffiths contends, the emphasis on acts of divine intervention remain a key feature of the Revival literature and within the bounds of Catholic theology (pp. 351-352).

Characteristically, their skepticism of human capability and appeals to divine authority confirms their politically conservative outlook, which as Griffiths (1966) observes, brings them into line with the reactionary and authoritarian views of de Maistre, Donoso Cortés etc., who remained insistent that humanity is dependent upon God (p.157). Inspired by de Maistre, Griffiths notes these writers were also highly keen to press “the harsh nature of Christianity” (pp. 8, 149). Following from this ‘negative anthropology’, he states that they also consign man to inevitable suffering and struggle, which is perhaps no more evident than in the doctrine of “vicarious suffering” advocated by writers including Bloy, Péguy and Claudel (pp. 156-159). While this was not true for Hello though, Griffiths alludes to the fact that he was still not averse to focusing on other harsh eschatological realities of Catholicism, explaining that Hello sought signs of the end of the world and for Judgement to begin out of desire to escape from his own difficulties circumstances (pp. 138-139, 155). In sum, he argues that these challenging dimensions of Christianity were not inconsequential, marginal theological elements of Christianity for the Revivalist authors in contrast to their liberal Catholic contemporaries who may have been keen to downplay them (pp. 7-11). While the ‘Reactionary Revolution’ was not uniform in terms of subject and focus with authors writing on a broad range of topics, as can be observed in Griffiths monograph, these are theological elements other than Papal supremacy, which underpin a conservative political Catholicism as advocated by ‘outsider’ lay Catholics.

SCHMITT’S USE OF CATHOLIC REVIVAL LITERATURE

Roman Catholicism and Political Form is perhaps Schmitt’s most famous apologetic on the political nature of the Roman Catholic Church,⁷ so finding a Revivalist reference here is seemingly coherent in the present context, in which I am seeking to argue for a Schmittian political Catholicism. Schmitt expounds his “auratic” conception of representation in the essay through demonstrating the Catholic Church’s ability to represent compared with ‘economic-technical’ thought (McCormick, 1997, p. 169; cf. Kelly, 2004, p.114-116). The section where Schmitt (1996/1923) uses the Ernest Hello tale appears later, towards the end of the tract in a discussion regarding the Church’s ability to represent “two antagonisms” of beauty and justice (p. 31). Immediately preceding Hello’s story of *Le Regard du Juge*, Schmitt argues against the “atheistic” rejection of Church authority Dostoyevsky outlines in his tale the *Grand Inquisitor*,⁸ who is portrayed as a Roman priest who yields an excessive amount of power (p. 32). Schmitt then insists that while it can be “[o]nly in God is the conflict between power and good ultimately resolved”, to reject “every earthly power would lead to the worst inhumanity” (p. 32). Following the Grand Inquisitor, Schmitt introduces Hello with much enthusiasm claiming that by comparison to Dostoyevsky he had “far greater vision” and “ge-

⁷ See Ulmen, 1996, p.xi-xii.

⁸ The tale of the Grand Inquisitor features in chapter 3 of *The Brothers Karamazov*.

nus”, through managing to incorporate the antagonistic tension between both justice and glory in his vision of the Judgement (pp. 32-33). Schmitt continues, stating that through an appeal to Divine Justice, this antagonism “dialectically forces justice to its logical conclusion in that law it preserves law in the forms of judgement and appeal” (p.33). Schmitt’s is notably appreciative, believing that Hello had “courage” in presenting this in a “despicable” vision of the day of Judgement (pp. 32-33).

The vision of this Judgement day may have not ever been penned by Hello directly (Bloy, 1892, p. 95). In fact, the story appears in an 1892 book authored by his protégée Léon Bloy, called “*Salut par les Juifs*”, or ‘Salvation for the Jews’ (1892, pp. 95-97). Bloy recounts the tale as was told to him before Hello’s death in chapter 28. Schmitt’s usage though is particularly focused on the visceral depiction of the judgement and appeal (1996/1923, p. 33). Extracting from the sentence in Bloy’s original: “C’est tout le Jugement, — effroyablement infaillible, effroyablement sans appel” (1892, p. 95). “[I]rrevocable” according to Schmitt is the finality of the Judgement (1996/1923, p. 33), but it is then set against one of the damned making an appeal culminating in the call to justice and glory, which Hello depicts as so:

Rien ne le sauverait. Ni les supplications de Marie, ni les bras en croix de tous les Martyrs, “ni les ailes éployées des Chérubins ou des Trônes... Il est donc damné, et de quelle damnation!

— J’en appelle ! dit-il.

Il en appelle!... A ce mot inouï les astres s’éteignent, les monts descendent sous les mers, la Face même du Juge s’obscurcit. Les univers sont éclairés par la seule Croix de Feu.

— A qui donc en appelles-tu de Mon Jugement? demande à ce réprouvé Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ.

C’est alors que dans le silence infini de la Création, le Maudit profère cette réponse:

— J’en appelle de ta JUSTICE a ta GLOIRE !” (1892, p. 97).

For Schmitt (1996/1923) who claims that the Catholic church is a *complexio oppositorum*⁹ which can embody the seemingly opposed, the antagonism between justice and glory (beauty) can be retained in the very eschatological nature of the Church (pp. 31-33). Schmitt’s reasoning for introducing this discussion on both justice and glory is set within the context of jurisprudence and how the Catholic Church has a deeper foundation than secular jurisprudence, with by pertaining to both justice and more pressingly, “the person of Christ - that substantiates its claim to unique power and authority” (p. 30). This representative element exists, Schmitt argues in his earlier *Visibility of the Church*¹⁰ essay, because Christ the son of God, has become man (1996/1917, p. 14). He understands the Church which is present in the temporal world until the Judgement, embodies both the mother (the ‘Bride of Christ’) and the Father, with the Pope as “vicar of Christ” in direct personal descent from Christ (pp. 8, 14). Schmitt bases Roman Catholicism’s authority on justice as a temporal institution through a recognition that it is bound to this eschatological reality whereby Christ returns to Earth on the Day of Judgement in this transcendental capacity (1996/1917, p.15 and 1996/1923, pp. 31-33).

⁹ Or, the ‘complex of opposites’.

¹⁰ Henceforth VC.

It is important to demonstrate far from an extraneous and unnecessary addition to his point. Schmitt finds this vision of the Judgement insightful but also, it's author praiseworthy too, which corroborates a sense of deliberate intention in its placement within the tract. Furthermore, while Schmitt is speaking in the context of jurisprudence and justice, this application is a perfectly reasonable one from within the context of Revivalist literature.¹¹ Earlier we considered how the Revivalist's emphasis on the harsh and difficult aspects of Christianity constituted a central theo-political element. Schmitt willingly accepts the visceral brutality and violence of what Ernest Hello depicts of the Judgement, for the purposes of a defense of the Church's juridical authority. Indeed, by focusing on divine Judgement that confirms divine authority, as was his primary intention, another facet of the Revivalist literature is evidently observable here. Schmitt elsewhere in *RC* defends the eschatological Last Judgement as an element of Catholicism and as a mentality amongst Catholics too (1996/1923, p. 14). Claiming that the "[t]he expectation of the Last Judgement is as alive with a Spaniard like Donoso Cortés, French Catholics like Louis Veuillot and Léon Bloy" (p. 14). These are Revivalist figures which I contend represent the same conservative Catholicism which Schmitt too represents.

IMPLICATIONS ON SCHMITT'S THEOLOGY ELSEWHERE

How might Schmitt's usage of the Revivalist literature in the specific context of *RC* essay impact on our understanding of his other texts? As we have established, Schmitt's usage of Ernest Hello's story of "*Le Regard du Juge*" is a deliberate one in the context of defending the eschatological dimension of the Catholic Church. Here, it would be useful to consider Schmitt's other primary writing specifically dedicated to the Church that appeared in similar era to *RC*, which is his 1917 *VC* essay which originally appeared in a journal called *Summa*,¹² published by his then-friend Franz Blei, who had a strong interest in Catholicism (See Mehring 2014, 77-79). The essay begins with an open discussion of Christian eschatology and its perception amongst believers. Schmitt (1996/1917) rebuffs a "trite psychopathological analysis" which casts the early Christians as indifferent to the present world in their expectation of the new eschaton (p. 47). Schmitt's perceived unreasonableness of those who advocate the view of Christianity as ultimately indifferent to matters of this world can be captured in the following, dry remark: "[w]hy should Christians be interested in the end of the world at all, whereas today an autonomous spiritualist is interested only in himself and believes every man is his own judge (and consequently his own executioner)" (p. 48). It is possible we can read this comment by Schmitt as one of disdain for those who live without considering the prospect of a judgement from a 'higher' authority.

Yet, as Ulmen (1996) notes, in contrast to the focus on representation of the Catholic in *RC*, *VC* is focused on the Catholic church as a mediating institution and are therefore, not "uniform arguments" (pp. xi-xii). Additionally, he states that Schmitt's concern was predominantly about one about dogma in *VC*, where he wanted to challenge the "inwardness" of faith that was characteristic of Protestantism and a growing number of Catholics at the time

¹¹ See Griffiths (1966), *Reactionary Revolution*, p.139, he refers to Hello's tale in the context of searching for signs of the apocalypse.

¹² Also of interest is another satirical article by Schmitt published in *Summa* called "*Die Buribunken*", where a curious footnote claims that Schmitt defends the medieval Christian legacy. See *Summa: Eine Vierteljahresschrift*, 1918, p. 91.

of publication (p. xi). Schmitt is arguing against the abandonment of the world and leaving it “to its own devices” (1996/1917, p. 57). While he speaks as a lay person writing a scholastic consideration in 1917, he states later in *Political Theology II*¹³ that the 1923 *RC* essay was far from an “official church statement” (2008/1970, p. 47.) However, we do not see open any direct allusions these authors or their works in the prior essay. What impact does this have on interpreting the contributing value of Revivalist literature to Schmitt’s overall understanding of political theology? My suggestion is that we can interpret Schmitt’s shift towards endorsing the theology of the Revivalist’s as concurrent with his own personal distancing from the Church.¹⁴ There is still scope here to incorporate the traces of a more authoritarian religion present in the *VC* essay as part of the progression towards a conservative political Catholicism Schmitt represents. The dogmatic can be found in Schmitt here in statements such as “man is not alone in the world” but not because of the need “to discover the irrefutable but to find the truth” (1996/1917, p. 47). This aligns with the anti-rationalism mentality and deference towards divine authority of the Revivalist authors, even if we cannot see their presence in this earlier work.

In the overall broader context of Schmitt’s political theology, both essays show a *dis-ease* with modernity, with Ulmen (1996) remarking that he wanted to avoid “subjective theories” of human nature (Freudianism and Marxism) as well as any “scientific” arguments that were used to disprove the “incarnation of Christ” (p. xii). While in *RC* Schmitt would speak of the inability of global capitalism to yield any true representative power (1996/1923, p.24).¹⁵ Such suspicion accord with those of the Revivalists, who as Griffiths (1966) contends in his conclusion, ultimately struggled to accept the change of society and make adaptations to modernity, including liberalism and capitalism (pp. 225-257). This ‘outsider’ mentality of the Revivalists, which kept them away from the mainstream of the Church, seems to be also true of Schmitt and for most of his career. For, as Hoelzl and Ward (2008) highlight in their editorial introduction for *Political Theology II*, Schmitt’s last monograph, it was of a theological nature and it was likely published as a response to the events of the Second Vatican Council¹⁶ which engulfed the Catholic church between 1962-1963 (pp.15-16). They allude to the dedication of the book for his friend, a Catholic priest and critic of this Council called Hans Barion, an outsider to the Church who was disciplined for his controversial involvement with the Nazi Party (p. 16). Schmitt thus saw himself to be like Barion, as an outsider to the Church, provoked in response to the Second Vatican council.

Hoelzl and Ward (2008) explain that the Second Vatican Council attempted to reconcile with the modern world, but this risked being viewed as “embracing Protestant liberalism” as well as potentially undermining Vatican authority (pp. 16-17). They argue that for Schmitt, as a conservative, these efforts by the Church were deemed too excessive (pp. 17-18).¹⁷ Indeed, they explain that as part of Church’s embrace of public scrutiny and accountability, the Council galvanized both the laity and clergy, resulting in a repositioning, or “re-evaluation of the laity”¹⁸ in the Church hierarchy, ultimately leading to increased democracy within the

¹³ Henceforth *PT II*.

¹⁴ Ulmen, *Introduction*, 1996, p.xiii.

¹⁵ Also see Ulmen, 1996, pp. xii.

¹⁶ Henceforth ‘VC II’.

¹⁷ We can note Schmitt’s concerns regarding this here in *PT II*, 2008/1970 p.47.

¹⁸ For example, in *Lumen Gentium*, issued by the Second Vatican Council in 1964, chapter IV “Laity” attempts to set out how this new relationship between Church hierarchy and the laity is constituted: “Let the

Church (p. 17). The nature of this change, they claim, excluded figures such as Schmitt who valued authority akin to the Catholic counter-revolutionary theorists, such as de Maistre, Bonald and Donoso Cortés, as it risked diminishing the power of the Church (p. 16).¹⁹ As McCormick explains, qualitatively, representation in the Church for Schmitt followed the medieval structure of aura, allowed to run its own affairs without deference to public opinion, in contrast to modern democracy (1997, p.169). He notes that for Schmitt, the Church has an auratic representative capacity that comes from a transcendent reality, which “cannot be accessed through merely quantitative means”, so for Schmitt the concept of democracy where a representative figure is based on a quantifiable number of votes, is not relatable to the Church (p. 169). While not completely transformed into an absolute democracy, through introducing this new accountability and delineation of power, to reflect the external material changes taking place in the communities of its parishioners, the Church lost, or ‘surrendered’ its representational capacity based on aura alone, which stands contrary to Schmitt’s *RC* apologetic.

Theologically, as we could observe specifically from his application of Ernest Hello, Schmitt is admiring of the authoritarian elements of Catholicism and the Church hierarchy, which cannot be reduced to material and technological categories. From his early essay of *VC* (1917) through to *PT II* (1970), there is a distrust for the emphasis on human capability that Schmitt perceives as dominating the modern world.²⁰ Thus, we can see in Schmitt a continuous preference in the Church as a *distant* authority and judgement against a materialist modernity, with the view of himself on the periphery to the mainstream Church, much in line with the Catholic conservatism of the Revivalists and their forefathers.

CONCLUSION

Although the Ernest Hello reference appears in one essay by Schmitt to address a very specific point concerning the superior juridical basis of Roman Catholicism vis-à-vis secular jurisprudence, it is a trace which evidences his draw towards the conservatism of the Revivalists. While it could be claimed fairly by Mehring that Schmitt was not representative of the mainstream of political Catholicism like Thomism, the point is that he did not perceive himself as part of the Catholic majority and *was not aiming* to position himself as such. Notwithstanding that ultramontanist popular among Revivalists becoming official Church doctrine, there were features beyond the mainstream of Catholicism and their theological validity cannot be dis-counted. As Griffiths notes in his conclusion to the *Reactionary Revolution*, Catholicism is not ‘monolithic’; although there remain boundaries to what can legitimately be defined as Catholic and not heresy, there is scope to include these more anti-rationalism, mystical dimensions centered upon divine intervention (1966, p.351). There is certainly a continuity from de Maistre, Donoso Cortés through Hello and then to Schmitt with respect to a Catholic metaphysics which informs their political outlook.

spiritual shepherds recognize and promote the dignity as well as the responsibility of the laity in the Church. Let them willingly employ their prudent advice. Let them confidently assign duties to them in the service of the Church, allowing them freedom and room for action.” (Paul VI. Vatican II §37).

¹⁹ As can be observed in *PT II*, 2008/1970 pp.49-59.

²⁰ We can see in *PT II* “Postscript: On the Current Situation: The Legitimacy of Modernity” (pp. 116-130) that Schmitt vocalizes his skepticism towards this “de-theologized” modernity and “secular and humane humanity”, particularly because he understands the implication of this is ‘de-politicization’ (2008/1970, p. 128).

The outsider mentality is reinforced by Schmitt's draw towards the challenging aspects of Christianity like the Revivalists. Their propensity towards the more difficult elements of Christianity, which in this instance is divine judgement, are formative features evident in the political theory of Schmitt. One of the clearest examples is in the 'decisionism' that defines his conception of the sovereign, in *Political Theology*. In this respect, the mystical dimension of judgement in Schmitt makes him comparable to de Maistre who wrote in favor of the death penalty in his writing "*The Executioner*". The fact that de Maistre's writing on Papal supremacy (*Du Pape*) led to the first Vatican Council and was influential among Revivalists, but not explicitly followed by Schmitt, does not mean that there was a *total* absence of appreciation for the authoritarian dimensions of Catholicism. Schmitt's later wariness about the delineation of the Church's authority to the laity and the Church becoming too embedded in society indicates that he was very reluctant to see the hierarchy of the Church compromised. Surely this view coherently reflects too, his personal distance from involvement in the Catholic Church. Perhaps ultimately, Schmitt's critical distancing from the Catholic Church cements him as a true ambassador for a continuation of this outsider conservative Catholicism.

REFERENCES

- Bloy, L. (1892). *Salut par les Juifs*. Paris: A. Demay.
- Griffiths, R. M. (1966). *The Reactionary Revolution: The Catholic Revival In French Literature, 1870-1914*. London: Constable.
- Kelly, D. (2004). Carl Schmitt's Political Theory of Representation. *The History of Ideas*, 65(1), 113-134.
- McCormick, J. P. (1997). *Carl Schmitt's Critique of Liberalism: Against Politics as Technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Mehring, R. (2014). *Carl Schmitt: A Biography*. Malden, MA; Cambridge, U.K.: Polity.
- Mehring, R. (2016). A "Catholic Layman of German Nationality and Citizenship"?: Carl Schmitt and the Religiosity of Life. In J. Meierhenrich, & O. Simons, *The Oxford Handbook of Carl Schmitt* (pp. 73-95). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Paul VI. Vatican II. (1964). *Lumen Gentium*. 21 Nov. 1964. 5 Oct 2017. <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html>.
- Schmitt, C. (1918). Die Buribunken. *Summa: Eine Vierteljahresschrift*, 89-106.
- Schmitt, C. (1996). *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*. (G. Ulmen, Ed., & G. Ulmen, Trans.) Westport, CT; London: Greenwood Press.
- Schmitt, C. (2005). *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. (G. Schwab, Trans.) Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt, C. (2008). *Political Theology II: The Myth of the Closure of any Political Theology*. (M. Hoelzl, G. Ward, Eds., M. Hoelzl, & G. Ward, Trans.) Malden, MA; London: Polity.
- Tarragó, R. (1999). Two Catholic Conservatives: The Ideas of Joseph de Maistre and Juan Donoso Cortès. *Catholic Social Science Review*, 4, 166-177.
- Vier, J. (1962). Un grand écrivain Breton trop oublié : Ernest Hello ou la Réconciliation de la mystique et de l'art. *Annales de Bretagne*, 69, 245-256.