Orestes Brownson is regarded as one of the most important contributors to Catholic social thought that the United States has ever produced. Although he is famous for changing his views during the course of his intellectual career, he in fact consistently defended several core principles. His defense of community and social obligation never wavered. He called for greater social equality as a young socialist and Transcendentalist; as a mature Catholic he urged his readers to take seriously Jesus’s command that they love one another. Although Brownson wrote in the nineteenth century, his views remain relevant in the second decade of the twenty-first century. His work challenges the narcissism, individualism, and selfishness that plague our world today. In contrast to our culture’s tendency to focus on the individual, Brownson calls for us to think about our communities. He asks us to rise above our sinful natures.

How should the “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church” relate to the world around it? To what extent should the immortal Church of Rome adapt its teaching and mission to the historical and cultural context in which its message will be proclaimed? What truths are essential to the identity of the church that was first led by Saint Peter, and which parts of a Catholic thinker’s teachings are extraneous accretions of history and culture? How do we know when we are witnessing Christ transforming culture rather than the Christ of Culture? These questions have been at the core of theological discussion since St. Paul and St. Peter quarreled over whether the nascent Christian church should adhere to traditional Jewish disciplines. This paper explores the contributions of Orestes Brownson to this debate. It is a plea for Catholics who are interested in social questions to think through the contributions Brownson makes to Catholic perspectives on politics. It argues that Brownson’s criticism of individualism and his conception of the nature of the state make him relevant for Catholics living in the twenty-first century.

Brownson has been called “the Catholic thinker par excellence of the United States. There are no rivals. . . . No Catholic thinker has equaled him in national prominence, international presence, density of thought, variety
of concerns, or sheer volume.” Arthur Schlesinger, writing in 1939, said, “Few issues of the day escaped his attention between 1830 and 1870. His observations on society had a profundity that no other American of his time approached. Yet Brownson today is almost forgotten.” Happily, this is no longer true. A number of scholars have championed the cause of Brownson’s continued relevance after a period of neglect. Among others, Patrick Carey, R.A. Herrera, Russell Kirk, and Peter Lawler have written thoughtful essays that illuminate the significance of Brownson’s thought for understanding the dilemmas facing Catholics of the second decade of the twenty-first century.

Brownson’s remarkable ideological odyssey from Unitarian to Transcendentalist to Roman Catholic has been the subject of much commentary. Brownson’s intellectual journey, this paper will argue, provided him with distinctive, perhaps unique, insights into American culture and the future arc of intellectual change in the United States. Much like the “generation of seekers” Wade Clark Roof describes, Brownson followed numerous philosophical and religious traditions until he committed himself in 1844 to Roman Catholicism. As Schlesinger wrote, “Rome provided the only refuge. . . . [H]e found in the Catholic universe the security he had sought so long, and he rested joyously in the Catholic solutions of the central problems of life.” This paper examines the fascinating contrast between his thoughts about society during his Transcendentalist years (1836 to 1841) and the Catholic perspective that dominated his mature years. It is argued here that thinking about the contrasts between Transcendentalism and Catholicism helps illuminate much of Brownson’s thought and many of the tensions of our own day.

Gregory Butler’s superb 1992 book, In Search of the American Spirit: The Political Thought of Orestes Brownson, is a valuable contribution to our understanding of this important Catholic writer and is similar in focus to the argument presented in this paper. This paper, however, concentrates much more narrowly than Butler does on the contrast between Brownson and the Concord Transcendentalists, Emerson and Thoreau. Butler mentions Thoreau just once but provides an extended overview of the influence of thinkers like Constant and Cousin on Brownson’s thought. Butler also offers an insightful discussion of the legacy of Brownson’s work for a “Christian foundation for politics.” This paper makes the more limited point that Brownson was a critic of individualism throughout the course of his long and changing intellectual life. Thinkers like Emerson and Thoreau fail to provide democratic society with a vision of the common good. This is what Brownson always sought to provide both as a socialist in his early years and later as a mature Catholic thinker. While the values that defined
the ideal community for Brownson changed over time, his commitment to the primacy of community never wavered.

Butler argues that four essays are especially important for understanding Brownson’s thought: Transcendentalism, (1845); Channing on Social Reform (1849); Socialism and the Church (1849); and the Spirit Rapper (1854). Brownson’s most important book is The American Republic (1866). In addition to these primary works, Brownson published volumes of essays on a wide range of topics. This paper directs primary attention to the essays written during Brownson’s Transcendentalism period from 1836 to 1841.

WRITINGS THAT REFLECT NINETEENTH-CENTURY PREJUDICES

Examining the thought of Brownson helps us to think about which insights a thinker may offer that have eternal worth and which reflect only common cultural understandings of his or her era. Catholics and other Christian groups have often failed to proclaim the eternal verities of Christianity. For example, John Lee Eighmy’s classic Southern Churches in Cultural Captivity explains how southern Christian churches failed to bear witness to Christ by acquiescing in—or even contributing to—racial oppression. Brownson’s prolific pen produced much commentary that is fascinating for understanding the nineteenth century even though it does not illuminate dilemmas Catholics of the twenty-first century confront. Some of his writing fails to rise above prejudices common to the nineteenth century.

Most disappointingly, Brownson never became an abolitionist. One may wish that it had been he rather than Thoreau who wrote, “I cannot for a second recognize as mine that government which is the slave’s also.” Instead he wrote, “There is no doubt that the negro slave, well fed and well clothed, and not unkindly treated, is happier than the free laborer at wages.” This comment might have come from the pen of the Virginia defender of slavery and enemy of capitalism George Fitzhugh. On the other hand, Brownson was more opposed to slavery than many of his fellow Catholics during the 1850s. Once the war began, he urged the emancipation of the slaves. He also criticized Bishop John Hughes for failing to oppose slavery. It is heartening to read Brownson’s criticism of Chief Justice Taney for the Dred Scott decision: “We regret that in giving the opinion of the court the learned judge did not recollect what he is taught by his religion, namely, the unity of the race, that all men by the natural law are equal, and that negroes are men, and therefore as to their rights must be regarded as standing on the same footing with white men.”
WRITINGS WITH ENDURING VALUE

What themes in Brownson’s thought have relevance for us in the twenty-first century? Brownson’s insights into the nature of the self and the nature of the American state are two invaluable contributions that transcend his historical context and that illuminate a Catholic understanding of our world. One distinctive contribution Brownson is able to make to our world today is his insight into the consequences of American individualism for social order. The second contribution follows from the first. Brownson rejects the social contract view of politics found in contemporary thinkers like Rawls and insists instead that the U.S. is the product of divine providence. These two contributions ensure Brownson’s continued relevance to our world today.

UNDERSTANDING THE SELF

Perhaps the greatest contribution Brownson makes to social thought is his understanding of the self. Brownson was a leading voice in two philosophical traditions with sharply contrasting understandings of the nature of God: Roman Catholicism and Transcendentalism. Brownson was a founding member of the Transcendental Club in 1836 and part of the inner circle of Concord Transcendentalists until 1841. He also was a prominent Catholic advocate for three decades after his conversion in 1844. Few Catholic thinkers have this insider’s perspective and intimate understanding of one of America’s most famous forms of individualism.

Brownson’s oeuvre is dauntingly immense. Thus, this paper must necessarily be selective in its treatment of his essays. Brownson’s principal defense of the Transcendentalist persuasion, “New Views of Christianity, Society, and the Church,” appeared in 1836. Emerson’s most famous essay “Nature” was also published in 1836; both writings are considered leading expressions of the Transcendentalist approach. Both Brownson and Emerson argue in these essays that religious sentiment has outgrown religious institutions. These two famous Transcendentalists shared a willingness to dispense with traditional authority that could no longer speak meaningfully to a searching nineteenth century. (It is remarkable that the Brownson who could write “New Views” as a Transcendentalist would as a Catholic write “Newman’s Theory of Christian Doctrine.” This essay appeared in 1847 and criticized John Henry Newman for suggesting that Catholic doctrine could evolve or develop.)

Brownson, however, never shared the radical individualism that was expressed in the epiphanies of many of the other Transcendentalists. Emerson, for example, called for freeing the individual from restrictive social,
economic, familial, cultural, and religious constraints. Have any thinkers ever surpassed American Transcendentalists of the antebellum years as defenders of individual liberty? No affirmation of the individual can surpass Emerson’s claim that “I have access to the entire mind of the creator.” In *Walden*, and in such essays as “Self-Reliance” and “Nature,” the individual is exhorted to rely on her own insights and to disregard the dead weight of society, tradition, and established religion. Thoreau advises his readers to “Go boldly in the direction of your dreams; live the life you have imagined.” Emerson claims that, “I simply experiment, an endless seeker with no past at my back.”

The Transcendentalists teach that no authority surpasses the individual. As Thoreau writes in *Walden*, “Be a Columbus to whole new continents and worlds within you, opening new channels, not of trade, but of thought. Every man is the lord of a realm beside which the earthly empire of the Czar is but a petty state, a hummock left by the ice.”

The individual must look inward rather than to her community or any external source of authority such as God to make decisions about her life. Indeed, Emerson has been seen as a type of pantheist, although his thought may contain isolated remnants of more orthodox Christian theology. As Thoreau writes in *Walden*, “heaven is under our feet as well as over our heads.” This belief that each of us is a part of God contrasts dramatically with the orthodox Christian belief that God is distinct from His creation and utterly beyond humanity in wisdom and power. Sin, Emerson would argue, is the result of man’s failure to understand and follow the voice within. Sin, he writes, is God in ruins. Some religious liberals may consider orthodox Christianity to be a vestige of the aristocratic past.

Brownson, even when rejecting established religion, worried about the social consequences of extreme individualism. “Are they my poor?” Emerson had famously asked. Brownson would have said yes. Even during his Transcendentalist years, Brownson objected to Emerson’s supreme confidence in the individual.

We presume that when Mr. Emerson tells us to obey ourselves, to obey the laws of our soul, to follow our instincts, he means that we shall be true to our higher nature, that we are to obey our higher instincts, and not our baser propensities. . . . But how shall we determine which are our higher instincts and which are our lower instincts?

Brownson objected that this “system of pure egotism” runs all through Emerson’s writings, as it does everywhere in his masters, Carlyle and Goethe.

Brownson urged Thoreau, who was his closest friend among the Transcendentalists, and others in their circle to think about how to achieve...
social reform. Indeed, Brownson was farther to the Left on issues of political economy than all of the other Transcendentalists and almost all of his contemporaries. His infamous 1840 essay, “The Laboring Classes,” called for rejecting wage slavery and was used successfully by the Whigs to discredit the Democratic presidential candidate in the election that year. Brownson was disillusioned when none of his fellow Transcendentalists came to his defense as he was being pilloried as a radical socialist in the national press.

After his conversion to Catholicism in 1844, Brownson decisively rejected the Transcendentalist cosmology and understanding of the self. Catholics, and other orthodox Christians, inhabit a world that is very different from the world as Emerson saw it. As Brownson writes in *The American Republic*, in Catholic thought, “Man is a dependent being, and neither does nor can suffice for himself.”

As a Catholic, as Carey argues, Brownson affirmed the notion of positive original sin—the belief that the fall had damaged man’s moral ability and judgment—against the negative thesis that original sin had damaged nothing essential. The famous story of Lucifer blamed his fall from heaven on his unwillingness to abase himself before God. By contrast, Christ “humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross” (Philippians 2:8). Grace, then, is central to Brownson’s theology. As a biographer of Thomas Aquinas noted, “It takes grace to know that we are in need of grace.” The assertion of the self against God’s sovereignty was for Brownson the cause of much of our social strife. By contrast, as Brownson argues, Transcendentalism “ridicules the notion that a holy life must be an incessant warfare against oneself.” Brownson’s 1845 essay “Transcendentalism” and his book *The American Republic* contain some of his most important insights into the essential character of human beings and were written during his Catholic years.

Brownson saw this individualism as a central flaw of Protestantism. Brownson alienated the larger Protestant community by arguing that salvation could be found only in the Catholic Church. Brownson defended a communal and sacramental view of life. Unlike most Protestants and even some Catholics, Brownson endorsed the 1864 encyclical of Blessed Pope Pius IX The *Quanta Cura* with its annex, the Syllabus of Errors. The document denounced any compromise between the Catholic Church and the Spirit of the Age. Such heresies as pantheism, rationalism, latitudinarianism, and modern liberalism were condemned as false. Brownson, then, believed that revealed truth could be found in the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church. The subjectivity of much of our culture today rests in the belief that individuals are themselves arbiters of what is real,
just, or true. Against these tendencies, Brownson posed the authority of the ancient church of Rome.

**UNDERSTANDING THE STATE**

This conception of the individual naturally informs Brownson’s understanding of the state. Social contract theory presupposes that individuals (or groups) decide to create a state to pursue ends that they can agree to. Rawls, for example, imagines individuals deciding behind the veil of ignorance what sort of society and state they prefer. As Butler correctly argues, Brownson rejects the social contract theories of Paine, Locke, Hobbes, and Rousseau: “One may say that the organic constitution is the political counterpart to the Catholic magisterium; the constitution is the revealed will of God.” Brownson rejected the individualism that is reflected in Rawls’s famous attempt to resurrect contract theory.

Brownson criticized other forms of individualism as well. “We know that we do not follow Adam Smith or any of the political economists. . . . [T]he system they defend, when carried into practice, and made the rule of national policy, is about as absurd and mischievous a system as the devil ever assisted the human mind to invent.” Any theory that begins with the premise of individual self-interest or autonomy would not meet Brownson’s approval. He also rejected the prevalence of selfishness or egoism in other realms of life. He would surely be appalled by the casualness with which many contemporary Americans regard marriage. For some Americans living today, marriage is merely a contract that can be voided when the marital partners no longer find it rewarding.

Brownson contends that the American political order is of providential origin and is God working through historical events, not a contract drawn up by human agreement. Brownson is uniquely aware of the threat Transcendentalism poses for political harmony. As a friend of Thoreau and Emerson, he has an insider’s perspective for the spiritual character of the movement. As Father John Courtney Murray, S.J argued, it is an “illusion that an ordered political existence, one that respects the freedom and dignity of all human beings, will emerge from a society grounded on nothing more than an atomistic, self-absorbed individualism.” As Butler argues, democracy can exist only where the Catholic church is received and loved because it elevates men above their nature. A communal and sacramental view of life provides the foundation for a just and humane society.

Brownson, although always skeptical of the liberal focus on individual autonomy, was strenuously opposed to socialism during his Catholic years. He condemned socialism as materialistic and atheistic. Butler provides an exceptionally insightful description of the contrast Brownson drew in...
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*The American Republic* between northern “humanitarian” democracy and the “personal” democracy of the South. Personal democracy, Brownson argues, is convinced that no restraint can be imposed on any individual’s will. It is pure egoism. The individual claims, “I am God.” Humanitarian democracy makes the opposite error. It seeks to efface all individualities and group differences into the solidarity of one human race. Brownson saw socialism, like abolitionism, as an error of humanitarian democracy.23

**CHALLENGES OF THE SECULAR TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY**

Brownson’s thought, like the thought of all other Catholics, reflects the predominant values, perspectives, and issues of his era. Peter Lawler argues that Brownson and Murray have written two of the most astute and comprehensive books Catholic Americans have ever written about their country. Each author wrote about issues of concern to his era. Murray, for example, wrote about the twentieth-century conflict with the Soviet Union, while Brownson shared the nineteenth-century experience of civil war, and much of his writing reflects debates over this searing conflict. But these two profound Catholic thinkers share a conviction that the individual is not sovereign in God’s world. Peter Lawler writes that there is “a tradition in American Catholic thought that begins with Brownson and ends (so far) with Murray.”24 Instead of autonomous individuals, these great thinkers argue that people are subordinate to revealed natural law or, as Murray put it, the “tradition of reason.” Our lives are (or should be) communal and sacramental rather than individualistic. While the Catholic intellectual tradition is diverse and includes libertarians (e.g., Juan de Marinana), Catholics like Brownson emphasize the role of tradition, authority, community, and obligation. As we have seen, these commitments are antithetical to the social thought of Transcendentalists like Emerson and Thoreau.

Which perspective prevails in the second decade of the twenty-first century in the United States? Our century, it might be argued, has witnessed the triumph of liberal individualism. Emerson comes to mind when reading Bellah et alia’s description of the woman whose religion was herself (or ‘Sheilahism’).25 The authors note that this creates the possibility of “220 million American religions.” Thinkers as diverse as Mary Ann Glendon, Alasdair McIntyre, Richard Merelman, Robert Putnam, and Michael Sandel worry that the bonds that create a functioning community are fraying. In their very different ways they worry that we have become a nation of utterly self-centered, self-seeking individualists. Robert Booth Fowler provides empirical evidence that liberal individualism has been gaining influence in recent decades.26
Charles Taylor describes a shift in our self-understanding that now celebrates individualism. Belief in God is now seen as one of many choices rather than an unquestioned truth. Even Christians now see themselves as “buffered selves” rather than “permeable selves.” Hell and the wrath of God are felt faintly in our age. Each individual, as Emerson urged, feels free to develop her own standards of meaning. As Gerhart Niemeyer argues:

Modern intellectuals are people of the mind. By this I mean they concentrate all attention exclusively on their own thought, absorbing the world, God, nature, history, society, into their narrow mental system, sure that they create values, cultures, and all kind of realities out of nothing but their own reason. . . . [T]hey have separated themselves from all that exists independently of them.

The difficulty these developments pose for creating a sustainable public culture has often been analyzed. In Brownson we have a formidable dissident from these prevailing trends. Some would say that he is the greatest Catholic social thinker America has produced. Surely he warrants close attention from all Catholics who think seriously about the future of their country.

In a practical sense, Catholics living today must strive to understand the truth of Catholic tradition and teaching. What guidance can Brownson and Catholic social thought offer on debates like abortion, birth control, foreign policy, gay marriage, immigration, health care, social policy, and other issues that Americans today must address? Pope Francis’s *Evangelii Gaudium* in 2013 sparked great public commentary when he criticized “the idolatry of money” and the “absolute autonomy of markets.” This furor led columnist Michael Gerson to write,

Those surprised that Catholic social thought is incompatible with libertarianism haven’t been paying attention—for decades. Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI said the same. And all warned of the danger when a mode of economic exchange becomes a mind-set. Absent a moral commitment to human dignity, justice and compassion, capitalism is conducive to materialism, individualism, and selfishness. It is a system that depends on virtues it does not create.

Students of Brownson will not be surprised that a Catholic would express uneasiness about laissez faire economics. They will know that this has been true for centuries. They will know that Catholics have long recognized that human beings are fundamentally social creatures rather than the rational individualists described in some political and economic theory.
CONCLUSION

Can a nineteenth-century Catholic, however brilliant, provide guidance for Catholics living in the second decade of the twenty-first century? The answer is surely yes. The fundamental contribution Brownson makes to social thought today is his realization that individualism alone cannot sustain a democratic republic. This skepticism of political or social theories that focus on the individual is consistent throughout his career as a writer. As we have seen, during his Transcendentalist years Brownson condemned the moral solipsism he saw in Emerson in 1838 and rejected the wage slavery of rapacious capitalism in an 1840 essay. After becoming a Catholic, Brownson was impressed by the central paradox of Christianity. The eternal, omnipotent God of the universe entered human history as a helpless child. In a world so impressed by power, status, and wealth, Christ was born in a humble manger. Thus, in his final three decades, Brownson called for loving service to humanity and to God and condemned radical individualism and egoism.

To be sure, Brownson is not the only social thinker to warn against the dangers of untrammeled individualism. His significance lies in both his analysis of the risk it poses for social order and his articulation of a Catholic alternative to a social order that values individual liberty to the exclusion of all competing values. The fundamental reason Brownson is skeptical of individualism is because he believes that humans are corrupted and sinful creatures. Although examples of the harm excessive individualism can cause any society could be enumerated at great length, one should note a few of the most obvious victims. Families may grow less stable as individual fulfillment assumes greater value. Children, especially in poor communities, will suffer as wealthy individuals feel little obligation to nurture and educate them. Thus, although Catholic social thinkers like Orestes Brownson surely value individual liberty, freedom cannot be the only good that Catholics cherish and defend.

What would Brownson have to say about some of the great controversies facing America in 2016? Three general principles Brownson consistently defended have clear implications for current policy controversies. First, Catholics, as the famous words of the Gospel entreat, are urged to “love thy neighbor as thyself.” He implored his readers to remember that life has a fundamentally spiritual nature. Every human has infinite value because she is an eternal soul created in God’s image. Catholics should ask themselves, “What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” We might explore the profound significance of this moral obligation for a wide range of public policies, but the example
of immigration furnishes one especially salient and poignant illustration. Contemporary Americans would benefit from reading Brownson’s 1844 essay “Native Americanism.” The question of whether to welcome desperate refugees was bitterly contested in the nineteenth century just as it is today. The contemporary controversy over immigration has prompted remarkably strident commentary that would dismay Brownson. He would understand the fierce anger and fear nativism can produce because he experienced it in his own time. He argued that immigrants should be welcomed as brothers and sisters both because of Christian love and because they enhance our vitality and dynamism. In light of the immense suffering experienced by today’s Syrian refugees, Brownson’s call for magnanimity is as necessary today as it was then.

Second, Brownson believed that humans are corrupted by sin. As this paper has emphasized, his recognition of the power of untrammeled selfishness is an insight that is relevant for our world today. He worried throughout his career about the concentration of power that a nexus of business and political elites could create. He found himself unable to vote a second time for U.S. Grant in the presidential election of 1872 because of the hold corrupt banking interests exerted on his administration. The dominant Republicans of his day were wedded to the rich and powerful. He offered a series of specific and detailed suggestions for reducing the risk the financial sector can pose to the American economy. The devastating Panic of 1873 could have been avoided, he argued, with greater restraints on the banking sector. Once again, critics worry about the clout of financial institutions that are “too big to fail” and the pernicious power of the 1%. He wrote in 1873 that:

> Congress is filled with factors of the great moneyed and business corporations; and the great railroad interests, combined with the manufacturing and banking interests, are not only stronger than the state governments, but stronger even than the general government.  

This echoes a concern he had expressed thirty years before. He wrote, “Bankers, capitalists, corporators, stock-jobbers, speculators, and trafficking politicians control the government, and in nearly all cases shape its policy.” Current political leaders seek ways to constrain the financial speculation and systemic risk created by bankers’ power and recklessness. The awareness that power could be abused was one of the guiding insights that shaped Brownson’s thinking about political questions throughout his career.

Brownson would say that the reality of original sin requires Catholics to be vigilant in promoting justice. For Brownson, pride is the preeminent human vice and humility before God is the preeminent human virtue.
Brownson believed his beloved Church had a moral obligation to be a beacon of light in a fallen world. He warned that even ostensibly Catholic countries failed to honor Catholic spiritual principles. “In every land the church is a missionary church.” The division of the world into Catholic and missions is obsolete. Protestantism’s fissiparous individualism, Brownson believed, diminished its potential to assist in promoting principles of social justice. Indeed, Protestantism can contribute nothing to social order because of its reliance on empty emotion and subjective perception.

Brownson’s commitment to a traditional understanding of federalism is a third position with relevance for our world today. Brownson argued that the federal or “general” government should be a government of express and limited powers. Brownson did write in *The American Republic*, “Let government take care of the vulnerable.” But because he thought that state and local governments are better suited to address public problems, it is likely that he would have opposed the adoption of the Affordable Care Act. He believed that the Catholic spirit of mercy and solidarity would flourish best in local communities. Indeed, he regarded the 14th and 15th Amendments as dangerous excesses of federal influence. Brownson’s defense of localism anticipates Pope Leo XIII’s 1891 defense of the principle of subsidiarity. Thus, Brownson’s articulation of these three traditions places him squarely in the tradition Catholic social thought.

It is the failure of Protestants to abide by these traditions that Brownson would say contributes to social disorder in our time. Transcendentalism in the nineteenth century is the final philosophical conclusion of Protestantism. It is the logical result of earlier Protestant dissenters like the seventeenth-century leader Charles Fox who professed to be following an inner voice. Orestes Brownson is one of the most capable defenders of the traditions of Catholic social thought that America has ever produced. Those who teach Catholic social thought would do their students a great service by asking them to read “Transcendentalism” and other works by Brownson. He still has much of value to say to Americans living in the second decade of the twenty-first century. He provides something that is often missing in our contemporary public discourse: a compelling vision of the common good.
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