

From “Main Tendue” to Vatican II: The Catholic Engagement with Atheism 1936–1965

Stephen Bullivant

Abstract

Pius XII condemned atheism’s “most ignoble corruptions” in his 1956 encyclical *Haurietis Aquas*, along with its “lethal tenets” in 1958’s *Meminisse Iuvat*. Only six years later, however, in 1964, Vatican II’s *Lumen Gentium* affirmed the possibility of salvation for “those who, without any fault of theirs, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God” (article 16). Furthermore, the following year’s *Gaudium et Spes* 19–21, drafted by Paul VI’s newly-founded *Secretariat for Non-believers*, offers, among much else, a sympathetic overview of contemporary atheisms, and invites their contemporary adherents to “a dialogue that is sincere and prudent”. These paragraphs, according to Ratzinger, “may be counted among the most important pronouncements of Vatican II”.

Evidently, comparing Pius XII’s “lethal tenets” to Vatican II’s salvific optimism, profound developments are manifest in the Catholic engagement with atheism. Primarily responsible for this are, I argue, two episodes in French Catholic history in the decades preceding Vatican II: a) the unprecedented dialogue of Catholic intellectuals with modern atheism, following the French Communist Party’s *main tendue* (“outstretched hand”) during the period of the Popular Front (1934–38); and b) the ‘priest-worker’ experiment, initiated by Henri Godin and Yvan Daniel’s 1943 publication of *La France – Pays de Mission?*

Keywords

Vatican II, Atheism, Worker-priest, Congar, Lubac

In his 1878 encyclical *Inscrutabili Dei Consilio*, Pope Leo XIII likened “complete forgetfulness of things eternal” to “the deadly kind of plague which infects in its inmost recesses”.¹ This document

¹ Leo XIII, ‘Inscrutabili Dei consilio’, in Claudia Carlen, ed., *The Papal Encyclicals 1878–1903* (Wilmington, NC: Consortium Books [1878] 1981), pp. 5–10, at p. 5.

set the tone for eight decades of magisterial teaching on unbelief. Indeed, Pius XI might have been speaking for an almost unbroken line of popes, stretching from Leo to his own successor Pius XII, when he wrote in 1937: “During Our Pontificate we too have frequently and with urgent insistence denounced the current trend to atheism which is alarmingly on the increase”.² Pius XII himself, not to be outdone, lambasted atheism’s “most ignoble corruptions” in 1956’s *Haurietis Aquas*, along with its “lethal tenets” in 1958’s *Meminisse Iuvat*.³

Only six years later, however, the Fathers of Vatican II promulgated *Lumen Gentium*, article 16 of which affirmed the possibility of salvation for “those who, without any fault of theirs, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God”.⁴ The following April, Paul VI founded a *Secretariat for Non-believers* – named, as its president Cardinal König wryly emphasized, “for” rather than “against” non-believers.⁵ Among its first tasks was the redrafting of articles 18 and 19 of Schema XIII. The resulting statement of the Church’s position on atheism, *Gaudium et Spes* 19–21, offers, among much else, a sympathetic overview of the sheer variety of atheisms, admits that “Believers can... have more than a little to do with the rise of atheism”, and invites its contemporary adherents to “a dialogue that is sincere and prudent”.⁶

Evidently, from Pius XII’s “lethal tenets” in 1958, to the Council’s optimism regarding dialogue, cooperation, and even salvation, something had changed in the Catholic understanding of atheism. Recent research on Vatican II has emphasized a growing openness and tolerance within the Church towards non-Catholics and non-Christians, beginning perhaps as far back as the discovery of the New World, but accelerated by social factors in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The dramatic developments, in both tone and content, of the Church’s teaching on atheism must also be understood against this background. But it does not, in itself, suffice to explain it. As such, in this paper I will briefly highlight two separate but related trajectories in twentieth-century European – and in fact, predominantly French – Catholic history: one intellectual; one practical and social.

² Pius XI, ‘Divini redemptoris’, in Claudia Carlen, ed., *The Papal Encyclicals 1903–1939* (Wilmington, NC: Consortium Books [1937] 1981), pp. 538–54, at p. 538.

³ Pius XII, ‘Haurietis aquas’, in Claudia Carlen, ed., *The Papal Encyclicals 1939–1958* (Wilmington, NC: Consortium Books [1956] 1981), pp. 291–313, at p. 293; and Pius XII, ‘Meminisse iuvat’, in Carlen, ed., *1939–1958*, pp. 373–8, at p. 374.

⁴ Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* (Dublin: Pillar Books, 1975), pp. 367–8.

⁵ Charles Moeller, ‘Man, the Church and Society’, in John H. Miller, ed., *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), pp. 413–21, at p. 416.

⁶ Flannery, *Vatican II*, pp. 918–22.

Both of these were, as I shall argue, defining landmarks on the road to *Gaudium et Spes* 19–21.

Trajectory 1: Dialogue and Scholarship

The first trajectory is one of dialogue and scholarship. In the decades preceding Vatican II, for arguably the first time in history, Catholic priests and theologians began seriously to engage, socially and intellectually, with *real* unbelievers. The true beginnings of this engagement can be dated with some precision: 1934 to 1938, the era of the French ‘Popular Front’, a coalition of left-wing parties spearheaded by the French Communist Party (PCF).⁷ This short and turbulent period had a number of notable repercussions. Among these, as David Curtis has argued, “one facet was a *main tendue* [‘outstretched hand’] to Catholics that the Party has never withdrawn”.⁸ In 1936 Maurice Thorez, the PCF’s general secretary, proposed dialogue with Catholics.⁹ The intention was to reach beyond the Left’s traditional, staunchly-anticlerical boundaries, and to cease alienating influential groups, including Catholic intellectuals and members of dynamic, socially-committed youth movements such as the *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* (JOC), who might otherwise be sympathetic to the left-wing parties.¹⁰ Irrespective of its political motivations, and whatever its other limitations, there can be no denying that this gesture, this olive branch, to French Catholicism marked a significant watershed. Organized dialogues, involving Christian and atheists actually *talking to* one another, started to be arranged (although these were, prior to the Council, necessarily informal, unofficial affairs).

La main tendue sparked a flurry of responses. In 1937, the Jesuit philosopher Gaston Fessard published “*The outstretched hand*”: *Is the Catholic-Communist dialogue possible?*¹¹ Fessard’s answer, drawing particularly on the young Marx’s ‘existential’ humanism, was a cautious, qualified “yes”.¹² The previous year, the lay Thomist philosopher Jacques Maritain had published his own remarkable work of “‘positive’ anticommunism”,¹³ *Integral Humanism*, which was itself partly based on Marxist concepts. The Dominican

⁷ David E. Curtis, *The French Popular Front and the Catholic Discovery of Marx* (Hull: University of Hull Press, 1997), p. 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ A. J. Van der Bent, ‘A Decade of Christian-Marxist Dialogue’, *Ateismo e Dialogo*, 6/2 (June 1971), pp. 23–34, at p. 24.

¹⁰ See Julian Jackson, *The Popular Front in France: Defending Democracy 1934–1938* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 259.

¹¹ In French, *La Main tendue. Le Dialogue catholique-communistique est-il possible?*

¹² See Curtis, *Popular Front*, pp. 151–62.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

journal *La Vie intellectuelle*, for which Marie-Dominique Chenu acted as censor, published a series of articles on Marxism in 1937–8.¹⁴ And during the same period, a young Jean Daniélou (who had been an acquaintance of Sartre's while at the Sorbonne) wrote two articles for *Chronique sociale de France* on the young Marx's humanism.¹⁵

Catholic intellectuals were hence, again for the first time, engaging sincerely, in a non-polemical way, with some of the key figures of modern atheistic thought. Over the next twenty-five years, a significant number of serious studies on atheistic themes would appear. To name only the more famous figures, de Lubac's magisterial 1944 volume *The Drama of Atheist Humanism* comprises detailed analyses of Feuerbach, Nietzsche, Comte, and (of course) Marx.¹⁶ Hans Küng's licentiate dissertation, written at the Gregorian in the early-1950s, was on Sartre.¹⁷ Romano Guardini, also in the early-1950s, began (although never completed) a study of Nietzsche.¹⁸ And in Britain, the Jesuit philosopher Frederick Copleston published studies of Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, existentialism and logical positivism in the forties and fifties.

Needless to say, this burgeoning intellectual engagement with atheism engendered new theological understandings of it. But its implications were felt in other areas also, most notably in ecclesiology. Of particular significance here is de Lubac's *Catholicism*, published in 1938. De Lubac stresses the unity of mankind, as affirmed by the Fathers, and it is clear from his introduction that the impetus for this *ressourcement* lies in criticisms of the Church made by contemporary 'free-thinkers'.¹⁹ Although disagreeing with their charges that the Church is "uninterested in our terrestrial future and in human fellowship",²⁰ de Lubac strikes a note that would later be echoed in *Gaudium et Spes*:

Nevertheless, if such a misunderstanding has arisen and entrenched itself, if such an accusation is current, is it not our own fault? . . . if so many observers, who are not lacking in acumen or in religious spirit, are so grievously mistaken about the essence of Catholicism, is it not

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 135–46.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 162–4.

¹⁶ Henri de Lubac, *The Drama of Atheist Humanism*, tr. Edith M. Riley, Anne Englund Nash and Mark Sebanc (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, [1944] 1995).

¹⁷ Fergus Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), p. 146.

¹⁸ Robert A. Krieg, *Romano Guardini: A Precursor of Vatican II* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), p. 178.

¹⁹ Henri de Lubac, *Catholicism: A Study of Dogma in Relation to the Corporate Destiny of Mankind*, tr. Lancelot C. Sheppard (New York: Mentor Omega Books, [1938] 1964), p. x.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. ix–x.

an indication that Catholics should make an effort to understand it better themselves?²¹

This striking *nostra culpa*, an admission of failure in light of the erroneous, but nonetheless excusable, criticisms made by sincere unbelievers, motivates the entirety of the text – which, as Fergus Kerr recently put it, “Many, including Congar, Balthasar, Wojtyła and Ratzinger, considered...as the key book of twentieth-century Catholic theology, the one indispensable text”.²²

Slightly earlier even than this, in 1935, Congar published an article in *La Vie intellectuelle* entitled ‘The Reasons for the Unbelief of Our Times’.²³ Commenting on recent sociological studies of the French working classes, revealing “a generalized state of unbelief”,²⁴ Congar focuses on the *social*, rather than the strictly intellectual, origins of this situation. He identifies two main factors. Firstly, the secularizing processes of modern society have forced a separation between faith and life. Secondly, and most importantly, the Church’s *reaction* to these processes – as he puts it, “she fell back upon her positions, put up barricades and assumed an attitude of defence”²⁵ – has alienated those who might have otherwise remained. In later works, Congar identified Christian disunity as a further cause of unbelief. As he put it in 1961, “Concretely, the division among Christians is a scandal for the world. The world is exonerated, to a degree, from the duty to believe”.²⁶ In the same piece, referring back to his 1935 article, Congar commented: “It seemed to me that, *since the belief or unbelief of men depended so much on us*, the effort to be made was a renovation of ecclesiology.”²⁷ Thus Congar’s great theological achievement, his hugely influential corpus of ecclesiological writings, was, like de Lubac’s *Catholicism*, motivated in no small part by the Church’s engagement with atheism. Indeed, Gabriel Flynn has recently argued that “the overarching concern of Congar’s whole theology of the Church is precisely to counteract unbelief.”²⁸

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Kerr, *Theologians*, p. 71.

²³ The English version of the article, published in the Cambridge student journal *Integration*, appeared in two parts.

²⁴ Yves Congar, ‘The Reasons for the Unbelief of Our Times, Pt. 1’, *Integration: A Students’ Catholic Review*, 2/1 (Aug./Sept. 1938), pp. 13–21, at p. 13.

²⁵ Yves Congar, ‘The Reasons for the Unbelief of Our Times, Pt. 2’, *Integration: A Students’ Catholic Review*, 2/3 (Dec. 1938/Jan. 1939), pp. 10–26, at p. 19.

²⁶ Yves Congar, ‘The Council in an Age of Dialogue’, tr. Barry N. Rigney, *Cross Currents*, 12 (1962), pp. 144–51, at p. 148. See Gabriel Flynn, *Yves Congar’s Vision of the Church in a World of Unbelief* (London: Ashgate, 2004), p. 37.

²⁷ Yves Congar, *The Wide World My Parish*, tr. Donald Attwater (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, [1961] 1962), pp. 147–8 (emphasis in original).

²⁸ Flynn, *Unbelief*, p. 212.

Trajectory 2: The Priest-Worker Experiment

The Church's encounter with atheism was not, of course, purely theoretical, which leads us to the second trajectory: the priest-worker experiment. As mentioned above, already in the 1930s sociological studies of the working classes suggested that French Catholicism was facing a grave new world of mass indifference and unbelief.²⁹ In 1943, at the behest of the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Suhard, Henri Godin and Yvan Daniel published a curious mix of reportage and manifesto, the seminal tract *La France – Pays de Mission?* Drawing on social research, their own experiences, and a great deal of anecdotal evidence, the two priests identified certain regions of French society as "Pagan areas. Missionary areas."³⁰ Generally speaking, these were the working-class neighbourhoods of large industrial cities such as Paris and Marseilles.³¹ Their description of these is significant, and worth quoting at length:

In this region and in all like it... [a man] knows nothing of whence he comes, whither he is going, why he is on earth. He has no reason for living, no guiding principles, no scale of values. Nor do you find among such people that basis of Christian values that elsewhere helps you to reach many Christians even though they are unconscious that they are Christians. Even the natural morality is gone... Yes, here we are indeed in missionary country... Here we find nothing, sheer emptiness... with civilization superimposed.³²

In the face of this massive missionary task, Godin and Daniel famously proposed that priests leave behind the bourgeois parish system, immersing themselves totally in the lives of the proletariat – bringing them the gospel on their *own* terms, and not those dictated by an already (and increasingly) alien culture.³³ Daunting though this project was, *Pays de Mission?* is not without hope for future 'priest-workers':

Already half Christian are a mother who brings up her children with a great deal of love, a workman who is obliging with his comrades, or, still better, who puts his whole heart into his job. That girl is a Christian who carries out her duties of girlhood in a spirit of charity

²⁹ E.g., Oscar Arnal, *Priests in Working-Class Blue: The History of the Worker-Priests (1943–1954)* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1984), pp. 50–1.

³⁰ Henri Godin and Yvan Daniel, 'France A Missionary Land?', in Maisie Ward, ed., *France Pagan?* (London: Sheed and Ward, [1943] 1949), pp. 65–19, at p. 69. See also Mary Theresa Moser, *The Evolution of the Option for the Poor in France 1880–1965* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America Press, 1985), pp. 130–2.

³¹ Godin and Daniel, 'Missionary Land?', pp. 65–6.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 71.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 129–33.

and joyfulness, Christian that poor man who shares the bread he has begged with one poorer than himself.³⁴

Taken together, these two quotations are highly instructive. On the one hand, the contemporary proletariat, being *de facto* atheists, are characterized as not possessing even the rudiments of “natural morality”. But on quite the other, even *here* are sometimes to be found Christians who are ignorant of the fact – *anonymous Christians*, as one might say. This tension should come as no surprise, coming as it does on the threshold of, and moreover helping to usher in, the Catholic reappraisal of unbelievers.

Pays de Mission? had a deep impact, and various ‘Missions’ were duly set up. These attracted a steady trickle of young priests – including disproportionate numbers of Dominicans and Jesuits. Henri Perrin, one of the latter, was among the first to join the experiment. Beginning in 1943, workers in occupied France were conscripted for forced labour in Germany.³⁵ Since chaplains were forbidden from accompanying them, a number of priests, including Perrin, clandestinely volunteered to go as workers instead.³⁶ Assigned to a munitions factory, he initially avoided detection, but was eventually arrested, imprisoned for several months, and deported back to France. Recovering in Paris, he wrote of his sojourn in a “foreign land”:

But make no mistake – this foreign land I’m talking about isn’t. . . the country in which we lived. No, it’s the workers’ world, about which we previously knew nothing and which we gradually discovered while we were there. . . . This is the land where Christ is unknown, where the name of God evokes no response; it’s the land of men without God. . . . In our new life we were obliged to see and reckon with the mass of ordinary people, non-Christians, those who are not “one of us,” whom we had never come across except in the silence of the streets, on buses, or in trams. Suddenly, as a result of a conversation or a meeting. . . we discovered a “foreign country” – which yesterday was distant and unknown, but is today terribly close and distressing.³⁷

Significantly, Perrin recounts his experience in terms of *meeting* unbelievers for the very first time. As such, not surprisingly, his initial impressions of his fellow-prisoners were not overwhelmingly positive.

From the first, I resolved not to treat them as Christians. . . . They did not have a Christian’s point of view on any of the great problems which must present themselves to a man as soon as he thinks – life, love, money, death, society, the family, justice. . . . They were not Christians, and had no right to claim the title, since they had nothing to do

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

³⁵ Moser, *Evolution*, pp. 124–7.

³⁶ Henri Perrin, *Priest and Worker: The Autobiography of Henri Perrin*, tr. Bernard Wall (London: Macmillan, [1958] 1965), pp. 27–9.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

with Christ... Whether they wanted to or not, they lived in utter paganism.³⁸

Before long, however, by living alongside these men and coming to know them better, Perrin's attitudes shifted somewhat: "actually they were not as ill-disposed as they at first seemed... From Raymond to Hermanus there was a whole crescendo of good will, and even a certain desire [for religious instruction], more obvious in some than in others, more easy to waken in some than in others."³⁹

Perrin was not the only priest-worker forced to make this reappraisal.⁴⁰ In fact, it happened naturally as, after the War, they began fully to enter the workers' world. As workers themselves, and committed to the rights and welfare of their compatriots, the priests would join, or otherwise cooperate with, the Communist-controlled unions. Priests and Party activists thus began to socialize and collaborate, forcing *both* sides to revise their erstwhile prejudices. As Oscar Arnal has rightly observed:

these intimate contacts with grass-roots militants would reshape inevitably and profoundly their earlier notions... That is not to suggest that there were not some hostile and suspicious moments, but such discord emerged habitually within an atmosphere of dialogue and leisure. Indeed, informal socializing was the first pattern of Communist-clerical encounters within the context of the neighbourhood and the very nature of this friendly mingling was able to transform conflict into camaraderie.⁴¹

Although worlds away from French Catholic intellectual life, the priest-workers' new perspectives were not unknown to some of the academic theologians mentioned above. If nothing else, the preponderance of Jesuits and Dominicans among the priest-workers ensured that their learned confrères – including, among others, de Lubac, Daniélou, Congar and Chenu – were kept abreast of their experiences. And indeed, when the "mission" was eventually liquidated by the Holy Office in February 1954, Congar and Chenu's sympathies saw them stripped of their teaching posts at Le Saulchoir and exiled from Paris.⁴² This new spirit of dialogue, respect, and collaboration

³⁸ Henri Perrin, *Priest-Workman in Germany*, tr. Rosemary Sheed (London: Sheed & Ward, [1945] 1947), p. 191.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

⁴⁰ E.g., Jacques Loew, *Mission to the Poorest*, tr. Pamela Carswell (London: Sheed and Ward, [1946] 1950), pp. 93–4.

⁴¹ Oscar Arnal, 'A Missionary "Main Tendue" toward French Communists: The "Temoignages" of the Worker-Priests, 1943–1954', *French Historical Studies*, 13/4 (Autumn 1984), pp. 529–56, at p. 538.

⁴² François Leprieur, 'Do the Baptised Have Rights? The French Worker-Priest Crisis, 1953–4', in John Orme Mills, ed., *Justice, Peace, and Dominicans 1216–2001* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 2001), pp. 161–8, at p. 166; and Flynn, *Unbelief*, p. 10.

between Catholics and unbelievers did not, however, die with the priest-worker project. And nor was it confined only to France. In Franco's Spain, for example, collaborations between Catholics and Communists began happening from the late-1950s, featuring joint ventures between the leftist unions and the Workers' Brotherhoods of Catholic Action. A 1965 article in *World Marxist Review*, carrying the once-unthinkable title 'Towards an Alliance of Communists and Catholics', cited this fact in support of its author's assertion that: "The Catholics are our main allies today in the struggle against Franco. This is a fact. It is perhaps the most characteristic and encouraging feature of the Spanish scene today."⁴³ Elsewhere in Europe also, Catholics were increasingly confronted with the presence of unbelieving apostates within their own families, requiring a very different form of "collaboration". As Karl Rahner details in his 1954 essay 'The Christian among Unbelieving Relations', for many this brought the Church's (hitherto "abstract") denunciations of atheists into painful relief, and showed up their inaccuracies and inadequacies.⁴⁴

Conclusion

In precisely the same period, then, as the latter two Pope Piuses were routinely denouncing atheism and (particularly) atheists, two crucial developments were underway in the Catholic understanding of modern unbelief. On the one hand, Catholic intellectuals were seriously studying the leading writers of nineteenth- and twentieth-century atheism: Marx, Comte, Feuerbach, Nietzsche, the logical positivists, Sartre. And on the other, Catholic priests were living, working, and collaborating with non-believers, and Marxists in particular. Together, these meant that neither the traditional view that, as Garrigou-Lagrange put it in 1914, "speculative atheism is an impossibility for any man who has the use of reason and is in good faith",⁴⁵ nor the theologies of atheism that had been based upon it, could any longer be countenanced. For, indeed, to quote Congar, "The Church learns through contact with facts. . . . Truth remains unaltered; but it is grasped in a new and undoubtedly more adequate way when men and the world are known *as they are*, in an extent, age and goodness

⁴³ Santiago Alvares, 'Towards an Alliance of Communists and Catholics', *World Marxist Review*, 8/6 (June 1965), pp. 27–3, at pp. 27–8.

⁴⁴ Karl Rahner, 'The Christian among Unbelieving Relations', in *Theological Investigations: Volume III*, tr. Karl-H. and Boniface Kruger (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, [1954] 1967), pp. 355–7. See also Joseph Ratzinger, 'Die Neuen Heiden und die Kirche', *Hochland* (1958), 51, pp. 1–11.

⁴⁵ Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *God: His Existence and His Nature*, vol. 2, (St Louis, [1914] 1939), p. 28.

other than what has been believed of them previously.”⁴⁶ Furthermore, there is a clearly demonstrable link between those involved in these two developments, and the new, respectful and pastorally-centred approach to atheism that was enshrined in the texts of the Second Vatican Council. Congar, for example, played a part in the drafting of *Lumen Gentium* 16. He was, moreover, among the first consultants appointed to the Secretariat for Non-believers, as also were Chenu, de Lubac, and Jacques Loew (a French Dominican and one of the first priest-workers, working as a docker in Marseilles).⁴⁷ And de Lubac was one of four *periti* entrusted with drafting what would become *Gaudium et Spes* 19–21 (a text which substantially echoes his earlier ideas), as also was Daniélou (who was however never formally appointed to the Secretariat).

Now the ambit of this paper has been very narrow. A great deal more could have been, and elsewhere should be, said about *Gaudium et Spes* itself; how the *theology* behind actually developed; the role of Paul VI’s encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*; the intellectual debt both de Lubac and Maritain owed to Blondel and Maréchal on the subject of atheism; and the origins and development of the Secretariat for Non-believers. But my purpose here has simply been to narrate, very briefly, two aspects of *Gaudium et Spes* 19–21’s genealogy – to suggest how and why Catholic-atheist religions shifted, on *both* sides, “from anathema to dialogue”.⁴⁸ This transition was by no means an easy one, and needless to say, it was not permanent. But this history is nevertheless an important one – and one which may, at the present time, be useful to revisit.

Stephen Bullivant

Christ Church

Oxford

Email: Stephen.bullivant@chch.ox.ac.uk

⁴⁶ Congar, *Wide World*, p. 98.

⁴⁷ Secretariat for Non-believers, ‘Elenco degli Ecc. Vescovi Membri e dei Signori Consultori’, *Bollettino di Informazione [del Segretariato per i Non Credenti]*, 1/3 (September 1966), pp. 68–73. Consultants were not *formally* appointed to the Secretariat until after the Council, beginning in January 1966. However, given that the Secretariat was clearly active during the Council, drafting parts of Schema XIII and releasing a series of informative reports for the Fathers, it is clear that its consultants were already at work – albeit not yet, in Vatican terms, “officially”.

⁴⁸ This phrase is taken from the title of Roger Garaudy’s book on “the challenge of Marxist-Christian cooperation”, for which Karl Rahner wrote an introduction – see Roger Garaudy, *From Anathema to Dialogue: The Challenge of Marxist-Christian Cooperation*, tr. Luke O’Neill and Edward Quinn (London: Collins, 1967). The philosopher Garaudy, at that time a member of the French Communist Party, was one of the leading lights of the post-conciliar dialogue between Christians and Marxists.