

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19767> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Krijtenburg, Margriet

**Title:** Schuman's Europe : his frame of reference

**Issue Date:** 2012-09-11

## CHAPTER TWO

### Schuman and Contemporary Thinkers on Europe

This chapter will introduce Schuman's thoughts on European unification and will attempt to determine the uniqueness of these thoughts. The chapter will therefore include a brief discussion of contemporary thinkers who thought about European unification in order to provide a comparison with Schuman's thoughts and give a more articulate version of his ideas. Key concepts will be European spiritual and cultural heritage with a focus on the human person and Christian morality and, when applicable, on supranationality.

The intellectual climate that surrounded Schuman those days is barely reflected in his writings. His library in Scy-Chazelles confirms the supposition made by his biographer François Roth, that he was not much interested in fashionable contemporary books or intellectual theories. He owned scarcely any books by contemporary novelists such as Camus or Sartre. On the other hand he owned a great deal of history, Greek and Roman culture and religion such as the entire *Summa Theologiae* by Thomas Aquinas and the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Whenever Schuman expressed himself and his interests more profoundly, he did so with discretion and only in the Catholic Institute, among Catholic intellectuals,<sup>102</sup> at conferences with

---

102. Referring to Schuman's private circumstances can be observed, despite the lack of written evidence, that he surely had valuable and inspirational gatherings on also the topic of European unification with his friends and acquaintances of the Catholic society *Unitas*, of the Catholic intellectual circles of Theodor Abele and Hermann Platz and of the *Görres-Gesellschaft*. The fact that Schuman worked for the *Görres-Gesellschaft*, as is mentioned in chapter one, already before the First World War on an international peace-project based on Christian principles indicates his interest in extending peace beyond national borders. It also makes plausible not only that he and the people of the *Görres-Gesellschaft* had a common interest in finding a way to preserve the peace in Europe, but also that they exchanged ideas on the matter.

Catholic students and other youngsters.<sup>103</sup> Of the latter some examples have already been given in the first chapter.

The intellectuals selected and studied in this chapter are those who exposed their ideas and theories in the thirties of the twentieth century and soon after the Second World War. Their focus was, as mentioned before, on the European spiritual and cultural heritage or aspects thereof, and for some of them also on supranationality. Their main thoughts will be discussed after Schuman's ideas have been briefly presented and subsequently briefly contrasted with the thoughts of a few contemporary and current thinkers. This will indicate the revival of the discussion on European unification and show Schuman's way of thinking in a current context.

## ***2.1 Schuman: Thoughts on European Unification***

*The European spirit signifies being conscious of belonging to a cultural family and to have a willingness to serve that community in the spirit of total mutuality, without any hidden motives of hegemony or the selfish exploitation of others. The 19th century saw feudal ideas being opposed and, with the rise of a national spirit, nationalities asserting themselves. Our century, that has witnessed the catastrophes resulting in the unending clash of nationalities and nationalisms, must attempt and succeed in reconciling nations in a supranational association. This would safeguard the diversities and aspirations of each nation while coordinating them in the same manner as the regions are coordinated within the unity of the nation.*

*Robert Schuman, Strasbourg, 16 May 1949<sup>104</sup>*

---

103. See: Roth, 326.

104. Robert Schuman, Speech at the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 16 May 1949. See also: David Heilbron Price, *Schuman or Monnet?* (Brussels: Bron Communications, 2003) 47. See also: News and Research on Europe highlighting Robert Schuman's political, economic, philosophical contribution from the independent [Schuman Project](#), directed by David H Price.

Schuman regarded the unification of Europe<sup>105</sup> as a necessity not only because of the threats of Communism, the East-West conflict, and a possible third world war because of or led by Germany once it had recovered. He saw it as a necessary condition for the survival of Europe. The continent needed to become strong and healthy again so as to avoid disasters such as the many wars, especially the world wars, it had experienced in the past. Franco-German reconciliation was not enough. In order to achieve successful unification this reconciliation should be accompanied by effective solidarity and a moral order based on Christianity, products of the European spiritual and cultural heritage. These aspects will be discussed into more detail in chapter 3.6.

The reconciliation rather than retaliation policy Schuman insisted on was a turning point in European history. Taking into account the preceding centuries of constant strife between the powers now known as France and Germany, this policy can truly be qualified a unique policy. This time there would not be a dominating nation in command of the nation that lost, but cooperation between states.

Robert Schuman was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Fourth Republic of France from 1948 until 1953. Despite strong opposition

---

105. The idea of European unification is not new and has been propagated through the centuries. Schuman himself referred to its history when he said the following on 16 May 1949 in Strasbourg when the Council of Europe was signed for: *“We are carrying out a great experiment, the fulfilment of the same recurrent dream that for ten centuries has revisited the peoples of Europe: creating between them an organization putting an end to war and guaranteeing an eternal peace. The Roman church of the Middle Ages failed finally in its attempts that were inspired by humane and human preoccupations. Another idea, that of a world empire constituted under the auspices of German emperors was less disinterested; it already relied on the unacceptable pretensions of a ‘Führertum’ (domination by dictatorship) whose ‘charms’ we have all experienced. [...] Audacious minds, such as Dante, Erasmus, Abbé de St-Pierre, Rousseau, Kant and Proudhon, had created in the abstract the framework for systems that were both ingenious and generous. The title of one of these systems became the synonym of all that is impractical: Utopia, itself a work of genius, written by Thomas More, the Chancellor of Henry VIII, King of England.”*

from the Gaullists and Communists, he could count on the support of the majority of politicians for his policy of reconciliation with Germany. It was a policy that was contrary to that of his predecessor De Gaulle, right after the Second World War in 1945–46.<sup>106</sup> De Gaulle wanted to weaken Germany and to dismantle its productive resources.<sup>107</sup>

Schuman's policy of reconciliation, although possibly also influenced by the fact that he himself was in a certain sense both German and French due to historical circumstances, originated from his Christian faith, as he himself explained in *Pour l'Europe*. He wrote that it was Christianity that taught us that all people were equal in their essence<sup>108</sup> and that the general law of love and mercy, which could be considered the foundation of our social relations in the Christian world, turned each person into one another's brother. It was

---

106. See also: Helen Drake, "The Gaulle's complicated legacy", *European voice.com*, 17 June 2010. De Gaulle considered the idea of reconciliation and pooling sovereignty with Germany "an accident of history". He wanted an independent France leading the way in Europe.

107. Charles De Gaulle, *Mémoires de guerre: Le Salut 1944–1946*, (Paris: Plon, 1959). See also: Fimister, 272.

108. On this point of equality his statement is comparable to that of Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859), French political thinker and historian who admired the American form of government. Tocqueville said that in America, the Union's subjects are not states, but individuals. When it wants to levy a tax, it does not turn to the government of Massachusetts, but to each inhabitant of Massachusetts." Larry Siedentop, *Democracy in Europe*, (London: Allen Lane, 2000), 8. Famous is also Tocqueville's remark that he found in the United States an "ostensible respect for Christian morality and virtue." He also applauded that "The religion which declares that all are equal in the sight of God, will not refuse to acknowledge that all citizens are equal in the eye of the law." "De Tocqueville on the Christian influence for Equality" in: *Liberty Letters*, [www.newsmax.com](http://www.newsmax.com). Tocqueville believes in the supernatural foundation of morals in religion and considers Christianity to be at the base of (American) democracy. He sees morality, religion and order as aspects in harmony with man's freedom and equality before the law. Paul Cliteur argues that Tocqueville's ideas might be interpreted these days as the need for a binding element or for common values, such as faith in democracy, in human rights or in the rule of law and that for that reason Tocqueville's words would not go against a utilitarian or secular foundation for morals. See: Paul Cliteur, "A secular reading of De Tocqueville" in: Raf Greenens and Annelien de Dijn, eds., *Reading Tocqueville: From Oracle to Actor*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2007), 112-132.

this law and its practical consequences that changed the world completely, Schuman wrote.<sup>109</sup>

Schuman's strategy for unification was one of cautious small steps.<sup>110</sup> He compared it with the process of crossing a shallow river: putting one foot carefully on one stone and making sure it is firm before taking the next step. He was particularly insistent on restraining the desire to hurry towards the final goal. People would not be able to cope with a hurried process that, in fact, needed a careful preparation of the mind:

We are still at the start of things. We would do well to bridle our impatience. If not, we are likely to make the doubters more distrustful and what is more serious, endanger not only the experiment but also the whole idea of a united Europe.<sup>111</sup>

According to Schuman each step of unification needs to be guided by the 'European spirit'. This is by "the consciousness of belonging to a cultural family and the willingness to serve that community in the spirit of total mutuality, without hidden motives or the selfish exploitation of others".<sup>112</sup> For this to happen, the sense of belonging to a common European cultural and spiritual family, which entails brotherhood and respect for man's personal freedom, needs to be fostered constantly. Such a spirit will encourage the willingness to share personal interests with those of others and the practice of solidarity. This in turn will foster the openness necessary for a unification of interests. On the level of states it will thus facilitate the compromising of national interests that go against common European interests. However, allowing for human nature, the integration also implies that no common European policies should be adopted hastily.

---

109. See also: Schuman, *Pour l'Europe*, 57–58.

110. Roth, 566. Jean Monnet preferred a faster kind of integration. See: Roussel, 91.

111. Schuman, Speech at the Council of Europe.

112. See quote at the beginning of this section (2.1).

The people (and states), even though they do share the ‘European spirit’, still need to grow accustomed to the integration process. This is because at first glance integration seems to take away part of their ownership, even though it is said to be for their own good and prosperity.

Schuman’s approach is comparable to feeding milk to a baby so that it might grow and later be able to eat solid meat. Eventually the European would mature and be able to deal with mankind on the basis of his own identity, the ‘European spirit’. Schuman was therefore not in favour of a rapid unification on every plane as this would neglect the necessary preparation of the people. It might mean the premature end of the entire unification project. This is why he did not, on purpose, have a detailed plan or a timetable with deadlines to be achieved. He did, however, have a plan for fostering European unification and encouraged cooperation across borders in politics, economics and military affairs. In all these things, this founding father of the EU continually focused on the ‘European spirit’ to facilitate precisely this preparation of the people and therewith the process of European unification as will be indicated in chapter three.

Before studying Schuman’s thoughts in detail, I will very briefly refer to several contemporaneous and current thoughts on the future of Europe and contrast them to Schuman’s. This will help to further establish the value of Schuman’s frame of reference. It will clarify the perhaps surprising topicality of his mostly unknown and underexposed thoughts which for that reason, and for being the thoughts of a main founding father of the European unification, become even more interesting to study. Schuman’s thoughts were in his days vehemently opposed by the Nationalists and Gaullists who wanted to safeguard the sovereignty of the nation at any cost. Famous

became De Gaulle's wish to strive towards a 'Europe of the states', '*l'Europe des patries*' that protected the sovereignty of each individual state. The Gaullists and Nationalists were therefore against Schuman's policy of reconciliation and European unification and did all they could to resist these policies, but were not able to do so.<sup>113</sup> The Communists were equally opposed to Schuman's politics. They strove in vain for the implementation of their Communist ideology.<sup>114</sup>

Current thinking on how Europe should proceed also provide several frames of references and interpretations. Thierry Baudet (1983), Dutch historian and jurist, is in favour of the nation state and opposes the need to surrender sovereignty due to European unification.<sup>115</sup> Considering the current state of affairs of the European Union, Baudet's view and Schuman's are not quite as far apart as they seem to be. Schuman would likely grieve over the EU's current state even though he would not fail to applaud the many good things unification has brought about in many respects. Schuman warned against a fast pace of integration which could harm the human psyche of the majority of citizens not directly involved in the process, as the human mind cannot handle fast changes well, especially those having a great impact on man's daily life. He also warned against it because it

---

113. A famous opponent of Charles de Gaulle (1880 -1970) was François Mitterand (1916 – 1995), who would be President of France from 1981-1995. He, like Schuman, applauded the reconciliation policy and the process of European unification. His exclamation "le nationalisme, c'est la guerre" during his last speech towards the European Parliament in Stasbourg in 1995 became legendary. He put this though in the context of the Second World War when he had escaped from a German prison and noticed how French and Germans saw each other from their different nationalist perspective. Mitterand warns for a possible return of war among nations if the future is not well guarded by the people who steer the EU. See: [www.dailymotion.com](http://www.dailymotion.com)

114. Chapter three (3.2.1; 3.2.2; 3.2.3) will show that Schuman's policy of reconciliation was heavily attacked by the Communists, Nationalists and Gaullists who did not want a partnership with Germany and were against the kind of European unification Schuman had in mind.

115. Thierry Baudet, "Juist Europese eenwording leidt tot oorlog", in: NRC Handelsblad, 23 June 2012, 4.

could destroy the entire unification process. In that sense his thoughts are similar to Baudet's. Schuman saw the European unification as a process that would take several generations to reach its full shape.<sup>116</sup> He similarly stressed the importance of safeguarding the national identities and interests of the states, but only as long as they did not harm the common European interests that in their turn needed to take universal interests into consideration.<sup>117</sup> Schuman and Baudet therefore share their ideal of protecting the nation state. Baudet, however, does not focus on the need to surrender national sovereignty only if necessary to common European interests as Schuman did. He regards the loss of national sovereignty due to common European interests as such a danger to the rule of law. For Baudet the single nation state should limit itself to intergovernmental agreements, decide itself on international cooperation and protect its rule of law. It should make its own decisions in the fields of economics, political and social order. Baudet is in favour of what he calls 'sovereign cosmopolitanism.' He considers the idea of a supranational structure to avoid war among the states to be without foundation. He argues that regional conflicts could still occur, as they did in the past when Europe was united in empires. According to Baudet, supra-nationality empties the rule of law and makes the state passive and powerless.

The other attack on the European unification Baudet launches refers to the danger of loss of national culture because of the way multiculturalism was embraced in the past. The immigrants who were welcomed because they were needed for economic reasons were not asked to become familiar with and adopt the national culture. They

---

116. See also chapter 3.4.2.

117. The general accusation that Schuman's idea of unification would have an adverse effect on nations was answered by Schuman by stating that because the historic realities of the nationalities would be safeguarded they would grow precisely because of joining and taking care of common European interests when this were necessary through the step-by-step method.

contributed in this way to today's lack of national culture. Baudet is not against different cultures, but stresses the need for what he calls 'multicultural nationalism'; the need for immigrants to adapt themselves to the national culture.<sup>118</sup>

Thinking along Schuman's line of thought, one could say that Baudet and Schuman differ 'only'—but fundamentally—in the premise of their thinking. Baudet rejects supra-nationality so as to protect the nation state and its freedom to act, and on no permission to live a culture different from the state in which one lives, but to adapt to the culture of the latter. Schuman is in favour of supra-nationality only when necessary for common European interests while protecting the national interests as much as possible. Schuman regards respect for different cultures necessary unless they obstruct the rule of law and go against the European and national culture which they in their turn should respect.

Roger Scruton (1944), British conservative philosopher and writer, supports Baudet's view.<sup>119</sup> He agrees with Baudet when the latter says that the project of European integration is based on the conviction that the nation and the desire of national independence had been the main causes of the wars that afflicted Europe. This conviction had according to Scruton a process of one-dimensional integration with a dictatorial structure that ever more absorbed national sovereignty as its consequence. The result would be a supranational government.

He then affirms that he is not against imperialism as such, but that certain forms of imperialism can be considered positive and others negative. He regards those that protect local loyalties and

---

118. See also: Baudet, *De aanval op de natie-staat*, (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker /Prometheus, 2012), 9-19.

119. Roger Scruton, "We hebben die natiestaten nodig" in: *NRC Handelsblad*, 2 July 2012, 15.

traditions through civilization and law as positive. Those types of imperialism that try to ban local customs and competitive loyalties through a central power without law Scruton considers to be negative. He recognizes elements of both kinds of imperialism in the European Union, but sees above all the defect of never having asked the citizens of Europe to accept the European unification project. He thinks this is because the political elite of Europe is afraid that the people will stick to their national feelings and traditions and vote in favour of those. Scruton also believes that this is the reason why expressing national feelings and the desire for a national identity has been demonized. According to Scruton national loyalty has nothing to do with racism or fascism, but with an attachment to the territory and its community. He warns against the impossibility of sacrifice for a common Europe-related cause, on which the political elite counts, if there is no social cohesion. He wonders how there could be social cohesion if there are no borders that divide 'us' from 'the others'.

Schuman would likely have responded to Scruton by saying that the *raison d'être* of the European unification was not the need to break the power of the nations so as to avoid wars, but the fact that all European countries share a common European heritage and belong to the same European cultural family. The process of integration should not be of a dictatorial kind and only in those areas that were absolutely necessary, precisely to protect the national identities as much as possible in the process of unification. The danger of 'bad' (in the sense of egocentric) nationalism at the cost of others would therefore be non-existent and 'sound' nationalism would be fostered as each state would benefit from protecting common European interests in its own national way. The European unification as Schuman had it in mind has therefore nothing to do with imperialism, nor with fighting nationalism, but with attaining a strong and integrated Europe in

which the nations benefit from common European interests that include and foster their own national interests. Famous is Schuman's expression that Europe won't be built overnight; its process of unification will take centuries.

Hans Wiegel (1941), former leader of the Dutch Liberal Party VVD, stresses, like Baudet and Scruton, the importance of the state and the loyalty of politicians to be first and foremost loyal to their own country.<sup>120</sup> Schuman would agree unless this loyalty implied an indulgence in navel-gazing that went against the common European interests and in the short or long run also against the national interests of that particular state.

Another and a very different way of thinking about Europe, which is partially opposed to Schuman's, is that of the federalists who focus exclusively on the common market. They support integration in the field of economics accompanied by political integration so as to safeguard the market.<sup>121</sup> The pace of integration as the federalists envision it would have been much too fast for Schuman. More importantly, Schuman would likely have objected to the federalist failure to focus on the main reason of European unification, which is not the economy nor integration for its own sake, but the human person and the common European heritage with the consequent solidarity through specific deeds.<sup>122</sup> This implies taking into account the human psyche which cannot cope with too much change and that abhors the fact that its own state imposes (sometimes) unnecessary European rules on him, against which he can hardly object successfully. The euro is an example of both a hasty introduction of a market oriented policy people were not yet ready for and of an

---

120. Hans Wiegel, "Eigen land eerst, en dan pas Brussel" in: NRC Handelsblad, 2 July 2012, 15.

121. Television debate with EP-members in Dudok, 2 June 2012.

122. See also chapter 3.4.3

incorrect way of introducing a new European economic measure as it lacked a suitable common economic preparation among the states backed by a supranational entity behind it to safeguard and steer its proper functioning.

Some may argue that Schuman's ideas are naïve and idealistic and they may have a point. However, one must take into account the moment of time when something had to be done and ideals like reconciliation and unification had to be put into practice so as to prevent doom scenarios and give hope to the European citizen that had just suffered two world wars in one generation and only desired peace and security. And although Schuman's thoughts belong to the timeframe of the first sixty years of the last century, many of his thoughts on Europe remain topical as they explain to some extent why we face the problems we currently face. This knowledge helps to look for ways to solve many of today's problems while taking into account the ever more complex society we live in.<sup>123</sup>

As mentioned before this thesis deals only with those intellectuals whose ideas harmonize with Schuman's thoughts, so as to elucidate more sharply Schuman's frame of reference, which for being the principal architect of the European Union deserves serious attention.

## ***2.2 Schuman and contemporary thinkers on Europe***

*Let us think of the human being, not in an abstract and general way, but in the most concrete possible, the most personal fashion. Let us think of this certain old man we have known for years in the country - this old farmer with his wrinkled face, his keen eyes which have beheld so many harvests and so many earthly horizons, his long habits of patience and suffering,*

---

123. Another kind of accusation was that Schuman wanted a 'Vatican Europe'. Schuman himself protested against this accusation. See chapter 2.2.7.

*courage, poverty and noble labour, a man perhaps like those parents of a great living American statesman whose photographs appeared some months ago in a particularly moving copy of a weekly magazine. Or let us think of this certain boy or this girl who are our relatives or our friends, whose everyday life we well know, and whose loved appearance, whose soft or husky voice is enough to rejoice our hearts [...] We perceive intuitively, in an indescribable not inescapable flash, that nothing in the world is more precious than one single human being.*<sup>124</sup>

*Jacques Maritain*

The contemporary scholars and writers that are selected all searched for a European solution to the constant threat of war since the First World War, and especially so after the Second World War. As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, they are selected because they all share with Schuman their focus on the European spiritual and cultural heritage in which the human person and Christian morality play a crucial role. They often also share an emphasis on the need for a supranational structure. The brief discussion of their ideas will help to sharpen our understanding of Schuman's vision on Europe.

This particular selection was made to place Schuman's thoughts on Europe in a contemporary intellectual context and to make a comparative analysis between Schuman and these intellectuals. All of them have in common the search for ways to achieve a peaceful society, and the emphasis on the reconstruction of Europe so as to prevent another war on the continent. It turns out that their eagerness to create a new, safe and peaceful Europe produced sharp insights and a strong willingness to locate and solve the problem of unrest, fear and threat. The stress is on supranationality and on European spiritual and cultural heritage as key elements for European unification. Of course there were also intellectuals and statesmen such

---

124. Jacques Maritain, "The immortality of Man," in *The Crisis of Modern Times, perspectives from The Review of Politics 1939–1962*, ed. A. James McAdams, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 83–98.

as De Gaulle and Bidault<sup>125</sup> who thought about European unification in intergovernmental and not supranational terms or even completely opposed it. Their thoughts are not mentioned in this thesis because its purpose is to distinguish and illuminate specifically Schuman's thoughts rather than give a full overview of the intellectual history of the concept of European unification. They not only sharpen the understanding of his ideas that are mainly known through his speeches and through his personal background, personality and circumstances but also lay a foundation for a better understanding of his thoughts.

Schuman was familiar with the work of, and personally acquainted with, some of the intellectuals, such as Jacques Maritain,<sup>126</sup> Romano Guardini, Henri Brugmans<sup>127</sup> and Pope and scholar Pius XII. As Schuman was a man who did not live in an ivory tower it is likely he was familiar with the other intellectuals whose thoughts and works will be discussed: Denis de Rougemont, Christopher Dawson, Karl Jaspers, Julien Benda and Thomas Stearns Eliot. Several of the works of these scholars date from the interwar period while other documents, essays and books here referred to were written during and after the Second World War.<sup>128</sup>

A short introduction to the lives of these intellectuals will help to place their thoughts both in their personal context and in a broader perspective.

---

125. De Gaulle, *Le Salut*. See also: notes 310, 319.

126. See Roth, 326.

127. See also: *Hommage au Président Robert Schuman*, Centre de Recherches Européennes, Lausanne 1964, 15–17.

128. As indicated in the beginning of this chapter Schuman's library shows that Schuman did not have books that went against his personal frame of mind. Also for this reason have been selected well-known intellectuals that concord with his personal frame of mind.

### 2.2.1 Julien Benda

Julien Benda (1867–1956)<sup>129</sup> was a Jewish French critic and novelist. He was one of Schuman’s contemporaries who contemplated the possibility of European unification based on universal principles.<sup>130</sup>

Benda, before he expressed his thoughts about the kind of Europe he envisioned, enjoyed a wealthy, glamorous lifestyle until he was thirty years of age. Triggered by the Dreyfus affair of 1897 in which intellectual truth was severely tested, he then decided to start his career as a writer.<sup>131</sup> Benda himself was neither in favour nor against the Dreyfusards as he acknowledged a lack of intellectual truth on both sides, but he praised those who were ‘rationalists’ and regarded their emphasis on intellectual truth as vital to civilization.

At the age of sixty, Benda became famous with his book *La Trahison des clercs* (The Betrayal of the Clerks)<sup>132</sup> of 1927. This became a lasting international call for the questioning of ‘intellectual truth’. He accused the intellectuals of his days of permitting themselves to be influenced by political ideologies and a bourgeois lifestyle instead of sticking to intellectual tradition and leading a pure life of the mind. He reproached them for neglecting their vocation as

---

129. (Biographical) data from: Julien Benda, “De eenheid van het weten,” in *Rekenschap van Europa*, (Amsterdam: Vrij Nederland, 1947), 15–40. See also: *Encyclopedia of World biography*, Farmington Hills (Michigan).

130. The content of the universal principles needs to be placed in the context of the first half of the twentieth century. Its echo was found in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights of 1948. (Navarro Vals, Conference on human dignity, Moergestel, 2009).

131. The Dreyfus case of 1897 concerns a Jewish army captain accused of treason by the French parliament. Dreyfus is said to have given secret military information to the Germans. Dreyfus claimed he was innocent, but, mainly because he is a Jew, he remained the primary suspect. It became a major case, politically speaking, because of the possibility of accusation due to discrimination. It took nine years before Dreyfus’s innocence was formally recognized.

132. Julien Benda, *The treason of the intellectuals*, trans. Richard Aldington, (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009).

guardians of the truth.<sup>133</sup> Instead, Benda embraced the rationalism that characterized the French republican educational system.

Besides writing books and articles, Benda also wrote critiques on the works and ideas of for instance Jacques Maritain<sup>134</sup> and Henri Bergson, when they attacked his rationalism for being one-sided.

Benda was in favour of not only rationalism, but also of a morality that was based on universal values or principles. He further promoted an idealist, anti-subjective rationalist attitude in life. All this is reflected in his ideas about Europe which he expressed in his pamphlet *Discours à la Nation Européenne* (An Address to the European Nation) of 1933. Benda emphasized the importance of supranational polity building firmly embedded in a moral framework, as explained by Jan-Werner Müller:

The pamphlet amounted to a complete manual for supranational<sup>135</sup> polity-building, addressed primarily to French republican teachers and intellectuals. Benda started out with the argument that Europe had to be viewed, above all, as a moral idea and, even more so, as a moral problem.

European unification could not simply be treated as an economic or even just a political project. Economic realities

---

133. Zbigniew Janowski, in: *Encyclopedia of the essay* (Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2006), 162.

134. Jacques Maritain, *Notebooks*, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 70–71. “4 May 1911. Returned *L’Ordination* to Bourgeois [Péguy] with this note: “My dear Bourgeois, enclosed herewith *L’Ordination* of M. Benda. Please spare me henceforth the little blasphemies of this jester. Cordially, J.M.”(Péguy said later that I had withdrawn my subscription to the *Cahiers*. Not at all; it was a question only of Benda and of this book.)”

135. ‘supranational’ because according to Benda one should think beyond borders, but Benda himself stresses at the same time the need of supernatural politics ‘politique surnaturelle’ in the sense that this supranationality should be embedded in a moral framework. “L’Europe ne se fera que si elle adopte un certain système de valeurs morales”. He directs himself to an audience that focuses on a Europe that is not afraid of an intellectual and moral ‘revolution’ and not to an audience that aspires to a mere political, economic or juridical ‘revolution’. “Je ne m’adresse pas à tous. Parmi ces hommes, les uns cherchent ce que l’Europe, pour gagner l’existence, devra faire dans l’ordre politique, d’autres dans l’ordre économique, d’autres dans l’ordre juridique. Je n’ai point qualité pour retenir leur audience. D’autres pensent à la révolution qu’elle devra accomplir dans l’ordre intellectuel et moral. C’est à ceux-là que je parle.” *Discours à la Nation Européenne* (Paris: Les Éditions Gallimard, 1992)

always had to be placed in a larger moral and spiritual framework.<sup>136</sup>

Political events increasingly affected Benda's high intellectualism. He criticized the weakness of democracy, attacked the French right and the menace of fascism. After the fall of France in 1940, he fled to Carcassonne; the Nazis confiscated all his books and papers in Paris. He wrote a clandestine pamphlet for the Resistance and smuggled several works out of France for publication abroad. After the war he opposed De Gaulle on account of the latter's nationalistic approach.

Schuman shared with Benda the emphasis on morality in the rebuilding of Europe. Like Benda, Schuman also believed European unification needed to be placed in a larger moral and spiritual framework, one that goes beyond the economic and political. He too fought against the nationalistic approach. Benda's emphasis on the intellect beyond politics also finds an echo in Schuman's thinking, although Schuman warned this emphasis should not turn into an obsession. After all, politics is about serving the citizen. Schuman considered man as consisting of more than just reason and believed that the spiritual dimension of man, as contained in the European spiritual and cultural heritage, needed to be taken into account as well.

### **2.2.2 Christopher Dawson**

*Every culture is like a plant. It must have its roots in the earth, and for sunlight it needs to be open to the spiritual. At the present moment we are busy cutting its roots and shutting out all light from above.*<sup>137</sup>

---

136. Jan-Werner Müller, "Julien Benda's Anti-Passionate Europe," *European Journal of Political theory* 5, no. 2, (2006). The translation of Benda's "politique surnaturelle" into Werner's 'supranatural policy' should be changed into 'supernatural policy'.

137. Quoted in Gerald J. Russello, "Christopher Dawson, Christ in history," *Crisis* 14, no. 4 (1996), 30.

*Christopher Dawson*

Christopher Henry Dawson (1889–1970)<sup>138</sup> was a renowned British historian and intellectual. His thoughts on Europe are in several regards similar to Schuman's.

Dawson's interest in Catholicism and European history help to explain why he thought similarly to Schuman. Dawson was Anglo-Catholic, but converted to Catholicism at the age of 25. He studied economics, then history and sociology at Trinity College in Oxford. Both Catholicism and his studies left clear marks on his work. He wrote several books on European history and the important role of religion. He always studied the whole of European culture and therefore European history from a panoramic point of view in order to achieve a proper understanding. Dawson firmly believed that the medieval Catholic Church had been essential for the rise of European civilization, as it was through the Church that Catholic faith permeated all realms of life.<sup>139</sup> He was also convinced about the fact that one person could change history completely: "history is at once aristocratic and revolutionary. It allows the whole world situation to be suddenly transformed by the action of a single individual."<sup>140</sup> Dawson was appreciated as an innovative scholar and admired by intellectuals such as J.R.R. Tolkien and Russell Kirk. He also had as such a strong influence on T. S. Eliot.

Dawson taught at Harvard University. He was known for his open-mindedness and his ability to combine and integrate opposite ideas. It was this quality that facilitated his understanding of the

---

138. (Biographical) data from "Christopher Dawson", *Gifford Lectures*, West Conshohocken (Pennsylvania). See also: Caroline T. Marshall, "Modern Pioneers: Christopher Dawson, champion of Christian culture," *Christian History Magazine* 72, (2001); and Russello, 28–30.

139. See also: Araceli Duque, "The Vision of Christopher Dawson." Catholic Education Resource Center, July 2004.

140. See Russello, 28–30.

universality of the Catholic Church, followed by his conversion to the Catholic faith. This quality of unifying opposite ideas also showed he shared Schuman's Thomist conciliatory and reconciliatory attitude.

The European solution after the disastrous effects of the world wars was, according to Dawson, to be found in the focus on the European common spiritual tradition and not by merely re-organizing Europe into a federation of states. A common moral vision, based on Christianity, is essential according to Dawson. He writes the following in his book *Understanding Europe*:

The European problem cannot be solved merely by a drastic process of economic and political reorganization which would create a federal unity - the United States of Europe [...] Europe owes its unique character to the fact that it is and has always been a society of nations, each intensely conscious of its own social personality and its own political institutions and laws, but all united by a common spiritual tradition, a common intellectual culture and common moral values [...] It is only by the recovery of these common traditions and values and in the strengthening of them that Europe can be saved.<sup>141</sup>

According to Dawson, without religion at the base of culture, man's tragedy was a fact, a statement comparable to Guardini's, as we will see in section 2.3.6.

In his book *The Making of Europe* (1932)<sup>142</sup> Dawson gave a full account of how Europe got into the disastrous situation it was in at the time. He defined the problem, explained its origins and suggested it could be solved through a return to the forgotten world of spiritual reality. He stressed the importance of religion, in Europe's case of Christianity, as the soul of culture and parallel to Schuman's thoughts of integrating the European cultural heritage in the European

---

141. Christopher Dawson, *Understanding Europe*, (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1953), 223.

142. Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe*, (London: Sheed & Ward, 1932).

integration process, Dawson focused on the need to integrate the spiritual world with the world of reason and science.

The keynote of Dawson's thought as found in *The Making of Europe* was: religion is the soul of a culture, and a society that has lost its spiritual roots is a dying society, however prosperous it may appear externally. The fate of our civilization was endangered not only by the fading of the vision of faith that originally formed it, namely Christianity, but also by the failure to integrate the world of reason and science with the world of the soul, which has lost the power to express itself through culture. In Dawson's view this was the tragedy of modern man.<sup>143</sup>

Dawson also argued that "the world religions have been the keystones of the world cultures, so that when they are removed the arch falls and the building is destroyed."<sup>144</sup>

Dawson thus affirmed that no culture could truly thrive if it was cut off from its religious roots. He was convinced that Christianity needed to be and remain the binding element for Europe. This is expressed explicitly in this book *The Making of Europe*. Like Schuman and many others, he was already envisioning a new united Europe, but he perceived the profound problem of all Western States of the separation of culture from its religious base. He saw the lack of religion in the educational systems and the aim to do completely away with religion in education. He also noticed the lack of unity of thought in the world of investigation and the stress on specialization with the risk of seeing the tree and missing the forest.<sup>145</sup>

There is a strong similarity in thought between Schuman and Dawson on the vital need for spirituality at the base of European culture and the integration of the world of education and science into

---

143. Emanuel L. Paparella, "Christopher Dawson and The Making of Europe," *Metanexus*, (2008).

144. Christopher Dawson, *Progress and Religion: an historical inquiry*, (London: Sheed & Ward, 1929, 140). See also: Paparella, "Christopher Dawson."

145. Paparella, "Christopher Dawson."

the world of spirituality and culture is evident. The transformative power of the Christian faith greatly interested both of them. For Schuman this meant the need to imbue political European unification and economic cooperation with the spiritual heritage of Europe in which Christianity played an essential role.

### 2.2.3 Denis de Rougemont

Denis de Rougemont (1906–1985)<sup>146</sup> was a Swiss writer and philosopher. His drive to come to a united Europe resembles Schuman's closely. One important difference is that De Rougemont advocated a federal structure as soon as possible.

De Rougemont studied Humanities at the University of Neuchatel. He moved to Paris in 1930, where he wrote and edited various publications, associating with the personalist groupings<sup>147</sup> and the non-conformists of the 1930s, who rejected ideologies such as Nazism and Communism, but were also against modern individualism and nationalism. De Rougemont was exiled from Switzerland and moved to the United States where he was involved in Resistance activities during the Second World War, in spite of official Swiss neutrality. He there published *La part du diable* (1942), in which he criticized totalitarianism and the materialism of modern society. After

---

146. (Biographical) data from: Denis de Rougemont, "Het vaderland der herinnering" in *Rekenschap van Europa*, (Amsterdam: Vrij Nederland, 1947), 101-123; *The Crisis of Modern Times, perspectives from The Review of Politics 1939 - 1962*, Ed. A. James McAdams, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 67–83; and *Denis de Rougemont: 1906 / 1985*, (Geneva: University of Geneva, 9 February 2007).

147. See also: 'Personalism' in *Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy*, Stanford (California): "In its various strains, personalism always underscores the centrality of the person as the primary locus of investigation for philosophical, theological, and humanistic studies. It is an approach or system of thought which regards or tends to regard the person as the ultimate explanatory, epistemological, ontological, and axiological principle of all reality, although these areas of thought are not stressed equally by all personalists and there is tension between idealist, phenomenological, existentialist, and Thomist versions of personalism."

the war he wrote his *Lettres sur la bombe atomique* (1946), in which he condemned the nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and expressed the need to surpass the sovereignty of the nation state in the field of nuclear technology. That same year recorded his first thoughts on a united Europe. A year later he returned to Europe and attended the First Congress of European Federalists. He soon became one of the leading figures of the Union of European Federalists (UEF).

He founded the *Centre Européen de la Culture* in Geneva in 1950, which was also a product of the European Movement and of the Congress of The Hague, referred to in the previous chapter. In 1963 he founded the *Institut Universitaire d'Etudes Européennes (IUEE)* (Graduate Institute of European Studies) attached to the University of Geneva, which he led for a long time.

In 1947 De Rougemont attended the well-known Federalist Conference on the origins of federalism in Montreux, Switzerland. The key issue De Rougemont addressed in his speech there was the spiritual origin of federalism. He stressed the importance of a correct concept of man, as all politics is built on a concept of man and the need to contribute to a certain kind of humanity.<sup>148</sup> He explained that man is not meant to be an isolated individual without responsibility who is thus easily led to anarchy, nor an object of the state, which would lead to totalitarianism. He stressed that man is a responsible human being. Man is a person who is responsible regarding his own unique vocation as well as regarding the community he lives in. Man is both free and engaged, autonomous and solidary with others. It is this idea of man that federalism is built on, according to De Rougemont. He adds to this that this 'man' he describes should not be

---

148. Denis de Rougemont, "L'attitude fédéraliste", Montreux Congress, 27–31 August 1947, Archives historiques des Communautés européennes, Florence, Villa Il Poggiolo. Dépôts, DEP. Mouvement européen, ME. "toute politique implique une certaine idée de l'homme, et contribue à promouvoir un certain type d'humanité, qu'on le veuille ou non qu'on le sache ou non."

considered a kind of person ‘in between’, that is between the individual without responsibility and the political soldier without freedom. This ‘man’ is the only real man and the others are but conceptual variations of what man really is.<sup>149</sup>

De Rougemont made clear that it is on this concept of man that federalist work and its methods should be built and developed. For an idea of the way in which Europe needed to be reconstructed De Rougemont referred first of all to Karl Jaspers, a German philosopher, whose main ideas will be discussed in more detail in section 2.3.5. Basically, Jaspers believed Europe would have to choose between Balkanisation and Helvetization. De Rougemont explained the concept of Balkanisation as the disintegration of Europe into nationalisms and national rivalries, while the concept of Helvetization refers to the federal integration of states, surrendering absolute sovereignty and accepting a common constitution.<sup>150</sup>

He began to refer to the United States of Europe with Switzerland and its federalist system as an example and rejected the argument that Switzerland is too small a country to have an exemplary function for the whole of Europe. He compared it with an experiment and result acquired in a laboratory, which is necessarily attained on a

---

149. Ibid., “l’homme est un être doublement responsable: vis-à-vis de sa vocation propre et unique, d’une part, et d’autre part vis-à-vis de la communauté au sein de laquelle sa vocation s’exerce. [...] L’homme est donc à la fois libre et engagé, à la fois autonome et solitaire. [...] Enfin, à l’homme comme personne, à la fois libre et engagé, et vivant dans la tension entre l’autonomie et la solidarité, correspond le régime fédéraliste. [...] Il ne faut pas penser que la personne soit un moyen terme ou un juste milieu entre l’individu sans responsabilité et le soldat politique sans liberté. Car la personne, c’est l’homme réel, et les deux autres ne sont que des déviations morbides, des démissions de l’humanité complète.”

150. Ibid., “Je suppose que Jaspers entendait par balkanisation la désintégration de l’Europe en nationalismes rivaux, et par helvétisation au contraire, l’intégration fédérale des nations, renonçant au dogme de leur souveraineté absolue, et acceptant sous une forme ou sous une autre, une constitution commune.” See also: Denis de Rougemont, “L’Europe en jeu: unie ou colonisée”, (Neuchâtel: Éditions de la Baconnière, 1948), 125–141.

smaller scale than its applications.<sup>151</sup> He dismissed the suggestion that it would be too fast for Europe to accept a federalist system, saying that in 1846 no Swiss could have thought of ever having a federalist system with a common constitution, but it had one by 1848.<sup>152</sup> It was a civil war that forced the Swiss to adopt a common constitution and form a confederation. Only in this way could they return to the peaceful way they had lived together before the civil war. De Rougemont stressed that a state such as Switzerland that respects the peaceful union of two religions, four languages, 22 republics and a large number of ‘races’, thus displays anti-racism and anti-nationalism.<sup>153</sup>

De Rougemont strongly criticized the scepticism and even the hostility of public opinion regarding plans for European federalization. He objected to those who considered the federalist idea utopian wishful thinking. By doing so they gave preference to the existing status quo with the inevitable danger of war, according to De Rougemont. He ridiculed the fact that what is called the utopian ideal seems to be the exclusive patrimony of those who fight for peace and union while those that recommend war and prepare the future accordingly are taken seriously. The idea of a customs union, of political calm or of a federation was considered premature, but where

---

151. De Rougemont, “L’attitude fédéraliste,” “Une expérience de laboratoire est nécessairement plus réduite de dimensions que ses applications, mais pourtant celles-ci n’existeraient pas sans celle-là.”

152. Ibid., “Ce qui étonne tous les historiens de notre Confédération, c’est justement l’extrême rapidité avec laquelle la Constitution de 1848 fut proposée, écrite, adoptée et mise en pratique. En 1846, elle était encore une utopie. Trois ans plus tard, elle fonctionnait si bien que l’on eût dit qu’elle allait de soi.”

153. Ibid., “Par la force des choses, l’union paisible de deux religions, de quatre langues, de 22 républiques, et de je ne sais combien de “races” en un État qui les respecte, cette union prend l’allure à la fois d’un antiracisme déclaré et d’un anti-nationalisme.”

re-armament and preparations for a war between nations or political parties were concerned, haste had to be made.<sup>154</sup>

Many parallels can be drawn between Schuman's thoughts and those of De Rougemont, especially regarding the importance of the concept of the human person and the need to work together as nations. Though their respective understanding of both 'man' and 'method of cooperation' might have been slightly different, the underlying idea is very similar. Man should occupy a key position within the European process of integration. Like De Rougemont, Schuman was not afraid of encouraging the partial surrender of sovereignty of national states. One difference between the two is that Schuman never spoke of the United States of Europe, as De Rougemont did. Schuman gave a lot of importance to the national identity of each state on its own within the European integration process while De Rougemont stressed the need to do away with any kind of nationalism. According to Schuman unification had to be achieved through step-by-step integration with respect for national identities as long as they did not violate the European common good, as is explained in section 2.1. Schuman wanted a European unification that was the result of common European interests of member states while De Rougemont focused on fast federalization on every plane, disregarding national identities in the process. De Rougemont does also not stress explicitly the importance of the European cultural and spiritual heritage.

---

154. De Rougemont, "L'Europe en jeu," 85-87. "De même, l'adjectif utopiste est exclusivement réservé à ceux qui luttent pour la paix et l'union. On ne traite jamais d'utopiste un homme qui préconise la guerre, la juge prochaine, et veut tout disposer, dès maintenant, dans cette vue de l'avenir. [...] Enfin un plan d'union douanière, de trêve politique, ou de fédération, sera toujours qualifié de prématuré. [...] Mais pour peu qu'il s'agisse de réarmer et de se préparer à la guerre entre nations ou entre partis, le temps presse, le moment est venu, peut-être même est-il trop tard! Dans tous les cas, l'urgence est telle que discuter serait faire le jeu de l'ennemi, et que demander à voir serait trahir."

## 2.2.4 Henri Brugmans

*Rare are the people that received the gift to pay a sustainable tribute to history. The President Robert Schuman belongs to this small group of privileged children of humanity.*<sup>155</sup>

*Henri Brugmans*

Henri Brugmans (1906–1997) was a widely known Dutch advocate of European integration after the World War II and a friend of Schuman's. Like Schuman, Brugmans was also occupied with a European unification and the way it should come about. Even during the war whilst held in a concentration camp he and other intellectuals were outlining a new political and social order for after the war.<sup>156</sup>

Brugmans held several offices in European institutions, for instance the office of President of the Union of European Federalists (1946–1956). He and De Rougemont shared the ideal of federalism during those years. In 1949 he also became the first Head of the College of Europe in Bruges. This was the first centre of which European Studies formed the core. Brugmans held this post until 1972. In 1951, two years after the start of the College of Europe, he received a Charlemagne Award for his European unifying efforts.

At the congress on the origins of federalism in Montreux in 1947, Brugmans, as President of the UEF, stressed the need for Europeans to be confident and to practice solidarity. He emphasized the need to see the 'German question' as a problem that needs a European solution. His idea is that it is not so much a 'German question' as it is a 'European question'. He urged the countries in this

---

155. Henri Brugmans, "Eloge du Professeur Henri Brugmans" in *Du Pater Europae aux Pères de l'Europe*, (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2010), 48. "Rares sont les hommes à qui il est donné d'apporter un tribut durable à l'histoire. Le Président Robert Schuman fait partie de ce petit groupe d'enfants privilégiés de l'humanité."

156. Walter Lipgens and Wilfried Loth, *Documents on the History of European Integration, The Struggle for European Union by Political Parties and Pressure Groups in Western European Countries 1945–1950*, Volume 3, European University Institute, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1988), 359.

regard to be conscious of the European common vocation to work towards unity and to reconcile and cooperate in the fields of coal and steel as these provided the suitable means for fruitful collaboration.

What is needed is to establish the first nucleus of autonomous European administration of coal and heavy industry, administrations which would restore in the economic sphere the geological and geographical unity of the coal-producing and industrial basin of Western Europe, which would then be able to function effectively, freed at last from national trammels. These organizations would be controlled by all the interests concerned, and, for this very reason, would no longer be in danger of serving potential aggressors. [...] Once there is the prospect of material revival and European co-operation, the decentralization of the country ceases to look like anti-national and reactionary dismemberment. Once the Ruhr becomes part of One Europe, in exactly the same way as Lorraine, Luxembourg, the coalfields of Belgium and North-Eastern France, Liege and the Limburg the spectre of “Balkanization” disappears, and the life of the locality, the parish, the province can develop freely, in a large, united “living space.”[...] What has been called the re-education of Germany [...] is the responsibility<sup>157</sup> of the whole European and human community.

Brugmans thus encouraged European countries to work together in the fields of coal and steel and in this sense anticipated the European Coal and Steel Community.

Brugmans pointed out this was a troubled period of transition: “Three years after the death of Hitler we see around us nothing but mistrust, uncertainty and fanaticism. We live under a Great Fear regime.” He mentioned the importance of the Marshall Plan and its motto for Europe to “First get together; then we will see,”<sup>158</sup> a demand

---

157. Henri Brugmans, “Fundamentals of European federalism,” speech delivered at the Conference of the European Union of Federalists, at Montreux in August 1947, brought up-to-date for publication. (London: British Section of European Union of Federalists, 1948), 3–19. See also: [www.ena.lu](http://www.ena.lu)

158. Ibid.

that he considered of common sense and healthy for Europeans, who desperately needed the American aid for the rebuilding of Europe. Brugmans focused on the necessity for complete European unification characterized by a confidence in the Europeans themselves and their common vocation.<sup>159</sup> The situation of political disunity thus had to change, was his conclusion.

An extensive number of Brugmans' remarks will be quoted to illustrate these convictions. The first ones refer to the lack of unity Europe experiences right after the Second World War. Brugmans points at the dangerous attitude of those who wish to go back to the past only to protect their own interests and privileges. He stresses the urgent need for unity and focuses on the fact that Europe needs to cure itself, as there is no state that will be able to do it for Europe. Only in this way will Europe be capable of contributing to a new world-order. Through European unity Europe will deserve the American support and at the same time protect itself from too strong an American influence.

He further focuses on the need to strive towards re-unification with the Eastern and Central European countries and to foster the relationship with those countries, whilst not disregarding the Soviet Union. Brugmans then stresses the need for the introduction of a political federal structure. The latter would not only affect Europe but the entire world-order. The federal structure he speaks about would bring about a new social order in which the emphasis is on the individual's personal development and on solidarity and freedom.

Brugmans' quotes demonstrate a strong resemblance to Schuman's thoughts and reflect at the same time the contemporary situation: "We find ourselves in our present unhappy condition not

---

159. Ibid., "our European 'patriotism' means above all: confidence in ourselves, solidarity, consciousness of our common vocation."

because we are bankrupt or in a state of fundamental economic exhaustion but only because of political disunity.”<sup>160</sup> He stressed the fact that this is mainly due to inner division:

The most serious of all is the threat of treason, or at least of surrender, within our fortress itself. This danger comes from those “Europeans” who set their faces against any reform of the structure of society, who dream of a return to the past, who are “anti-Communists” not because they believe in freedom - but because they desire privilege; and who, beaten on the field of national politics, count on the United States to bring back the old discredited system.

Europe’s fate is in her own hands. It is at once weakness and wishful thinking to imagine that any outside power, however friendly, however generous, can save our continent. Europe is sick; Europe alone can cure herself. Thus only can she hope to make a complete and helpful contribution to the new world-order to which we all look forward.

That is why we believe so passionately in European independence, that is to say: in Europe’s own mission. But, for our struggle to succeed, we must unite as quickly as possible. To deserve help from America and at the same time to safeguard ourselves against eventual American interference in our affairs, there is only one weapon - unity. We must forge that weapon, and forge it with the least possible delay.<sup>161</sup>

At the Montreux congress he also mentioned the great setback caused by the Soviet Union when it prohibited countries of Eastern Europe from participating in the Marshall Plan and thus from combining efforts with Western Europe. Brugmans continued by stressing that unity remains Europe’s last chance. He also commented on an additional effect that European unity would have, saying:

---

160. Ibid.

161. Brugmans, Archives historiques de l’Union européenne, Florence, Villa Il Poggiolo. Dépôts, DEP. Mouvement européen, ME 406. A year later at the Congress of Europe in The Hague, Brugmans stated as President of the Bureau of the Union of European Federalists (UEF) in his opening address that European unity on a supranational basis is a prerequisite for all efforts towards international understanding.

“continental consolidation on our part would encourage other parts of the world to unite.”<sup>162</sup> He then referred to the need to continue the relationship with Eastern Europe and to strive towards the unification of Western and Eastern Europe:

Are we going to allow the bridges to be blown between ourselves and our brothers of Eastern Europe? Are we to capitulate before the accomplished fact? Certainly not. On the contrary, more than ever we denounce every tendency towards splitting the world between the two Super Powers (which, as a matter of strict fact, total between them only about 14 per cent of the world's population). More than ever are we convinced that war today is not only criminal but useless. More than ever do we feel ourselves one with the peoples of Eastern Europe. [...] Though the vicissitudes of international politics may separate us for the time being, European federalism does not accept this division as a fait accompli.<sup>163</sup>

Brugmans further argued that Russian Communism would never fit in western European society, though he was quick to add this did not imply a lack of respect towards the Soviet Union:

We believe that Russian Communism, with all it connotes of one-sided propaganda and censorship, police politics, fanaticism and spiritual inquisition, will never provide a form of society which will permanently satisfy the peoples of Europe whether of the East or the West. We all possess - and intend to preserve - a critical and free-thinking temperament, and if it were no longer possible to say “No” in our own countries - “No” to the legislative bodies, to the Government, to academic art or official science - then Prague, Vienna, Zurich, Paris and London would be cities of the dead.

Brugmans emphasized the need to reflect on the profound statement made to the American people by George Washington at the end of his presidency:

Treat all nations with good faith and justice [...] Permanent, inveterate hatred of certain peoples and a passionate attachment for others must be ruled out. The nation which

---

162. Brugmans, “Fundamentals of federalism,” Montreux 1947.

163. Ibid.

abandons itself to lasting hatred or unswerving affection for another nation, in some measure makes itself a slave.<sup>164</sup>

The federalist thought Brugmans proclaimed also involved the rest of the world: “by the very fact of pursuing a European policy we are already pursuing a policy of world order. It would be absurd to try to organize Europe in a watertight compartment.”<sup>165</sup> Next to the European common good the universal common good also needs to be taken into account, as it will affect and be affected by the European common good. A logical consequence of this idea is that federalist thought needs to permeate the economy, from agriculture to international transportation. This will invariably have an impact on the social structure.

The social aspect of federalism was that next to a new political system it also aspires to a new social order in which the individual is respected as a human being and his personal development encouraged:

What does federalism offer in this field? Two elements indissolubly linked: organic solidarity and liberty - in other words, development of the human personality. Only viewed thus can liberty cease to mean exploitation, and solidarity avoid turning into totalitarian dictatorship. [...] To our minds the worker is not free if he is the slave of mechanization or of profit, if the undertaking in which he works is not at the same time his undertaking; if he cannot be certain that what he produces will add to the well-being of the community as a whole. [...] We reject the divine right of employers and technicians, when they claim to be organizing economic life, to exploit man by using him as human raw material.<sup>166</sup>

Brugmans saw federalism as the solution to not only the ‘German question’, but also as the solution for Europe and even the world as such. Federalism would bring about man’s desired freedom and the abolishment of borders and divisions.

---

164. Ibid.

165. Ibid.

166. Ibid.

Federalism, then, on every plane - federalism, creator of organic and visible solidarity, European and World federalism, the only means of resolving the contradictions of a period in which all men are jointly and severally responsible for the activities of their fellow men. Federalism, federalism again, and always more and more federalism, so that we may live in freedom, and frontiers and divisions may at last be swept away.<sup>167</sup>

Brugmans called European federalism “a common and personal vocation which we have not the right to deny [...] for the rest, the future is not in our hands - it is in the hands of God.”<sup>168</sup>

There are many striking similarities between Schuman’s and Brugmans’ thoughts. Both have similar thoughts on the ‘German question’; that it is in fact a European question and that it can best be solved by cooperation in the fields of coal and steel. On this topic Schuman said the following:

It remains for me to raise a special problem for the French and for the peoples of Alsace and Lorraine in particular. That is the place that will be reserved for Germany in the European organization. Nobody can imagine excluding Germany from it. On the contrary, I think that when it comes to the German problem there is only one solution: the European solution.<sup>169</sup>

Schuman agreed with Brugmans’s statement that Europe alone could cure itself and had its fate in its own hands. There was no other entity that could solve its problem of disunity. Unity was the only solution to the problem and the American financial aid would contribute to achieving this. But Brugmans differed from Schuman in that he wanted federalism in every area. Schuman advocated the step-by-step procedure (see 2.1) and was more cautious about the protection of

---

167. Ibid.

168. Ibid.

169. Schuman, Speech at the Council of Europe.

national identities of states, as previously mentioned in the section on De Rougemont.

Schuman was hesitant about the idea of a Federation of European States as conceived by De Rougemont and Brugmans. Such a federation might unnecessarily, and counterproductively, ‘kill’ national sovereignty on essential points.<sup>170</sup> But Schuman did also underline the need for cohesion in all areas: in economic, political and military affairs. He envisioned a close cooperation that would lead to a common perspective of shared interests and responsibilities and not a strictly national point of view. But he also stressed the importance of this national point of view; that national interests should not be neglected, but incorporated in a reciprocal interdependence. Consider Schuman’s famous statements:

Europe won’t be built overnight, neither without obstacles on its way. Its construction will follow the way of the spirit. Nothing that lasts happens easily. Europe is already on its way. And beyond the existing institutions, the European idea, its spirit of solidarity as a community have taken root.<sup>171</sup>

The common basis of our civilization is essential, according to Schuman. This common basis gradually creates a bond strong enough to break all obstacles:<sup>172</sup>

---

170. Schuman, *Pour l’Europe*, 111–112. “L’idée même d’un gouvernement fédéral et celle d’un parlement fédéral impliquerait, me semble-t-il, un pouvoir de décision majoritaire, liant les États fédérés. J’estime que ce serait brûler les étapes, s’engager prématurément et imprudemment dans la voie d’un dessaisissement de la souveraineté nationale sur des points d’importance essentiels.” See also: section 2.1.

171. Robert Schuman quoted in Lejeune, *Robert Schuman*, 171: “L’Europe ne se fera en un jour, ni sans heurts. Son édification suivra le cheminement des esprits. Rien de durable ne s’accomplit dans la facilité. Déjà l’Europe est en marche. Et par-delà les institutions existantes, l’idée européenne, l’esprit de solidarité communautaire ont pris racine.” See also: Schuman, *Pour l’Europe*, 20. See also: section 2.1.

172. See also: Schuman, *Pour l’Europe*, 20. “Cette idée “Europe” révélera à tous les bases communes de notre civilisation; elle créera peu à peu un lien semblable à celui dont naguère se sont forgées les patries. Elle sera la force contre laquelle se briseront tous les obstacles.”

The idea is not to merge States to create a Super State. Our European States are a historical reality. From a psychological point of view it would be impossible to do away with them. Their diversity is a good thing and we do not intend to level them down or equalize them. [...] To our mind, European policy is certainly not in contradiction with the patriotic ideal. It encourages the particular nature and characteristics of each of its states and fosters the sound love for one's own country which is a love that does not go in detriment of other countries. It wants to attain a unity in the fullness of its diversity.<sup>173</sup>

Schuman thus shared many ideas with Brugmans. As mentioned before Schuman also believed that Europe alone could cure itself and that it could do so through unification. Both Schuman and Brugmans emphasized the need for reconciliation and regarded the 'German question' as a 'European question' that could be solved by cooperation in the field of coal and steel. Both stressed the pivotal role of the human person in society and in the European integration process.

Both Schuman and Brugmans supported the idea of European integration and the use of supranational entities to support common interests. The difference between the two resides in the fact that Schuman suggested a different method and a different model of European integration. Schuman wanted the step-by-step method and not all as soon as possible as Brugmans suggested. Schuman wished to safeguard the national identities in the process of unification and not federalization on every plane as Brugmans proposed.

---

173. Schuman, *For Europe*, 16, 21. Schuman, *Pour l'Europe*, 26, 30: "Cependant il ne s'agit pas de fusionner les États associés, de créer un super-État. Nos États européens sont une réalité historique; il serait psychologiquement impossible de les faire disparaître. Leur diversité est même très heureuse, et nous ne voulons ni les niveler ni les égaliser. Leur politique européenne, dans notre esprit, n'est absolument pas contradictoire avec l'idéal patriotique de chacun de nous."

### 2.2.5 Karl Jaspers

Karl Theodor Jaspers (1883–1969)<sup>174</sup> and Schuman received the Erasmus Prize together in 1959. Both were rewarded for their contribution to European culture and European unification.

Jaspers was a well-known German psychiatrist and philosopher. He taught psychology at Heidelberg University. At the age of 40 Jaspers turned from psychology to philosophy and became a renowned philosopher. When the National Socialists came into power in 1933, Jaspers was forced to leave the University because he had a Jewish wife. In 1938 he was no longer allowed to publish. He continued his studies though at home. It was only when the Americans liberated Heidelberg, in 1945, that Jaspers no longer needed to fear a concentration camp. He started to write and deliver speeches on Europe and about its way to go in the future. Three years later he moved to Basel in Switzerland where he was a prominent philosopher until his death in 1969.

Core issues in Jaspers' philosophy were the need for individual freedom, the meaning of being and the transcendence of the human being, and the interconnection of these three issues. According to Jaspers, the individual is confronted with the borders of reality and its meaning. He will therefore need to make a choice between sinking into despair and resignation and taking a leap of faith towards what Jaspers calls 'transcendence'. It is this leap of faith which makes an individual experience his own limitless freedom and thereby his authentic existence and being. Jaspers saw 'transcendence' as an ultimate absolute or non-objectivity (or no-thing-ness), but he did not

---

174. (Biographical) data from: Karl Jaspers, "Verantwoordelijkheid en opdracht" in *Rekenschap van Europa*, (Amsterdam: Vrij Nederland, 1947), 199–229; and *Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy*, Stanford (California).

associate this transcendence with any religious doctrine. Jaspers emphasizes that it is the individual who decides:

First, man is autonomous in the face of all the authorities of the world: the individual, reared by authority, at the end of the process of his maturation decides in his immediacy and responsibility before Transcendence what is unconditionally true. Second, man is a datum of Transcendence: to obey Transcendence in that unconditional decision leads man to his own Being.<sup>175</sup>

He recognized and wrote about the threat to human freedom from modern science, economics and politics. According to him positivistic philosophy could not be considered philosophy as it excludes transcendence.

Jaspers, as the other intellectuals mentioned in this chapter, vehemently opposed the totalitarian system of government. He too warned against the increasing move towards technology, and to a regime that regarded humans as mere instruments of science or ideological goals:

Totalitarianism is neither Communism nor fascism nor National Socialism, but it has appeared in all of these forms. It is the universal, terrible threat of the future of mankind in a mass order. It is a phenomenon of our age, detached from all the politics governed by principles of a historic national existence of constitutional legality. Wherever it comes to power, domestic politics give way to intrigues and acts of force, and foreign policy, the conduct of relations with other states, is shrouded in a semblance of talk and negotiation, but without being tied by any rules of the game, to any community of human interests. [...] We are fighting totalitarianism on behalf of freedom. The enemy is neither Communism in itself, nor Russia in herself [...] The fight is a struggle for freedom within the free countries. [...] We may hope that it will be waged with clear vision and acute intelligence in the concrete situations. It is in this task that our forces meet or split or grow

---

175. Karl Jaspers, "On my philosophy" (1941) in: *Existentialism from Dostoyevsky to Sartre*, ed. Walter Kaufman, (New York: New American Library, 1975).

confused on the plain basic issue of our spiritual fate, and of its consequences in political reality.<sup>176</sup>

Jaspers was in favour of a form of government that guaranteed individual freedom and had only limited involvement. According to him such a regime needed to be rooted in authentic tradition and be guided by an intellectual elite.<sup>177</sup> For him Europe is ‘the bible and the antiquity’, and these two should play a fundamental role in the governing of Europe.<sup>178</sup> His observations clearly echo those of Schuman with his focus on the European spiritual and cultural heritage.

Regarding the possible shapes that Europe could take, Jaspers believed that: “The alternative for Europe is Balkanization or Helvetization.” Balkanization, as explained by De Rougemont, refers to disintegration and national rivalries or a mixture of conflicts and hostilities; this would be contrary to Schuman’s thinking. Helvetization refers to building a political identity that overcomes the diversity of national origins and languages, as Switzerland did.<sup>179</sup>

Jaspers’s ideas on the necessity of transcendence in order to experience limitless freedom and authentic existence could be considered as a philosophic version of the concept of the human person Schuman believed in and saw as fundamental for the entire European unification process. Schuman’s definition of the concept of ‘individual’ is one that is proper to Catholic faith, which is a human being with a personal vocation to sanctity. Both Schuman and Jaspers believed that the European project should be built on and revolve

---

176. Karl Jaspers, “The Fight Against Totalitarianisms,” *Athenaeum Reading Room*, 1963.

177. *Ibid.*

178. See also note 197.

179. See also: “European Values & Identity,” Task Force for European values and identity of the European Ideas Network, Századvég Foundation, Austrian Institute for European Security Policy, Constantinos Karamanlis Institute for Democracy, Free Europe Centre, SPK-Europe.

around the concept of man and his transcendence and not on scientific, economic or political ideals that disregard his pivotal role. Jaspers thought about European spiritual and cultural heritage and about integration but did not express specific ideas in his writings about European unification as Schuman did.

### 2.2.6 Romano Guardini

*Europe will be Christian or it will cease to be.*<sup>180</sup>

*Romano Guardini*

Romano Guardini (1885–1968) was a prominent figure in Catholic intellectual life and an acquaintance of Schuman.<sup>181</sup> Their thoughts coincide to a large extent regarding the importance of Christianity for Europe. Guardini was an Italian by birth, but lived from his first year onwards in Germany due to his father being a diplomat. Being an Italian living and growing up in Germany made him consider the concept of being a European citizen and also meant he never disregarded either his Italian origin or his German formation. He studied theology, became a priest and taught philosophy of religion and Catholic Worldview at the University of Berlin until he was forced to resign for having openly criticized the Nazis in his essay *The Saviour* in 1939. He criticized them for mythologizing the person of

---

180. Romano Guardini, “De heilbode in de mythe, openbaring en politiek,” in *Peilingen van het Christelijk denken, verzamelde studies 1925–1963*, trans. Piet van Antwerpen et al., (The Hague: Lannoo, 1965), 541. See also: Romano Guardini, *Die Sinne und die religiöse Erkenntnis*, (Würzburg 1958). The word ‘Christian’ needs to be put in the context of Guardini’s constant search for the typical Christian element. Out of Guardini’s works (such as the ones that focus on his vision on worldview and on Europe as will be dealt with in this chapter) can be concluded that the Christian element implies respect of man’s freedom, also freedom of religion, and consists of man’s longing to become the person he is meant to be by God. It similarly encourages man to contribute to a society that concords with the universal principles embedded in natural law as reflected in those days in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and to not give in to the search for power. A secular society that is not an integralist secular society needs therefore not necessarily be an anti-Christian society. See also note 430.

181. See chapter 1.2.

Christ, putting Hitler in Christ's place and for abusing Christianity for Hitler's anti-Semitism.<sup>182</sup> Guardini had also stressed that Christ was a Jew, a statement that infuriated the Nazis. Another important reason for his dismissal was that the Nazis objected to the Catholic worldview he taught at the university because it was incompatible with the Nazi ideology.<sup>183</sup> Guardini saw Nazism as an immoral annihilation of the self.<sup>184</sup>

Guardini was appointed professor in philosophy of religion at the University of Tübingen the same year the Second World War ended. Three years later he moved to Munich to lecture at the University of Munich, where he remained until retiring, for health reasons, in 1962. His ill health prevented him from playing any active role in the Second Vatican Council. Nevertheless, his ideas were highly esteemed by the Roman Catholic Church and his thoughts on liturgical reforms found their way into official documents of the Second Vatican Council. Some even considered Guardini to be a precursor of the Second Vatican Council. Guardini's many writings were often powerful studies of traditional themes in the light of present-day challenges, or conversely examinations of current problems as approached from the Christian, and especially Catholic,

---

182. See also: Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006), 274. Dawkins quotes in this regard Hitler's words: "The first thing to do is to rescue [Germany] from the Jew who is ruining our country [...] We want to prevent our Germany from suffering, as Another did, the death upon the Cross."

183. Robert A. Krieg, "Romano Guardini's theology of the human person," *Theological Studies* 59 (1998). Krieg mentions that "Romano Guardini was summoned to the office of the Third Reich's Minister of Education, Bernhard Rust, in January 1939 and was told that he could no longer be the University of Berlin's professor of Philosophy of Religion and Catholic Worldview. Rust's explanation: "when the state itself has a worldview, there can be no room for a chair of Catholic 'Weltanschauung' at the University." [...] A few days later, the Minister of Education telephoned Guardini and asked him if he would be willing to retire without the academic rank of professor emeritus and also without a pension. The Catholic scholar immediately said yes."

184. See: Robert A. Krieg, *Romano Guardini: A Precursor to Vatican II*, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998), chapter 6.

tradition. His thoughts also influenced many intellectuals, amongst whom the current Pope Benedict XVI, then Cardinal Ratzinger.

Ratzinger would remind the public of Guardini's warning that no politics were possible combined with annihilation of conscience. He also pointed out Guardini's emphasis on the need for a real and effective interpretation of the world in order to procure sound politics. Ratzinger said the following in his speech for the Romano Guardini Award in 1979:

Romano Guardini's experience of Hitler's bloody tyranny and his vigilance before new threats led him, during his last years and almost against his own temperament, to issue dramatic warnings about the destruction of politics through the annihilation of conscience, and drove him to call for a proper interpretation, not a merely theoretical one, but a real and effective interpretation of the world according to the man who acts politically on the basis of faith.<sup>185</sup>

In 1952, Guardini won the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade and in 1962 the Erasmus Prize. He died in Munich in 1968. His estate was left to the Catholic Academy in Bavaria, which he had co-founded. The appreciation for his books increased in the 1990s due to the applicability of many of his ideas on current world affairs.

Regarding Europe, Guardini always stressed that it was a Christian spirit that made Europe what it was. Therefore, he considered Christ the protagonist of European history, the one who set man free from the bondage of myth and ties to nature and who enabled man to have a personal relationship with God. He also explained that it was precisely for this reason that National Socialism was so keen on removing Christ from the scene, trying to fill his place with its ideology incarnated in the person of Hitler. He was convinced

---

185. Joseph A. Ratzinger, speech on 14 March 1979 at the Bavarian Catholic Academy in Munich, when handing out the Romano Guardini Prize to the Prime-Minister of Bavaria, Alfons Goppel.

that the moment Europe ignores Christ and thereby its essence, it will lose its intrinsic value.<sup>186</sup>

Schuman and Guardini knew each other well and were thus familiar with each other's thoughts and works from the time of the recollections in Maria Laach onwards. Both were also acquainted with Theodor Abele, the then organizer of the Catholic intellectual circles in which both men participated. Their similarity of thought is striking in that Guardini's observations apply to Schuman's spiritual world and to his way of thinking about the role of nations within the European integration process. Guardini's search to express what is essentially Christian, truth and belonging to human dignity in a philosophic manner can even be considered a philosophical background or explanation of Schuman's driving force. Guardini's Catholic worldview thus provides a philosophical and cultural background or framework for the understanding of Schuman's thinking. For this reason some details on Guardini's worldview will be provided here.

### ***Guardini's worldview***

Guardini considered Catholic worldview (*Weltanschauung*) a science that needs to be defined properly so as to distinguish itself from both philosophy and theology on the one hand, and from natural sciences on the other hand. When making this distinction one could say about philosophy that it belongs to the field of thought and reason applied to thought. About theology can be said that it pertains to the study of faith, reason applied to faith and reason illuminated by faith. Natural sciences on the other hand belong to the fields of nature and restrict themselves to the examination and description of the tangible

---

186. Guardini, "De heilbode in de mythe," 542–543. See also: Guardini, *Die Sinne und die religiöse Erkenntnis*.

elements of a certain object. Guardini believed that the science of worldview distinguishes itself from all these in that it directs itself principally towards the totality of its object, the worldview. This totality is not a sum of its parts, nor a synthesis of its parts, but an ordering. It is an interpretation of what each separate thing strives for from the very first moment of its being and how this is related to all other separate things and to the overall totality.<sup>187</sup>

In connection to Schuman's ideas on European integration it means that a worldview tries to reach the point where the essence of each entity (be it a member state, Europe, or the world) is connected most intrinsically with the overall essence (*Wesentlichkeit*); that is, the Totality (*Ganzheit*) it participates in. This Totality is beyond the entity concerned and at the same time intrinsically present in each of the entities. The result of such a worldview is therefore different from the result of exploring and trying to identify the psychological, sociological, political and economic reasons that might explain the situation of the current world, although these can contribute a great deal to the understanding of the world.<sup>188</sup>

Solitude, when properly experienced, may be seen as personal liberation. Its power and necessity increase with the stature of the individual, and he has all the greater need of it when his special talents are of an active sort. One condition of a healthy life is that this experience of solitude be constantly renewed, to some extent by every man and, in a representative sense, by certain individuals for all mankind. Solitude stirs awareness of his personality in a man caught up in a network of community relationships. It makes him conscious of his own centre, which at times is the centre of the world, that is the real world: not the mere complex of available objects, but of the reality in which these objects are experienced, known and accepted by the person in question. Then what has been said previously about

---

187. See also: Romano Guardini, "Het wezen van de Katholieke Wereldbeschouwing," in *Peilingen van het Christelijk denken*, 17.

188. *Ibid.*, 20, 21.

the individual centre is carried over into the world of existence. The individual experiences his uniqueness, which can neither be replaced nor displaced. This has nothing to do with selfishness or self-aggrandizement; it is the foundation of man's being and worth - of the individual who, as a person, can never be a means to a further end and also of groups which, because they are human, can be formed only of persons.<sup>189</sup>

Guardini refers here to the need to foster the intrinsic connection between the entity of the person and the Totality which he experiences within himself and which pulls him upwards so as to attain his full development. The tension between the two must be kept alive. It requires, however, a person's constant will, strength and effort to keep this vision alive and live up to it. This task is humanly speaking impossible to carry out without supernatural help and vision, a vision that goes beyond human nature as such. That is, it is impossible without being fed by the Totality it participates in, and which, surprisingly enough, makes a person see and understand his own essence and that of others better. In this way, man attains a deeper insight in the Totality both unique and common to each and every person. A rather imperfect comparison could be made with getting to know oneself better because of knowing one's parents better, or with understanding a certain type of animal's behaviour better when knowing the main characteristics of its species.

The science of worldview makes use of philosophical insights, but is not a product of philosophy. Philosophy and science are closer to life in that sense than worldview is. Worldview is pure insight, a panoramic view, an understanding of life and the world that is even more profound than philosophy and natural sciences could ever be. It does not create, but it sees. Worldview does lead to a creative power,

---

189. Ibid., 44. See also: Heinz Kuehn, *The Essential Guardini: An Anthology of the Writings of Guardini*, (East Peoria, IL: Versa Press, 1997), 56.

but this power receives its form by observing, understanding, seeing. It allows an observer to see things as they are in themselves. Worldview entails to perceive what is already there, but not to act. To look at the world in this way one needs to create distance. It is necessary to look from beyond, from outside this world, being essentially different and free from the world. It is only then that man is free, able to look, see and observe correctly.<sup>190</sup>

In 1962, Cardinal Ratzinger reflected on the fundamental structure of Guardini's thoughts, which were focussed constantly on the need to search for truth. Ratzinger mentioned the 'logos' and the 'ethos' that can be found in Guardini's work, two concepts that can be considered parallel to, respectively, the Absolute and the individual object spoken of above. In order to find its own being and thereby also find truth, the individual object needs to obey the Absolute, the full Truth, and be actively connected with the Absolute which is at the same time both in his inmost being and beyond, but which asks to be searched for constantly in order to be found constantly. Ratzinger related the concept of the Absolute or the 'logos' in this regard to God, as Silvano Zucal explains:

For Guardini - the future Pope emphasizes - the truth of man is essentiality, conformity to being, or even better, the "obedience to being" that is above all the obedience of our being before the being of God. Only in this way does one attain the power of the truth, the decisive and directional primacy of logos over ethos on which Guardini always insisted. What Guardini wanted, Ratzinger explains, was always "a new advancement toward being itself, the search for the essential that is found in the truth."<sup>191</sup>

---

190. Guardini, "Het wezen van de Katholieke Wereldbeschouwing," 26-27.

191. Silvano Zucal, "Ratzinger and Guardini, a decisive encounter," *Vita e Pensiero*, (3 October 2008).

Guardini's theories echo Schuman's wish to act in accordance with the will of God, to be a faithful instrument of Providence. The search for the Absolute, which is also called Truth, or God, and the wish to be and act aligned with it as a human being and thus also with regard to his profession as a politician, characterized Schuman's entire life.

***Guardini's view on the reality of Europe and Europe's challenge ahead***

*If Europe is to become a reality, it is first essential that every European nation shall re-think its history and see its past in the light of this great construction of tomorrow.*<sup>192</sup>

*Romano Guardini*

Romano Guardini held a speech entitled "Europe, reality or mission" upon receiving the Erasmus Prize in Brussels on 21 April 1962.<sup>193</sup> In his speech he referred to the enormous task and challenge that awaited Europe in a world context shaped by its own past. According to Guardini, Europe has power and is able to exert, but also to abuse or to neglect it.

His thoughts on Europe's task can be considered a practical expression of his worldview. According to him it is the Totality that permeates each and every entity (be it a human person, state or continent) and that links the entities among themselves and unites them. Each entity as such has a unique relationship with the Totality in which it participates and therefore also with the other entities that participate in the same Totality, but each in a unique way.

According to Guardini, it is the power of science and technology that has made the world an increasingly smaller place. The

---

192. Romano Guardini, Acceptance Speech upon being awarded the Erasmus Prize, Brussels 2 April 1962. See also: *Europa, werkelijkheid en taak*, (Hilversum, Antwerp: Paul Brand, 1962).

193. Ibid.

power of certain states and continents had led to enormous empires in the past. In general, it is power that shapes the history of the world, of continents, states and individuals. Guardini's thoughts remind us in this regard of the theory of cultural philosophy that says that each action of man provokes a reaction towards man himself and others. What a person says, does or thinks has a direct or indirect effect on the person himself and the people surrounding him. Even the thought of possessing power has its influence on the person who has the power and on the people surrounding him. Guardini stated:

We do well to bear in mind a fundamental law of the philosophy of civilization; that nothing acts in one direction only - there is no action without reaction. Power is the capacity for action; but every influence I exert produces a reaction which in turn exerts an influence on me. The very fact of possessing power, of being able to use it, has an influence upon me; it urges me to use this power in the form of action. The urge may become compulsive, even demoniacal; the responsibility which this power lays on me as to whether and how I use it, and so on.<sup>194</sup>

The fact of having the power to act is in itself the incentive to act. Essential in this process is the responsibility man has because of this power and its use. Alan Geyer, Professor of political science at Mary Baldwin College, connects Guardini's view on power with man's need to act in accordance with his purpose in life, which ultimately resides in his discovery and fulfilment of God's aim for him:

Just as there can be no power without a purposing agent, so there can be no purposeful activity without the exercise of power. This is not simply a biological or psychological fact with political consequences, it is a religious fact. Man's creation in the divine image gives him a special participation in God's sovereignty. Man is lord of nature and of himself by the

---

194. Ibid.

grace of God. The exercise of sovereign power is essential to man's very humanity and, ultimately, to his God-likeness.<sup>195</sup>

Geyer describes how Guardini's worldview assembles and directs each and every entity towards the Totality they have in common and in which they participate. This principle resounds in Schuman's personal life and thought.

Guardini wondered if man could remain fully human when power increases exponentially. He asked himself if man would be able to manage this power properly. In short, he asked if man could absorb any amount of power or if he is limited by his human condition.

Schuman acted prudently so as to avoid the possibility of too much of power for Europe when he declared that Europe would not be built overnight. He stressed the need to follow a step-by-step process of European integration based on solidarity among the member-states.<sup>196</sup> He was acutely aware of the danger of giving too much power to the European Institutions at once, as this would not be fair towards the member states. The European Institutions themselves would not be able to cope with it. At the same time, Schuman insisted on the need for member states to leave behind the age of suffocating and egocentric nationalisms and to open up to other states in order to share and cooperate. They had sought to become too powerful and because of that became caught up in egocentric nationalisms.

Guardini observed that the magnitude of this problem of power had not yet been fully ascertained, and that the problem was as yet far from resolved. He questioned who was called to manage power and

---

195. Alan Geyer, "Guardini's view on Power" in *The voice for ethics in international policy*, Worldview magazine archive (1958–1985), Carnegie Council, New York 1962, volume 5, n. 1.

196. Schuman, *Pour l'Europe*, 146, 153. Schuman in Schuman Declaration: "L'Europe ne se fera pas d'un coup, ni dans une construction d'ensemble: elle se fera par des réalisations concrètes, créant d'abord une solidarité de fait."

concluded that Europe was the most appropriate candidate. The managing of power should be Europe's task because of Europe's long and experienced history that has led it to its current situation and more importantly, that has helped it shed its illusions. Europe had known glorious days and days of terror and tragedy, all due to its good and bad use of human freedom. It had known scientific progress and conquests, but did not believe in guarantees for the way history will advance or in utopias of world happiness.

According to Guardini, it was not only its experience that has made Europe what it was, nor was it only the knowledge of the consequences of good and bad use of power and the need to maintain an active connection with the Absolute. Most of all it was its identity itself that made Europe the most suitable candidate to accept this challenge. Europe's identity characterizes itself by a constant process of acquisition and assimilation of its identity. In other words, it concerns a constant appropriation of its roots. These roots are the Jewish Christian heritage and the Greek and Roman tradition, whereby the former permeates the latter. In a certain sense this is a borrowed identity as the Jewish Christian heritage comes from outside Europe. Europe should fastidiously care for it and not consider this heritage its exclusive possession.<sup>197</sup> As Europe experiences itself constantly the process of appropriation of what was once foreign to it, it should, according to Guardini, be able to transfer not only its values based on the European spiritual and cultural heritage such as Christian virtues, morality and solidarity, human rights, rule of law and democracy as such but also the way in which those values can be transmitted to other states and continents. It is therefore not through

---

197. Remi Brague, *Eccentric Culture, A Theory of Western Civilization*, trans. Samuel Lester, (South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press), 2002, 148–152. Europe is experienced in appropriating through the process of 'secondarity' what was originally foreign to it. This process is called a process of secondarity because of having its (primary) origin elsewhere.

imposition, but through transmission Europe can live up to its identity itself.

Schuman's creed was similar in that he constantly tried to live up to those values as well as to infuse the project of European unification with them. It is even possible to draw a parallel between Schuman's task and Europe's task; like Schuman was able to project the values of the European spiritual and cultural heritage onto the European unification project and its working towards the European common good, so Europe will be able to project those values onto the rest of the world and work with the other continents towards the universal common good. Then if the transmission of those values can be achieved among the European states, why not worldwide? Europe must simply be constantly aware of its spiritual and cultural heritage and its need for a constant process of appropriation of its values in order to be able to strive towards the universal common good. Furthermore it must be willing to share and cooperate with the other continents and not succumb to the suffocating continental egocentrism Schuman warned against.

Guardini firmly believed that the task of criticising power fell to Europe. This did not mean negative, fearful or reactionary criticism, but criticism out of concern for the human race. Guardini argued that in the past, Asia had appeared to be the oldest continent, timeless in a way other continents never were. However, Asia seemed now to deny its seniority and to live up to a new and grand but dangerous youth. By contrast, Europe had created this new age, but had also remained connected to its past. In this way Europe showed the signs of creativity together with those of its history of thousands of years. According to Guardini it is Europe's task and challenge not to encourage the power of science and technique, although this is surely unavoidable, but to restrain this power so as to prevent it from having

a deteriorating effect on human life itself.<sup>198</sup> He refers to the possibly detrimental effects of science and technology when they do not consider the limits of rationality and therefore of man's freedom.

According to Guardini, Europe is able to determine if one person is allowed to exercise power over another person. A mature question as this can only be answered clearly when one has lived through a great deal of history. In Europe man lives with an enormous amount of guilt towards his fellow men, and the enormous tragedies he caused. Europe also has to see how man suffers tremendously due to possibilities created by man himself. Europe should investigate the effects of this man-made power not as a purely theoretical problem, but as a moral issue of daily life.

The moral dimension proper to European integration Schuman and the other founding fathers had in mind revolved, perhaps especially to avoid the misuse of man-made power and a repetition of its dramatic consequences in the past, around man and his dignity. Economic cooperation was meant to be a means towards political integration so as to foster man's development, peace and security. The founding vision on European integration can therefore be considered a result or example of Guardini's theory.

Modern man, said Guardini, wants a structure behind which is a power; that is, a structure and power that serve. Here he returns to the science of worldview, the power of the Absolute and the structure of the entities aligned with the Absolute that Guardini sees as fundamental. The entities need to be open to and want to feed the alignment in order to achieve their totality or completeness. To recognize this and to attain this could also be a task for Europe in that Europe needs to be open to and want to achieve its totality or completeness. Guardini says in this regard that "History does not

---

198. Guardini, Acceptance Speech Erasmus Prize.

occur naturally, it is a man-made process, the accomplishment of which is not automatic, but has to be willed.”<sup>199</sup>

Guardini considered it Europe’s task to contribute to the unification of peoples and societies because Europe had itself undergone the process completely, but would constantly need to work at this process. Europe had already started its unification process at the time Guardini is speaking (1962). Europe’s attitude should be one of humility and service. Schuman’s motto “I have come to serve and not to be served” echoes Guardini’s observations on Europe’s task.

### **2.2.7 Pope Pius XII**

Eugenio Maria Giuseppe Giovanni Pacelli (1876–1958)<sup>200</sup> was a scholar and well-known diplomat for the Holy See before he was elected to the Papacy and became Pope Pius XII. Schuman was familiar with his writings and thoughts on the way to rebuild Europe after the Second World War. Schuman met the Pope several times. He received a personal letter from him in answer to the blessings Schuman had asked for when he was asked to become the new Prime Minister of France in November 1947. Schuman answered the Pope saying: “Acknowledging the sentiments that Your Holiness has dignified to direct towards me and that have touched me profoundly, I dare to offer You the witness of my most respectful devotion. The tasks of a quite heavy job make me feel every day the insufficiency of my proper means and the need of special grace.”<sup>201</sup>

---

199. Guardini, *Ibid.*

200. Biographical data from: Piet van Veen, *Geschiedenis van de Pausen*, (Roermond: Romen & Zonen, 1950), 536–563; Andrea Tornielli, *Pio XII. Eugenio Pacelli. Un uomo sul trono di Pietro*. (Milan: Mondadori 2007); *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 14, (Chicago: Benton Publisher, 1974), 486–487.

201. Robert Schuman, letter 24 May 1948, quoted in Roth, 329: “Sachant les sentiments que Votre Sainteté a daigné exprimer à mon égard, et qui m’ont profondément touché, j’ose lui offrir le témoignage de mon plus respectueux

When Schuman's government fell and he became Minister of Foreign Affairs, one of his first actions was the replacement of Jacques Maritain as Ambassador to the Holy See by Wladimir d'Ormesson. He did so in answer to Maritain's request to be withdrawn from this post. Schuman informed D'Ormesson of his policy of reconciliation regarding Germany and D'Ormesson passed the information on to the Vatican. The Vatican reacted favourably to this new kind of policy that broke with the policy of revenge of Schuman's predecessors De Gaulle and Bidault. D'Ormesson quickly found his way to reach the Pope himself and the Pope's closest associates Tardini and Montini (the later Pope Paul VI). He organized a personal meeting for Schuman with the Pope in September 1950.<sup>202</sup>

The connection between the Pope and Schuman was often abused by those opposing their policy of reconciliation, such as the Gaullists and the communists, who started to speak of a conspiracy and a Vatican Europe. However, the Pope made very clear, as we will see later on in this section, that the Church had no say whatsoever in temporal matters and could only express its opinion.<sup>203</sup> Furthermore, Schuman himself was in favour of a policy in line with the social doctrine of the Catholic Church<sup>204</sup> for the plain reason that it formed part of the Catholic faith and thus also of Christian morality. Schuman himself reacted to the accusation of 'Vatican Europe' with the words:

---

dévouement. Les charges d'une fonction bien lourde me font sentir chaque jour l'insuffisance de mes propres moyens et le besoin de grâces spéciales."

202. Roth, 329–330. The fact that Pius XII hoped Schuman would remain Minister of Foreign Affairs during the French Ministerial crisis one year later is literally expressed in the words the Pope spoke to a Frenchman who visited Rome "Above all, make sure that Schuman remains on Foreign Affairs!"

203. The Catholic Church holds a moral mirror in front of state-affairs, but has no say in the execution and technicalities of state-affairs.

204. Ferdinand Kinsky, "European Unity and Diversity, a Christian point of view" *The European Legacy, Toward new paradigms* 3, no. 2, (1998), 55. "Konrad Adenauer, Alcide de Gasperi and Robert Schuman thought their task of uniting Europe to be in accordance with the social and political doctrines of the Catholic Church. They were encouraged by Pope Pius XII, a convinced European and world federalist."

The “Vatican Europe” is a myth. The Europe we envisage is as profane in the ideas which form its foundation as in the men who are establishing it. They take from the Holy See neither their inspiration nor their orders. Certainly, Christians have played, in fact, a considerable part, sometimes preponderant, in the creation of European institutions. There is a sort of predisposition, a similarity of preoccupations which renders Christians open to European ideas. But never have they claimed any monopoly or conceived of any clericalist or theocratic conspiracy; such ideas are perfectly utopian [...] Our first initiatives were taken in cooperation with notorious unbelievers, socialists, and others, anti-papalist protestants and Jews. Let the laicist guardians of the Capitol reassure themselves: Europe is not a Trojan horse invented by the Church to accomplish some shadowy design.<sup>205</sup>

It is worthwhile to emphasize in this context as well that Christianity and therefore also the thoughts of the Catholic Church cannot be identified with an ideology and that European integration is not a matter of faith. The Christian social doctrine and other teachings of the Church, however, do offer guidelines for the Christians.<sup>206</sup> It is a known and remarkable fact though that no Pope until this day has expressed himself in such explicit ways on state affairs as Pius XII did on European unification.

In 1956, two years before the Pope died, Schuman received from him the Grand Cross of the Order of Pius IX,<sup>207</sup> a distinction that showed the Pope’s high esteem of Schuman’s integrity and service to the Church. During his lifetime, Pius XII was not only highly respected by Schuman, but by most of the faithful. However,

---

205. Fimister, 227; “*Le Catholicisme en face du problème de l’unification de l’Europe*”, Paris, November 1954. Archives Départementales de la Moselle, 43J31. See also: Roth, 330.

206. Ibid., “[But] of course, Christianity in general and the Roman Catholic Church in particular cannot be identified with any political ideology or party. [...] They [Christians] may disagree on European integration. However, the Christian social doctrine, the views expressed by the Holy Father in his encyclical letters as well as by national or transnational Episcopal conferences, do offer guidelines for the personal judgement and engagement of Christian citizens.”

207. Poidevin, *Robert Schuman*, 54, 55, 124.

since Rolf Hochhuth's play *Der Stellvertreter* in 1963, Pius XII has become a controversial figure. In this play he was accused for the first time for remaining silent on the Jewish persecution during the Second World War. Some stated this silence made him complicit with the Nazis<sup>208</sup> whilst others praised him for it or justified it by arguing he avoided even more bloodshed this way.<sup>209</sup> However, the discussion on this matter is of no relevance to this thesis.<sup>210</sup>

### ***From Pacelli to Pope Pius XII***

Pius XII was Pope from 1939 until his death in 1958. Because of his diplomatic posts he was familiar with international affairs and had a keen insight into the dangers that awaited Europe due to Nazism and Communism.<sup>211</sup> He firmly opposed both. In 1935 he ridiculed Nazism when attending pilgrims at Lourdes saying:

---

208. Hochhut's accusation was revived by the English journalist and author John Cornwall in his book *Hitler's Pope* (1999), and by the American author Daniel Goldhagen with *A Moral Reckoning: The Catholic Church during the Holocaust and Today* (2002). The Belgian social liberal theorist and author Dirk Verhofstadt criticized the Pope in *Pius XII and the extermination of the Jews* in 2008 and in his thesis on the same subject - *Pius XII en de vernietiging van de Joden. Een historisch en moraalwetenschappelijk onderzoek naar de morele verantwoordelijkheid van paus Pius XII ten aanzien van de Endlösung der Judenfrage*- in 2010.

209. The arguments against Pius XII were strongly refuted among others by the Jewish diplomat and theologian Pinchas Lapide (1922–1997) and Jeno Levai, a Jewish historian and the leading authority on the Jewish massacre. Levai was, together with Albrecht von Kessel the only survivor of the German Embassy in the Vatican. He repudiated Hochhuth's judgement unreservedly and refuted the accusations on the Pope's silence in his book *Hungarian Jewry and the Papacy: Pius XII did not remain silent*, first published in 1968. (O'Carroll, Michael, Pius XII dishonoured, Laetare Press, Blackrock, Co. Dublin). Jewish historians Norman Finkelstein and Rith Birn, refuted the accusations against Pius XII with *A Nation on Trial: the Goldhagen Thesis and Historical Truth* in 1998. The American rabbi David G. Dalin wrote *The Myth of Hitler's Pope: how Pope Pius XII rescued Jews from the Nazis* in 2005.

210. For an insight in the Vatican Archives see: Pierre Blet, *Pie XII et la Seconde Guerre mondiale d'après les archives du Vatican*, (Mesnil-sur-l'Estrée: Perrin, 1997).

211. Pius XII quoted in: J.K. Hahn, *Pius XII en de Internationale Vraagstukken*, (The Hague: Uitgeversmaatschappij Pax, 1956).

[The Nazis] are in reality only miserable plagiarists who dress up old errors with new tinsel. It does not make any difference whether they flock to the banners of the social revolution, whether they are guided by a false conception of the world and of life, or whether they are possessed by the superstition of a race and blood cult.<sup>212</sup>

For instance, in 1937 he warned the American consul to Berlin, Klieforth, not to trust Hitler who was “an untrustworthy scoundrel and fundamentally wicked person.” Klieforth himself wrote that Pacelli “did not believe Hitler capable of moderation, and [...] fully supported the German bishops in their anti-Nazi stand.” A report written by Pacelli the following year for President Franklin D. Roosevelt and filed with Ambassador Joseph Kennedy declared that the Church regarded a compromise with the Third Reich as “out of the question.”<sup>213</sup>

His predecessor, Pope Pius XI, acknowledged<sup>214</sup> that it was Pacelli who drafted the encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge* (With Burning Concern) published during his Papacy in 1937. It firmly condemned the ideology of National Socialism:

Whoever exalts race, or the people, or the State, or a particular form of State, or the depositories of power, or any other fundamental value of the human community - however necessary and honorable be their function in worldly things - whoever raises these notions above their standard value and divinizes them to an idolatrous level, distorts and perverts an order of the world planned and created by God; he is far from

---

212. Joseph L. Lichten, “A Question of Judgment: Pius XII and the Jews” (1963).

213. Joseph Bottum, “The End of the Pius Wars,” *First Things Magazine*, (April 2004).

214. John Peter Pham, *Heirs of the Fisherman: Behind the Scenes of Papal Death and Succession*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 45. “When Pius XI was complimented on the publication, in 1937, of his encyclical denouncing Nazism, *Mit Brennender Sorge*, his response was to point to his Secretary of State (Pacelli) and say bluntly, ‘The credit is his.’”

the true faith in God and from the concept of life which that faith upholds.<sup>215</sup>

This was the second time in history that an encyclical was written in the vernacular language, German, instead of in Latin.<sup>216</sup> It was written in German so as to make sure it could be understood by all and read from every German Catholic Church pulpit on Palm Sunday. It was the first official denunciation of Nazism made by any major organization and resulted in persecution of the Church by the infuriated Nazis.<sup>217</sup>

When Pacelli became Pope Pius XII in 1939 he wrote his first encyclical entitled *Summi Pontificatus*. In this document he explicitly condemned the invasion, occupation and partition of Poland under the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact:<sup>218</sup>

The blood of countless human beings, even noncombatants, raises a piteous dirge over a nation such as Our dear Poland, which, for its fidelity to the Church, for its services in the defense of Christian civilization, written in indelible characters in the annals of history, has a right to the generous and

---

215. Pius XI (Pius XII), encyclical letter *With Burning Concern (Mit Brennender Sorge)*, Rome Palm Sunday, 14 March 1937, n. 8.

216. The first encyclical written in the vernacular language – French – instead of Latin, was *Une fois encore* (1907) by Pope Pius X which dealt with the separation of Church and State.

217. Thomas Bokenkotter, *A Concise History of the Catholic Church*, (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 389–392: “And when Hitler showed increasing belligerence toward the Church, Pius met the challenge with a decisiveness that astonished the world. His encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge* was the ‘first great official public document to dare to confront and criticize Nazism’ and ‘one of the greatest such condemnations ever issued by the Vatican.’ Smuggled into Germany, it was read from all the Catholic pulpits on Palm Sunday in March 1937. It exposed the fallacy and denounced the Nazi myth of blood and soil; it decried its neo-paganism, its war of annihilation against the Church, and even described the Fuhrer himself as a ‘mad prophet possessed of repulsive arrogance.’ The Nazis were infuriated, and in retaliation closed and sealed all the presses that had printed it and took numerous vindictive measures against the Church.”

218. See: *Internet Modern History Sourcebook*. The Molotov-Rippentrop Pact was a non-aggression agreement between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs Molotov and Von Ribbentrop. The treaty renounced warfare between their two countries. It also implied a secret division of Eastern European countries between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany.

brotherly sympathy of the whole world, while it awaits, relying on the powerful intercession of Mary, Help of Christians, the hour of a resurrection in harmony with the principles of justice and true peace.<sup>219</sup>

Pius XII also spoke out clearly against Nazism and totalitarianism in his Christmas messages of 1941 and 1942. In June 1942 Pius protested against the mass deportations of Jews from France, ordering the Papal Nuncio to protest against Pétain and his Vichy government against the inhuman deportations of the Jews.

The danger that empirical science would prevail over man, which Dawson, Jaspers and Guardini explicitly warned against, was also of great concern to Pope Pius XII. He mostly spread his ideas on reason, faith and the social doctrine of the Church through speeches and radio messages, but also through encyclical letters such as *Humani Generis* (1950). He considered for instance science and religion to be “heavenly sisters, different manifestations of divine exactness, who could not possibly contradict each other over the long term.”<sup>220</sup>

After the war, Pius XII contributed to the rebuilding of Europe, and advocated peace and reconciliation, including lenient policies toward vanquished nations and the unification of Europe. In this his

---

219. Pius XII, encyclical letter *Summi Pontificatus*, Rome 1939, n. 106.

220. See the following speeches and radio messages: Discorsi E Radiomessaggi di sua Santità Pio XII, Vatican City, 1940, 407; Discorsi E Radiomessaggi di sua Santità Pio XII, Vatican City, 1942, 52; Discorsi E Radiomessaggi di sua Santità Pio XII, Vatican City, 1946, 89. Discorsi E Radiomessaggi di sua Santità Pio XII, Vatican City, 1951, 28. In 1950, Pius XII promulgated *Humani Generis*. In this he acknowledged that evolution might accurately describe the biological origins of human life. He criticizes however those who “imprudently and indiscreetly hold that evolution explains the origin of all things.” As it is conform Catholic faith that the human soul is created directly by God. Since the soul is a spiritual substance it is not brought into being through transformation of matter, but directly by God, hence the special uniqueness of each person.” *Humani Generis*, n. 36. Fifty years later, Pope John Paul II, stating that scientific evidence now seemed to favour the evolutionary theory, upheld the distinction of Pius XII regarding the human soul. “Even if the human body originates from pre-existent living matter, the spiritual soul is spontaneously created by God.”

attitude resembled that of George Washington regarding the brotherhood of nations, which was quoted by Brugmans. Pius XII remained a staunch opponent of Communism.

On 11 November 1948, Pius XII expressed his support for the Federalist Movement's actions for European unity. He affirmed that it would serve man's freedom, provide economic peace and serve intercontinental politics. He recommended making haste with the unification process because of the precarious situation in Europe. Pius XII also made clear that the Church should not be part of this process, as it concerned a strictly temporal matter:

Last June 2 when we [I] spoke in favour of a European Union, we [I] had done so while taking well into account that the Church were not involved in these purely temporal interests.<sup>221</sup>

Pius XII echoed the statements of those of the other intellectuals mentioned in this section, most especially Schuman's, when he said states needed to be encouraged to set aside their egotistic national interests which were so often a source of jealousy and hate.<sup>222</sup> In this regard he made the distinction between national life and national politics:

---

221. Pius XII, Allocution de S.S. Pie XII aux congressistes de l'Union européenne des fédéralistes, in *Fédération*. Décembre 1948, n. 47, 2, 3. "Nous l'avons fait en nous gardant bien d'impliquer l'Eglise dans des intérêts purement temporels." Right before this he had said: "Et si l'on tient à ce que cette union atteigne son but, si l'on veut qu'elle serve utilement la cause de la liberté et de la concorde européenne, la cause de la paix économique et politique intercontinentale, il est grand temps qu'elle se fasse. ("and if we wish this union to reach its goal, if we want it to serve the cause of freedom and of European concord, the cause of international economic and political peace, then it is hard time that it occurs.")

222. Ibid., "un encouragement à déposer une bonne fois leurs préoccupations égoïstement nationales, source de tant de jalousies et de tant de haines."

The national life, the rights and the honour of a people have to be protected. National politics, however, must be firmly rejected, since they are the cause of never-ending strife.<sup>223</sup>

Much like Brugmans and De Rougemont, Pius XII warned those attending the UEF Congress about the possible lack of interest in contributing to the European unification process from the larger European countries that were still clinging to their glorious past or political superiority. To facilitate their participation in the process Pius XII stressed the need for respect for national cultures and for the acceptance of the cultural differences between member states. He warned against uniformity of culture and expressed his conviction that diversity would contribute to the success of the unification process.<sup>224</sup>

As an example of successful transnational political community, one that implied respect for each other's cultures, Pius XII also referred to Switzerland:

Today when the idea of unity between state and nation, that is even exaggerated to the point of confusion between the two notions, is claiming dogmatic validity, the specific case of Switzerland must seem quite paradoxical to certain people. But it should rather lead to serious reflection. Switzerland found itself geographically at the intersection between three mighty national cultures and unified all three into the unity of one unique people. In a time when nationalism seems to dominate everywhere, Switzerland, that is rather more a transgressing political community than a nation state, enjoys the fruit of peace and the power that results from the unity of its citizens

---

223. "Das katholische Europakonzept," in *Luxemburger Wort* 8, January 1955, n.8/9; 108, p. 1. Translated by the CVCE. (Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe).

224. Pius XII, Allocution, "Les grandes nations du continent, à la longue histoire toute chargée de souvenirs de gloire et de puissance, peuvent aussi faire échec à la constitution d'une union européenne, exposées qu'elles sont, sans y prendre garde, à se mesurer elles-mêmes à l'échelle de leur propre passé plutôt qu'à celle des réalités du présent et des prévisions d'avenir. C'est justement pourquoi l'on attend d'elles qu'elles sachent faire abstraction de leur grandeur d'autrefois pour s'aligner sur une unité politique et économique supérieure. Elles le feront d'autant meilleur gré qu'on ne les astreindra pas, par souci exagéré d'uniformité, à un nivellement forcé, alors que le respect des caractères culturels de chacun des peuples provoquerait, par leur harmonieuse variété, une union plus facile et plus stable."

[...] The strength and the political creativity that others believe they will find in the national idea, are found in Switzerland at least as much in friendly competition and in the cooperation between its different national constituents.<sup>225</sup>

His stress on solidarity among states combined with a respect for the national culture of each state brings to mind Schuman's statement that the unification process should not happen at the cost of the protection of the patriotic ideal of each state. The difference in point of view between Pius XII and Schuman on the one hand and the federalists De Rougemont and Brugmans on the other hand was that the federalists focussed on solidarity and the need for federalism in all areas while Schuman and Pius XII also highlighted the importance of protecting national identity in the process of unification.

The Pope's, and Schuman's, emphasis on solidarity over economic advantage expressed, like his other observations, the vision of the social doctrine of the Catholic Church. Such emphasis on solidarity is also a key aspect of the unification process as envisioned by Schuman, who always repeated that the technical parts were of less importance than the solidarity among the states. Pius XII said the following on this topic:

Without any doubt the advantage of a European economy does not only consist of a common and enlarged area where the so-called market mechanism is regulating production and consumption; it is more important to achieve, at the same time as the European economy is about to create a system of competition, a real social way of life in an attempt to ensure a healthy development of the family from generation to generation.<sup>226</sup>

Pius XII advocated a personalist view of society where man had to be at the centre of all proceedings:

---

225. Pius XII, "Broadcast message of 21 September 1946 to the Swiss people" in: *Herder-Korrespondenz* 1, 172.

226. Pius XII, "Address to Italian workmen on 1 May 1953" in: *Herder – Korrespondenz* 1, 215.

Human society is no machine and it should not be transformed into one, not even in the economic area. On the contrary one must always return to the contribution of the human being and to the identity of people as the natural basis [...] Therefore solidarity and the desire for a better standard of living and labour should be organized in different, though relatively large, areas where nature and the historical development of the participating nations could offer more easily a common basis.<sup>227</sup>

Pius XII made clear as well that no one would deny that in order to achieve successful unification on the European continent a moral order to which all should aspire was necessary. He mentioned that this moral order should be based in Christianity, much like in the time of Charlemagne. He observed that the unity of those days was gone once culture was separated from religion and religion was removed from public life. Pius XII saw this phenomenon as one of the main causes of the deplorable state of Europe in the post-war years.<sup>228</sup> He therefore recommended re-establishing the connection between religion and civilization.<sup>229</sup>

The observation made by Pope Pius XII on the danger of fast integration echoes Schuman's conviction that unification should happen step-by-step so as to avoid serious mistakes and hasty

---

227. Ibid.

228. Dawson concluded the same in his book *The Making of Europe*. See section 2.3.2.

229. Ibid. "Personne, croyons-Nous, ne pourra refuser de souscrire à cette affirmation qu'une Europe unie, pour se maintenir en équilibre et pour aplanir les différends sur son propre continent – sans parler ici de son influence sur la sécurité de la paix universelle – a besoin de reposer sur une base morale inébranlable. Où la trouver, cette base? Laissons l'histoire répondre : il fut un temps où l'Europe formait, dans son unité, un tout compact et, au milieu de toutes les faiblesses, en dépit de toutes les défaillances humaines, c'était pour elle une force; elle accomplissait par cette union des grandes choses. Or, l'âme de cette unité était la religion, qui imprégnait à fond toute la société de foi chrétienne. Une fois la culture détachée de la religion, l'unité s'est désagrégée. A la longue, poursuivant comme tache d'huile son progrès lent mais continu, l'irreligion a pénétré de plus en plus la vie publique et c'est à elle avant tout que ce continent est redevable de ses déchirements, de son malaise et de son inquiétude. Si donc l'Europe veut en sortir, ne lui faut-il pas rétablir chez elle le lien entre la religion et la civilisation?"

implementations that would be hard to undo. The Pope's preoccupation with what might happen if integration took place too hastily resounds in the following words:

When we observe the efforts of those statesmen [who work for European Unity] we can hardly avoid a depressing feeling. Under the urgent pressure to unify Europe as fast as possible, they begin to implement political objectives that are conditioned by a new thinking from nation to nation.<sup>230</sup>

Pius XII expressed his joy about the content and title "Common heritage of Christian civilization" of the resolution written by the Cultural Commission after the Congress of The Hague for referring at least to the universal moral law of good and evil as the foundation on which the human rights are based.<sup>231</sup>

Schuman too saw, like Pius XII, the European unification process as a necessity in spite of protests from the larger countries. He too recognized the need for a moral order based on Christianity so as to make unity possible. He too wanted the unification to be shaped with the social doctrine of the Catholic Church in mind, and he also knew the Church should not be included in this process, as it concerned a temporal matter.

For both Pius XII and Schuman the process of unification meant the process towards the achievement of a unity that would protect diversity. Both did not limit this concept to just European integration, although their focus was on Europe. Schuman made clear on several occasions that in order to take into account the European

---

230. Pius XII, "Address to the members of Pax Christi," 13 September 1952 in: *Herder-Korrespondenz* 9, 215.

231. Ibid. "C'est pourquoi Nous avons eu grand plaisir à lire en tête de la résolution de la Commission culturelle à la suite du Congrès de La Haye en mai dernier, la mention du 'commun héritage de civilisation chrétienne.' Pourtant ce n'est pas encore assez tant qu'on n'ira pas jusqu'à la reconnaissance expresse des droits de Dieu et de sa loi, tout au moins du droit naturel, fond solide sur lequel sont ancrés les droits de l'homme. Isolés de la religion, comment ces droits et toutes les libertés pourront-ils assurer l'unité, l'ordre et la paix?"

common good, the universal common good needed to be looked at as well. And Europe had a special responsibility towards its former colonies. Pius XII referred to world unity when he said:

Indeed no global world organization would be useful if it did not correspond to the plurality of natural relations, with the normal organic order that is ruling the specific situation of people and the different nations.<sup>232</sup>

The Pope's 1953 statement about the way the integration took place confirms Schuman's conviction that the unification needed to occur step-by-step as people and states must be prepared and made aware of the common 'European spirit' so as to be able to hand over partial sovereignty and achieve European unification.<sup>233</sup>

Europe was still waiting for the rise of its own consciousness [...] The practical implementation of European unity [...] whose urgency is felt by all [...] was opposed by two great obstacles. The first one has its origin in the constitutional structure of states, the second was of a psychological and moral nature. The first one includes a number of economic, social, military and political problems [...] but more urgent is the demand for what is called the European spirit, the consciousness of the internal unity that is not so much based on the satisfaction of economic needs but on the vision of common spiritual values, such a clear vision that a strong will to live in unity will be justified and kept alive.<sup>234</sup>

Both Schuman and the Pope insisted on the central importance of the 'European spirit', a product of the European spiritual and cultural heritage. Both saw this spirit as the essential ingredient for successful European unification.

---

232. Pius XII, "Address to the members of the 'Mouvement universel pour une confédération mondiale' on 6 April 1951." in: *Herder-Korrespondenz* 5, 352.

233. See also section 2.1.

234. Pius XII, "Address to professors and students of the College of Europe, Bruges," 15 March 1953.

### 2.2.8 T. S. Eliot

*The dominant feature in creating a common culture between peoples, each of which has its own distinct culture, is religion [...] I am talking about the common tradition of Christianity, which has made Europe what it is, and about the common cultural elements, which this common Christianity has brought with it [...] It is in Christianity that our arts have developed; it is in Christianity that the laws of Europe - until recently - have been rooted, it is against a background of Christianity that all our thought has significance.*

*An individual European may not believe that the Christian Faith is true; and yet what he says, and makes, and does, will all depend on the Christian heritage for its meaning. Only a Christian culture could have produced a Voltaire or a Nietzsche. I do not believe that the culture of Europe could survive the complete disappearance of the Christian Faith.<sup>235</sup>*

*T. S. Eliot*

Thomas Stearns Eliot (1888–1965) was a well-known American born poet, playwright and literary critic. Although at the first sight Eliot's thoughts on unification seem to echo Schuman's, there are some considerable differences.

Eliot was educated at Harvard, the Sorbonne and Merton College, Oxford. For most of his life Eliot lived in Great Britain and he became a British citizen in 1927. He not only renounced his American citizenship but also converted to Anglicanism in 1927.<sup>236</sup>

---

235. T.S. Eliot, *Die Einheit der Europaischen Kultur*, (Berlin 1946); also published as "The Unity of European Culture" in an appendix to *Notes towards the Definition of Culture*, London, 1948, 122–4; quoted in: Norman Davies, *Europe: A History*, (London: Pimlico Random House, 1997), 9. Eliot's description of Christianity as a main source of the European culture reflects according to me as well the universal importance of Christianity.

236. The Anglican Church was created by King Henry VIII when he wanted to free himself from his marriage with Catherine of Aragon who had already born him a daughter, but was not permitted to do so by the Church of Rome. As he wanted to pursue this aim he started the Anglican Church of which he himself became the Head. From then on the separation between the Roman Catholic Church with its Papacy and Magisterium, and the Anglican Church with the King or Queen as its Head became a fact. The Anglican faith denied in this way its unity with the Roman Catholic faith. A break with the Vatican was the result. For rejecting the Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Church has no

The publication of Eliot's first book of poems *Prufrock and other Observations* in 1915, followed by *The Wasteland* in 1922 made him a leading poet of the avant-garde. He also became one of the leading literary critics of the English-speaking world. After his conversion to Anglicanism he started to write about social and religious topics. Eliot received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1948. He died in London in 1965.<sup>237</sup>

### ***Eliot's Idea of a Christian Society***

Eliot explained in his book *The Idea of a Christian Society* (first published in 1939) that what he was concerned with "is not spiritual institutions in their separated aspect, but the organisation of values, and a direction of religious thought which must inevitably proceed to criticism of political and economic systems."<sup>238</sup> He pointed out that the problem of leading a Christian life in a non-Christian society is very present and that it is not merely the problem of a minority in a society of men holding an alien belief. It is the problem constituted by our being caught in a network of institutions from which we cannot dissociate ourselves; institutions no longer appear neutral, but anti-Christian. The Christian who is not conscious of this dilemma, and this is the majority, is becoming more and more de-Christianized by

---

unanimously accorded authorized documents on faith and morality that serve as guidelines. Another difference is that the Roman Catholic Church does not know about national churches as the Anglican Church does. The fact that Eliot is concerned about the Church of England and the Church of Christ as two different kind of churches with each their own functions, is therefore incompatible with the Catholic thought that does not acknowledge but the universal Church in whichever part of the world.

237. Ronald Bush, "T.S.Eliot's life and career" in: *Modern American Poetry*, American National Biography. Ed. John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

238. T.S. Eliot, *The Idea of a Christian Society*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1942), 6.

all sorts of unconscious pressure: paganism<sup>239</sup> holds all the most valuable advertising space. Eliot was concerned with the dangers for the tolerated minority. He stated that in the modern world, it may turn out that the most intolerable thing for Christians is to be tolerated.<sup>240</sup> The political and economic systems should therefore be ‘reviewed’ as these undermine and even destroy the people’s Christian faith.<sup>241</sup>

With *The Idea of a Christian Society* Eliot wanted to express “something that can only be found in an understanding of the end to which a Christian society, to deserve the name, must be directed.”<sup>242</sup> To make such a denomination possible Eliot suggested a division as it were of society into three components: the Community of Christians, the Christian Community and the Christian State. The Community of Christians is regarded as the elite among the faithful. They take their faith seriously and live up to it. Their behaviour is exemplary. For them Christianity is primarily a matter of thought and not of feeling.<sup>243</sup>

According to Eliot, the elite are those who must permeate the Christian Community with their faith and help show the way towards Christ. The Christian State will provide the necessary environment that makes it possible for the Community of Christians and Christian Community to live up to their faith and infuse society with the Christian spirit. The Christian State does not imply a certain political

---

239. By paganism is understood heathendom or the beliefs of those that do not believe in God.

240. See: Eliot, *Christian Society*, 22.

241. Schuman could have said the same about the situation in France when he obtained his ministerial job as a member of the Finance Committee (1946) and experienced the chaos of his country and the lack of morality in politics. He worked hard to remedy this situation, but had to contend with strong opposition. Caricatures in which he was portrayed as a Gandhi or with an aureole showed that people mocked him for his effort to cleanse politics.

242. *Ibid.*, 8.

243. T.S. Eliot, *Christianity and Culture*, (San Diego: Harcourt, 1988), 6.

form, but can take whatever form is suitable to a Christian society.<sup>244</sup> The State is meant to govern the Christian framework within which the people can realise their ambitions and improve the prosperity and prestige of their country. They may frequently perform un-Christian acts, but they must never attempt to defend their actions on the basis of un-Christian principles:<sup>245</sup>

In the Christian Community that they ruled, the Christian faith would be ingrained, but it requires as a minimum, only a large unconscious behaviour; and it is only from the much smaller number of conscious human beings, the Community of Christians, that one would expect a conscious Christian life on its highest social level.<sup>246</sup>

Eliot's proposal to divide society into three components is not compatible with Schuman's Catholic faith, according to which it is no more than the product of human effort to establish an ideal society based on Christian convictions. Reasoning from Schuman's Catholic framework one objection to Eliot's suggestion is that it is too subjective. For instance, in order to belong to the Community of Christians Eliot talks of, one must be an exemplary Christian. But who would decide who is exemplary and can belong to this Community of Christians? The Anglican Church does not have a *Magisterium* that helps to make those choices. Consequently these choices would depend exclusively on temporal circumstances and human interpretation. He would therefore probably have been sceptical about the election and selection of candidates to the Community of Christians, who would indirectly be the executives of the Christian State. Schuman would have stressed the danger of arbitrariness in the selection procedure. He would also have disagreed with Eliot about what Eliot considered Christian 'enough'. This would imply a lack of

---

244. Eliot, *Christian Society*, 12.

245. *Ibid.*, 27.

246. *Ibid.*, 28.

integrity, as Eliot seemed to reduce faith for the majority to a lifeless set of habits. Eliot believed that:

For the great majority of the people - and I am not thinking of social classes, but of intellectual strata - religion must be primarily a matter of behaviour and habit, must be integrated with its social life, with its business and its pleasures; and the specifically religious emotions must be a kind of extension and sanctification of the domestic and social emotions. [...] Even for the most highly developed and conscious individual, living in the world, a conscious Christian direction of thought and feeling can only occur at particular moments during the day and during the week, and these moments themselves recur in consequence of formed habits.<sup>247</sup>

Eliot regards religious life thus mainly as a set of customs that are part of social life. He reduces faith in the quote above to 'religious emotions' and a 'Christian direction of thought and feeling' that is hardly accessible. In another passage from *The Idea of a Christian Society*, he defines Christianity as 'the system for the rulers under which to govern' that will be accepted by the people 'as a matter of behaviour and habit'.<sup>248</sup>

Schuman, precisely because of his belief that every person has a vocation to holiness, would have objected to Eliot's statement. He would not have agreed with the statement that for the majority of people Christian behaviour and certain religious practices on special occasions and days of the week would suffice. Schuman would have said that Christianity is more than sound behaviour or good habits. He would have stressed the need for integrity and the call to live one's Christian faith twenty-four hours a day. His own life can be seen as a testimony to this conviction.

Eliot reached the conclusion that "a state secularized, a community turned into a mob, and a clerisy disintegrated" can only be

---

247. Ibid., 30.

248. Ibid., 34-35.

recovered “in a society with a religious basis where you can get the proper harmony and tension, for the individual or for the community.”<sup>249</sup> This observation reflects the state of confusion and chaos people lived in during the years just before the outbreak of the Second World War. The ‘state secularized’ refers to the lack of living faith and most probably to the State’s lack of living up to the Christian morality. Eliot’s observation of ‘a community turned into a mob’ refers to the people living and acting without direction, without a state to guide them, without a faith that has something to tell them. ‘The clerisy disintegrated’ refers to the lack of integration on the part of the intellectuals and elite and the lack of understanding, and even the desire for understanding, what is happening in society. Eliot’s conclusion that man should live in a society with a religious basis is therefore not surprising. Eliot himself wondered: “was our society [...] assembled round anything more permanent than a congeries of banks, insurance companies, and industries, and had it any beliefs more essential than a belief in compound interest and the maintenance of dividends?”<sup>250</sup> The industrial revolution, the rise of technology and movements such as Socialism, Communism and Liberalism made it hard for man to remain open to the supernatural. Eliot commented that “more important than the invention of a new machine, is the creation of a temper of mind in people such that they can learn to use a new machine rightly.”<sup>251</sup> He observed that only then would society be able to change and awaken its people. A Christian mentality could help

---

249. T.S. Eliot, quoted in: Harold J. Blackham, *Religion in a modern society*, (London: Constable and Company, 1966), 75. Blackham studies the position of religion in a modern society and interprets events of the past that happened thanks to and due to religion. He studies and compares among others also the theories of T. S. Eliot exposed in *The Idea of a Christian Society* and of Jacques Maritain. Blackham himself is in favour of an open society in which social agnosticism composes the horizontal line to which, according to him, all, believers and non-believers, can and need to adhere to and develop themselves fully.

250. Eliot, *Christian Society*, 82.

251. Eliot, *Christianity and Culture*, 77.

combatting the general conviction that “the actual constitution of Society, or that which their most generous passions wish to bring about is right, and that Christianity must be adapted to it.”<sup>252</sup> Then it is “[f]or a long enough time that we have believed in nothing but the values of a mechanised, commercialised, urbanised way of life: it would be as well for us to face the permanent conditions upon which God allows us to live upon this planet.”<sup>253</sup>

Eliot’s arguments are ably summarized and paraphrased by Russell Kirk when he says that according to Eliot:

Christianity prescribes no special form of government. Yet the source of any political order is a religious creed or else the inverted religion of ideology. A principal function of the state is the maintenance of justice; and justice can be defined only upon ethical assumptions, ultimately derived from religious insights. If the state is in opposition to the religious principles of a society, or indifferent to those principles, then either the state or the society is not long for this world. For our civilization, Christianity has provided both the principles of personal order and the principles of social order. If we repudiate or ignore those principles, our only alternative is the Pagan State, obeying the commandments of the Savage God. So it is that we must labour to restore the Christian State. It is not necessary that all statesmen be good Christians; nor is it necessary that dissent be discouraged among the citizens; but it is necessary that the state should recognize the moral order which Christianity outlines, and should conform the public order, so far as possible in this imperfect world, to that ethical understanding.<sup>254</sup>

Eliot elaborated on his ideas of the Community of Christians, the Christian Community and the Christian State so as to give shape to the way in which this Christian society could be achieved and how the pagan culture could be fought.

---

252. Eliot, *Christian Society*, 97.

253. *Ibid.*, 62.

254. Kirk Russell, *Eliot and his Age*, (LaSalle, IL: Sherwood Sugden & Company, 1984), 277–278.

According to Schuman a Christian State could lead to a theocracy, on which he stated:

Theocracy ignores the principle of separation of the two domains. It gives the religious idea responsibilities that do not belong to it. Religion has no say in issues that have nothing to do with faith or morality. Under such a regime, the divergences of political order risk to degenerate in religious fanaticism; the holy war is the most horrifying expression of a bloody exploitation of religious sentiments.<sup>255</sup>

These thoughts were fully in line with the Catholic Church, which also regards theocracy as going against the principles of faith. The negative experiences of past centuries in this regard in which clerical and political interests were often improperly mixed, were a consequence of human error and abuse of religion.

Schuman, knowing and accepting the teachings of the *Magisterium* wholeheartedly, would, like Eliot, have underlined the necessity to safeguard the principles of personal and social order. Thinking along Schuman's lines, these principles would come from natural law, the universal moral law ingrained in all human souls.<sup>256</sup> This was also expressed in the resolution on the "Common heritage of Christian civilization" written by the Cultural Commission after the Congress of The Hague to which Pius XII referred as we saw before.

Eliot believed only a Christian society could be a fully human society and solve the problem of the lack of spirituality in today's world. But we can suppose that Schuman would not agree with the way in which Eliot embodied his idea of a Christian society for not believing in prefabricated structures such as the Community of

---

255. Schuman, *For Europe*, 55–56.

256. Leo XIII, encyclical letter on the nature of human liberty, *Libertas praestantissimum*, 597.

"The natural law is written and engraved in the soul of each and every man, because it is human reason ordaining him to do good and forbidding him to sin [...] But this command of human reason would not have the force of law if it were not the voice and interpreter of a higher reason to which our spirit and our freedom must be submitted."<sup>256</sup>

Christians, the Christian Community and the Christian State created by man himself. Schuman did applaud though a life consistent with Christian faith.

### 2.2.9 Jacques Maritain

*A single idea, if it is right, saves us the labour of an infinity of experiences.*

*Jacques Maritain*

*Our great Christian philosopher, Jacques Maritain, who we, the French, wrongly abandoned to study in a distant university instead of taking advantage of his brilliant teaching, indicated the parallel between development of Christian thought and democracy.<sup>257</sup>*

*Robert Schuman*

Schuman knew Maritain personally from the encounters and recollections at Maria Laach and later as colleague, as Maritain was the Ambassador to the Holy See at the time Schuman became Prime Minister. During Schuman's Prime Ministership, Maritain spoke as French Ambassador at the UNESCO about the need for supranationality in order to achieve a durable peace in Europe, but he did so without crediting it as actually feasible.<sup>258</sup> The fact that Maritain spoke as an Ambassador of France makes it plausible that he spoke in the name of the Prime Minister of that time, Schuman. The hesitant

---

257. Schuman, *For Europe*, 43. Schuman, *Pour l'Europe*, 53. "Jacques Maritain, notre grand philosophe chrétien que nous, Français, avons eu le tort d'abandonner à une université lointaine, au lieu de mettre nous-mêmes à profit son enseignement lumineux, a marquée ce parallélisme dans le développement de l'idée chrétienne et de la démocratie."

258. Maritain, "L'Unité de l'Esprit" in: *Syntheses*, n.9 (Paris: Revue Mensuelle Internationale, Dec.1947) 273. Maritain opened with this speech the 2<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly of the UNESCO in Mexico in 1947. "Les premières questions qui se posent à qui médite sérieusement sur les conditions d'une paix juste et durable, son évidemment celles qu'évoque l'idée d'une organisation supra-nationale des peuples. Nul n'ignore les obstacles qui aujourd'hui, plus encore qu'au lendemain de la victoire, se dressent devant la réalisation d'une telle idée. A l'heure présente, une organisation réellement supra-nationale de monde est hors du domaine des possibilités."

way in which he commented on supranationality might suggest that he was not very convinced about it and that it was not his own idea, but Schuman's.

Jacques Maritain (1882–1973),<sup>259</sup> whom Schuman quotes in his book *Pour l'Europe*, was a well-known French Catholic philosopher. He studied philosophy at the Sorbonne and at the University of Heidelberg. Before the Second World War, he moved to the United States where he taught philosophy and Catholic theology at Columbia, Princeton University and at the University of Notre Dame. He fiercely opposed both Nazism and Communism. Maritain was raised a Protestant, but converted to Catholicism at the age of 24. This conversion affected his entire life. The Catholic faith played a main role in all areas of his life. He became one of the leading representatives of Neo-Thomism, a philosophical doctrine that wanted to bring Thomas Aquinas's theological and philosophical thinking closer to society, culture and science. Aquinas's teachings were highly recommended by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* of 1879, as mentioned in chapter one. Maritain cherished Thomas Aquinas's harmonization of revelation and reason and his holistic and realistic description of reality.

In his 1920 work *Éléments de Philosophie* he highlighted what he saw as the truthful connection between the pagan philosophy of Aristotle and Aquinas's Christian philosophy:

If the philosophy of Aristotle, as revived and enriched by St. Thomas and his school, may rightly be called the Christian philosophy, both because the church is never weary of putting it forward as the only true philosophy and because it harmonizes perfectly with the truths of faith, nevertheless it is proposed here for the reader's acceptance not because it is Christian, but because it is demonstrably true. This agreement

---

259. (Biographical) data from: *The Crisis of Modern Times, perspectives from The Review of Politics 1939 – 1962*, Ed. A. James McAdams, (2007); and *Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy*, Stanford (California).

between a philosophic system founded by a pagan and the dogmas of revelation is no doubt an external sign, an extra-philosophic guarantee of its truth; but from its own rational evidence, that it derives its authority as a philosophy.<sup>260</sup>

For Maritain, religion was far from an impediment to genuine philosophizing and in fact enhanced philosophy and provided it with access to regions it would otherwise be denied. According to him it was faith that shed light on reason and made it able to see what otherwise would be difficult to see.<sup>261</sup> It is therefore not surprising that he was a strong defender of a natural law ethics and regarded ethical norms as being rooted in human nature. According to him those norms were known primarily not through philosophical argument and demonstration but through connatural knowledge, a kind of direct knowledge man gets through his experience. He sees natural or human rights therefore as products of natural law and thus rooted in natural law. His conviction was key to his involvement in the drafting of the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>262</sup>

Some dominant themes in his work are the human person's transcendence of the political community; secondly, that natural law expresses not only what is natural in the world but also what is known naturally by human beings; thirdly, that moral philosophy must take into account other branches of human knowledge; and finally, that people holding different beliefs must cooperate in the formation and

---

260. Jacques Maritain, *An Introduction to Philosophy*, (Wiltshire, UK: Anthony Rowe, 1930).

261. See also: Leo XIII, Encyclical letter *Rerum Novarum* (1891) in which Leo XIII renewed the condemnations of Rationalism for its theory that reason is the primary source of knowledge and of spiritual truth. The Pope pursued the reestablishment of the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas which made clear that faith shed light on reason and that reason could never be contradictory to faith.

262. James V. Schall, *Jacques Maritain: the philosopher in society*, (Landam, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1998), 223. "Maritain chairs the committee on human rights - other members: Aldous Huxley, E.H.Carr, Benedetto Croce, Teilhard de Chardin - whose document forms the basis of the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights in 1948."

maintenance of salutary political institutions. Among his major works are *Art and Scholasticism* (1920), *The Degrees of Knowledge* (1932), *True Humanism*<sup>263</sup> (1938), *Man and the State* (1951), and *Moral Philosophy* (1960).

Maritain's convictions show a remarkable similarity with Schuman's beliefs. It is a known fact that Maritain's philosophy was to a large extent applauded by the Roman Catholic Church and that he contributed greatly to the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (1967) of Pope Paul VI. *Populorum Progressio* can be considered a follow-up to *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) of Pope Pius XI, but broadened from a continental to a global level, which in turn was an elaboration of *Rerum Novarum* (1891) in which Pope Leo XIII expounded the social doctrine of the Catholic Church. Maritain's ideas on democracy and the future of European society surely also had their impact on the thoughts, and definitely had the approval, of Pope Pius XII regarding Europe's future after World War II, as discussed in a previous section of this chapter.

Schuman held Maritain's works in high esteem, as the quote at the beginning of this subsection in which he speaks about Maritain's 'brilliant teachings' illustrates. They shared ideas at Maria Laach where both went for their spiritual recollections, as mentioned in chapter one. Both were Thomists and naturally their concepts on human dignity, natural law and the line of thought that results from these concepts overlapped. Schuman applauded Maritain's ideas on democracy, as will be discussed in chapter three.

---

263. The original French title *Humanisme intégral* is translated both as *True Humanism* and as *Integral Humanism*.

Maritain prefaced his sketch of a new Christian order with a survey of modern culture from a Christian point of view in which he distinguished three phases, as Harold Blackham writes:

The first is what he calls the classical period of Christian naturalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when human confidence and efforts were increasingly drawn to the idea of the sufficiency of reason, without abandoning Christian assumptions. The second period is the period of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in which the bourgeois world of rationalist optimism brought into question and rejected the assumptions of revealed religion. And the third phase, the twentieth century, is considered the attempt of a radical atheism to produce by social means a new humanity. In the first phase, culture becomes the means of man's domination over matter, instead of a link in the process of salvation for eternal life. The rest is a working out of this aim to end in man's domination of man by means of the technical. At the end of the epoch, in our own day, pure atheism confronts pure Christianity, two absolute positions.<sup>264</sup>

Maritain described the shift of man's focus from God to reason, from reason to man removed from God, from man removed from God to man governed by technology. Man removed from God increasingly becomes a merely rational and material being. Man becomes more and more bourgeois, and the spiritual element is increasingly left out. According to Maritain, this bourgeois man needs to change. He referred to the biblical expression that the 'old man' may die to make place for the 'new man'.<sup>265</sup> Maritain abominated

---

264. Blackham, *Religion in a modern society*, 68–69. Blackham quotes Maritain and studies his ideas on a Christian society. Blackham has a very much different view on religion as he regards it as a social phenomenon more than a product of faith. He focuses on the utility and cultural standing of religion. He studies and compares among others also the theories of Thomas S. Eliot and of Jacques Maritain.

265. See: Jacques Maritain, *Humanisme intégral*, (Paris: Aubier Ed. Montaigne, 1968), 101. "et cela seul au fond nous importe: je veux dire, au sens chrétien, faire mourir "le vieil homme" et donner place à "l'homme nouveau".

false appearances also in Christianity and calls for integrity that has its repercussions in society.<sup>266</sup>

In this regard, Maritain and Eliot differ considerably. Maritain and Schuman stressed the need for Christian integrity or unity of life for each and every person, and of holding each person responsible for this. Both also rejected the idea that the good behaviour of the majority of people would be sufficient for communal purposes.

Maritain explained that to permeate society with a Christian spirit was not a purpose on its own of Christianity, but a consequence of man's need to answer his vocation and graces received. Man will thus help to improve society and make temporal life better.<sup>267</sup> Maritain argued that for this reason the domains of economic activity and politics should also be integrated into ethics. A synthesis of life is needed.<sup>268</sup> His way of reasoning echoed Schuman's thinking. Schuman did not insist on Catholicity but did want to permeate society with a (Christian) ethical spirit in line with Maritain's ideas. The following quote from an interview with Schuman on the Social Christian Movement in Europe is illustrative of this point:

Let me say first of all that I never used that expression "Political Catholicism". The parties of the social-Christian movement are no confessional parties. In France counts foremost the M.R.P. with Israelites, protestants and non-believers among its members [...] What characterises the M.R.P. is that it recruits its members among the right and among the left. Among the right because it wants to reconcile the interests from an economic point of view, among the left because it is above all a social movement. Moreover it recruits

---

266. Ibid., 102. "il importe de donner partout le pas au réel et au substantiel sur l'apparement et le décoratif, - au réellement et substantiellement chrétien sur l'apparement et décorativement chrétien; il comprendra aussi que c'est en vain qu'on affirme la dignité et la vocation de la personne humaine si on ne travaille pas à transformer des conditions qui l'oppriment, et à faire en sorte qu'elle puisse dignement manger son pain."

267. See: Ibid., 120.

268. Ibid., 126. "Les choses du domaine politique et économique doivent ainsi se trouver, conformément à leur nature, intégrées à l'éthique."

believers because it has made itself the defender of the free school. One conceives therefore the width of its programme, its successes and also its difficulties. Its greatest enemies, if one has to call them that way, are the communists.<sup>269</sup>

In this way, Schuman indicated that Christianity is essentially supernatural and as such beyond politics.<sup>270</sup> Maritain stressed that each man has a vocation to sanctity. He spoke of the sanctification of the secular.<sup>271</sup> Interestingly, Harold Blackham (1905–2009), who is referred to as the father of Modern Humanism, commented favourably on Maritain’s conviction:

Maritain proposes a commonwealth that would be virtually Christian, oriented towards integral Christianity, allowing the various non-Christian groups a just liberty.<sup>272</sup>

---

269. “M. Robert Schuman nous parle du Mouvement Social-Chrétien en Europe” in: *La Métropole*, 21 January 1954. Archives *Maison de Robert Schuman*, Scy-Chazelles. “Laissez-moi vous dire d’abord que je ne prise guère cette expression: ‘Catholicisme politique.’ Les parties nées du mouvement social-chrétien ne sont pas des parties confessionnelles. En France notamment le M.R.P. compte parmi ses membres des Israélites, des protestants, des incroyants... de même il en est ainsi, peut-on dire, partout. [...] Ce qui caractérise le M.R.P. c’est qu’il recrute ses membres aussi bien vers la droite que vers la gauche. A droite parce qu’au point de vue économique il cherche à concilier les intérêts, à gauche parce qu’il est résolument social. Au surplus il raille les croyants parce qu’il s’est fait le défenseur de l’école libre. On conçoit dès lors l’ampleur de son programme, ses succès comme aussi ses difficultés. Ses principaux adversaires, faut-il le dire, sont les communistes.”

270. According to Catholic faith, God created man in his image to govern the earth. God in time became man in Christ, in order to redeem man and procure his personal relationship with God. Christianity is therefore both exalted and very much down to earth and personal. It concerns man and all he is into as all is related to man’s personal relationship with God.

271. Maritain, *Humanisme intégral*, 130. “la prise de conscience de l’office temporel du chrétien appelle un style nouveau de sainteté, qu’on peut caractériser avant tout comme la sainteté et la sanctification de la vie profane.” It is reminiscent of Schuman’s friend Eschbach’s advice to Schuman to become a ‘saint in suit’ and follow his professional career, as mentioned in chapter one.

272. As a general comment can be said that Blackham’s statement might recall the position of the Dhimmis or non-Muslims that practiced certain kinds of faith in a Muslim society in which the sharia was practiced. Those faiths were originally, in the seventh century, restricted to the Jewish and Christian faith. Later the Dhimmi status was also conferred to the Sikhs, Zoroastrians and several other religions. The Dhimmis did not have the same rights as the Muslims, but they did have more than many other religions. When a Dhimmi became a Muslim he immediately obtained also all the rights that he lacked when he was a Dhimmi. In the beginning no force was put on people to become Muslim. This changed later on

Blackham continued by stating:

The unity of such a civilization would not be a unity assured from above by profession of the same faith and the same dogmas, but a unity of orientation proceeding from a common aspiration for a form of common life in harmony with the supra-temporal interests of the person. Distinct from the medieval conception in that it admits diversity, it is also distinct from the liberal conception in that it insists on a definitely religious and ethical specification of the temporal order, an order intrinsically ethical and bearing an impregnation of Christianity.<sup>273</sup>

In his book *Religion in a Modern Society*, Blackham's observation on Maritain's ideas is not followed by an attitude of rejection, but by one that shows that Modern Humanism is not opposed to Maritain's ideas on a form of common life in harmony with the supra-temporal interests of the person.

To underline Maritain's statement on the need for religious freedom, which is proper, but for centuries not recognized by the Church as such, to the Catholic faith since Christ, the Declaration on religious freedom made by Pope Paul VI in 1965 states:

This Vatican Council declares that the human person has a right to religious freedom. This freedom means that all men are to be immune from coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups and of any human power, in such wise that no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits.<sup>274</sup>

---

and it became ever more frequent that fights occurred to attain this goal. The essential difference with Christians respecting others in their religion or lack of religion is, precisely that it belongs to the essence of Christian faith to respect any person and to see a child of God in each person alike. Christian faith itself is however not compatible with any ideology or belief of believers and non-believers that goes against its view on human dignity with its transcendent core.

273. Blackham, *Religion in a modern society*, 71.

274. Paul VI, *Dignitatis humanae*, Declaration on religious freedom, 1965,

Maritain's conception of a Christian society in which there is respect for all different religions and ideas, was actually a very young idea that found its expression within the Church in this Declaration on religious freedom of Pope Paul VI. This was two years after Schuman died. However, the fact that religious freedom was only officially proclaimed by the Catholic Church in 1965 does not mean that Schuman did not recognize its truth, for being proper to Christianity, before. His respect for those that thought differently is already reflected by the quote on the Social Christian Movement in Europe. The testimonies about his personality as provided in chapter one confirm this respect for religious freedom.

Blackham explains in *Religion in a Modern Society* that Maritain stressed the need for a Christian orientation as a product of good reason that benefitted the common good. Blackham pointed out Maritain's view with the words:

But in order that the Christian conception of the temporal order shall prevail "in a secular and pluralist way" Christians imbued with this conception must have enough spiritual energy and enough political prudence to make men see, if they are capable of comprehension, that such a conception is in conformity with good reason and the common good, and to rouse and merit the confidence of them as leaders with authority. Believers and unbelievers in such a society are not sharing a doctrinal minimum but a practical task, which is secularly Christian and follows a Christian initiative. ("He that is not against you is with you"). All may be inspired by the idea and ideal of laws and institutions founded on and infused with the spirit of fraternal love.<sup>275</sup>

---

275. Blackham, *Religion in a modern society*, 72. See: Jacques Maritain, *True Humanism*, trans. M.R. Adamson, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938) and Joseph Ratzinger, *Values in a time of upheaval*, trans. Brian McNeil, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006), 69–70. Cardinal Ratzinger, just before being elected Pope says in this regard: "The Church should not coincide with the State nor become the plaything of political power. The Church remains something "outside" the state, for only thus can both Church and state be what they are meant to be. [...] The Church must exert itself with all its vigour so that in it there may shine forth the moral truth that it offers to the state and that ought to become evident to the citizens of the state. This truth must be vigorous within the Church, and it must form men,

Schuman and Maritain thought similarly about Christian orientation. Both stressed the need for moral order in all areas of life and thus also in politics. He strove towards the implementation of such moral order, as is manifested for example by his struggle against corruption within the government. Both argued the content of the Christian conception of the temporal order should refer to the Christian virtues and fundamental concepts embedded in norms that according to Catholic faith are universal.<sup>276</sup>

Maritain saw a strong connection between Christianity and democracy and so did Schuman. In fact, Schuman specifically referred to Maritain's thoughts on precisely this matter, as will be shown in chapter three.

Both thinkers also referred to the philosopher Henri Bergson in this regard, though in slightly different ways. On the topic of the Christian essence of democracy Schuman mentions Bergson's statement that the moral authority and the high value of its doctrine are always with the Church. Maritain focused on Bergson's emphasis on the openness of Christianity when commenting on the Christian essence of democracy in his writing on *Christianity and Democracy*. Maritain wrote:

[I]t is the urge of a love infinitely stronger than the philanthropy commended by the philosophers which causes human devotion to surmount the closed borders of the natural social groups - family groups and national groups—and extend it to the entire human race, because this love is the life in us of the very love which has created being and because it truly makes of each human being our neighbour. Without breaking the links of flesh and blood, of self-interest, tradition and pride which are needed by the body politic, and without destroying

---

for only then it will have the power to convince others and to be a force working like a leaven for all of society.”

276. As examples of virtues can be mentioned sincerity, perseverance, friendliness and humility. Examples of fundamental concepts are the transcendence of human dignity, freedom and responsibility in line with the transcendence of human dignity.

the rigorous laws of existence and conservation of this body politic, such a love extended to all men transcends, and at the same time transforms from within, the very life of the group and tends to integrate all of humanity into a community of nations and peoples in which men will be reconciled. For the kingdom of God is not miserly, the communion which is its supernatural privilege is not jealously guarded; it wants to spread and refract this communion outside its own limits, in the imperfect shapes and in the universe of conflicts, malice and bitter toil which make of the temporal realm. That is the deepest principle of the democratic ideal, which is the secular name for the ideal of Christendom. This is why Bergson writes, “democracy is evangelical in essence and ... its motive power is love.”<sup>277</sup>

Maritain also refers to non-Christians in this respect:

I am not forgetting that strangers to Christian philosophy can have a profound and authentic feeling for the human person and his dignity, and even at times show by their behaviour a practical respect for that dignity which few can equal. But the description of the person here outlined is I believe the only one which without their being themselves aware of it, provides a complete rational justification for their practical convictions.<sup>278</sup>

Maritain agreed that other philosophies could make similar claims if they “recognise the existence of an Absolute superior to the entire order of the universe, and the supra-temporal value of the human soul.” Yet Christian philosophy has an advantage in that the second of these two necessary postulates cannot be demonstrated by human reason and, when the certainty of reason deserts mankind, for

---

277. Jacques Maritain, *Christianity and Democracy and the Rights of Man and Natural Law*, trans. Doris C. Anson, (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986), 53–54. From a typewritten manuscript by Jacques Maritain, who gave this address at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in New York on 29 December 1949 and again at Gettysburg College under the auspices of the Adams County Round Table of the National Conference of Christians and Jews on 19 February 1950. “As the French philosopher Henri Bergson put it, the democratic sense or feeling is, by its very nature, an evangelical sense or feeling, its motive power is love, the essential thing in it is fraternity, it has its real sources in Gospel Inspiration.”

278. Jacques Maritain, *The Rights of Man and Natural Law*, (London: Geoffrey Bless, 1944), 7.

the Christian philosopher the stronger light of faith will take the strain.<sup>279</sup> In this way Maritain developed a political philosophy “which intertwined the question of regime, of supranational society, and the question of the confessional character of the state, by asserting that the solidarity of all classes and nations demands a supranational democracy as its ideal political expression but requires revealed premises as its foundation.”<sup>280</sup>

In his work *True Humanism* Maritain dealt extensively with this subject and compared secular humanism with integral humanism while working towards a political theory for a Christian democracy. Maritain considered secular forms of humanism anti-human because of refusing the wholeness of the person by leaving the spiritual dimension out. His conviction was that once the spiritual dimension of the person is rejected only partial humanism, humanism without foundation, will remain. In *True Humanism* Maritain explored ways in which Christianity can imbue politics in a pluralistic society. He believed that people with different ways of thinking could work together in a democratic way towards common practical aims. Maritain’s political theory became a primary source of inspiration for the Christian Democratic Movement.

As mentioned before, Schuman applauded Maritain’s ideas on democracy. It was probably a combination of Maritain’s ideas strengthened by Bergson’s observation that made Schuman regard democracy as essentially Christian.

Maritain brought his thoughts down to man when he quoted Charles Péguy saying that to transform a socialist society, man needs first of all to transform himself. Man needs to completely renew his own spiritual and moral life. He then should try to understand

---

279. Fimister, 121–122.

280. Ibid., 255.

thoroughly the leading moral ideas of the socialists so as to be able to awaken a new élan in them consistent with Christian morality: “The social revolution will be a moral revolution or there will not be a revolution.”<sup>281</sup>

Maritain considers ethics to be an essential component of the uniting of Europe. He wrote the following at the outbreak of the Second World War, when peace seemed very far away:

[I]f a federal Europe is to be born, and if it is to be viable, politics must be intrinsically bound to ethics, and that a good politics is a just and humane politics, and that without political justice there can be neither peace nor liberty nor honour among nations. [...]

All peoples must equally reconstruct their political philosophy, renounce the false political dogmas of liberal individualism and of revolutionary totalitarianism in its various forms, rely upon the truths which have given shape to the West to advance, in the West, that common ideal of civilization without which, as I said at the outset, a true federal organization is not permanently to be realized. A federal Europe will not exist unless the Christian spirit makes it exist.[...]

The acceptance by all the members of the federation of the reductions in the sovereignty of the State required by an authentic international organization would lead at the end, if they are conceived under the banner of liberty, to the establishment of what we can properly call in its own right a new Christendom.<sup>282</sup>

Maritain continued by stating that peace must be built collectively and that the common Father should enlighten the people building this peace. His high regard for Pius XII is expressed in the following quote:

---

281. Maritain, *Humanisme intégral*, 128, quoting Charles Péguy, “La révolution sociale sera morale ou elle ne sera pas.”

282. Jacques Maritain, “Europe and the federal Idea,” *The Commonweal* XXXI, no. 26, (19 April 1940). See: Fimister, 282–284.

Nothing could be more definite than the [...] points indicated by Pius XII. They have received the sympathetic attention of the Allies. One of the powerful reasons for hope is that the Holy See, which was carefully kept out of the negotiations for the peace which followed the last war [the Treaty of Versailles], has taken already attitudes of major importance with regard to the peace which is to come, and will in all probability, be induced to play a decisive role.<sup>283</sup>

The similarity in thought between Schuman and Maritain regarding the Papacy is evident. The only notable difference between the two is that for Schuman the Church held a central position in the assurance of the connection between Christianity and democracy while Maritain focused more on the nature, and specifically the openness, of Christianity.

Schuman and Maritain believed Christianity and the European cultural heritage as such to be essential elements of the European integration process. Both were consequently in favour of a reconciliation policy towards Germany, regarded man as a human person with a personal vocation to sanctity in the middle of the world and therefore of pivotal importance in the unification process and considered democracy to be essentially Christian.

---

283. Maritain, "Europe and the federal Idea."

### ***2.3 Conclusion***

Schuman stressed the importance of a ‘European spirit’ that needed to permeate this European enterprise. This spirit was to be found in the European cultural heritage with its Christian roots in which the human person and his transcendence played a pivotal role and of which effective solidarity through practical integration was the outcome.

The thoughts of Schuman’s contemporaries were surprisingly similar regarding the most fundamental issues. The same goes for their thoughts with regard to the idea of unification. All of the intellectuals mentioned in this chapter stressed the pivotal role of the human person and the need for a correct concept of man in order to be able to construct a new political and economic order.

De Rougemont and Brugmans focus on man’s freedom and responsibility, including solidarity, that should inform the social, political and economic order. The other intellectuals mentioned in this chapter, Benda, Dawson, Jaspers, Guardini, Pius XII, Eliot, Maritain, focus on the recognition of man’s transcendence and the need for a moral order based in Christianity. They stress the necessity of the integration of spirituality into the world of science, as the separation of the two badly damages society and is one of the causes of the deplorable state of Europe. Dawson, Guardini, Pius XII and Maritain thus comment on the devastating effect of separating faith and reason. According to them this separation means, in Dawson’s words, seeing the tree while missing the forest. They, like Benda, Jaspers, De Rougemont, Brugmans and Eliot, also emphasize the need for a moral order, principles or spiritual framework consistent with Christianity, that informs the public order so as to avoid man becoming an instrument of ideologies or of a totalitarian regime. Guardini centers

in his worldview on man's need to be aligned with the Totality, or Absolute, in which he participates. He also states that Europeans need to continuously re-appropriate their European cultural heritage and live up to it if they want to strive towards the attainment of the universal common good. Thus they need to be willing to share and cooperate with other continents and not succumb to continental egocentrism as if Europe exists on its own.

All the intellectuals mentioned before oppose nationalism and are in favour of European unification. The federalists De Rougemont and Brugmans are the only ones with Benda who explicitly mention the need to surrender sovereignty in order to achieve a real European Union. But the others also acknowledge the need for supra-nationality and thus for transfer of sovereignty. Brugmans even explicitly states that the German problem was a European problem and that it should be solved by the creation of a supranational cooperation in the field of coal and steel. He also explains that Western Europe needs to be reunited with Eastern Europe, that Europe has its fate in its own hands and that European federalism will surely affect the world order. The similarity in thought on all these issues between him and Schuman is surprising.

Jaspers, De Rougemont and Pius XII all point to Switzerland as an example of how European integration should come about. Pope Pius XII provides as it were a blueprint of what would become the European unification Schuman strives towards. Pius XII favours a policy of reconciliation and a supranational polity for achieving European unification. He emphasizes that national political interests should be set aside so as to make room for common interests. Pius XII further comments that there should be solidarity among states along with respect for the national culture of each state. In this regard, he stresses the links between unity and diversity, between European and

national common good, and between universal and European common good. For this unity to happen the creation of a moral order based on Christianity is needed. Pius XII strongly suggests re-establishing the connection between religion and culture so as to cure the deplorable European situation of the years after the war. As far as the method of integration concerns, he recommends a slow integration and avoidance of acting hastily. Although the Church does not mingle in temporal affairs and only opines, it is clear that all these thoughts of Pope Pius XII mentioned above are known to and shared by Schuman.

Eliot suggests a society built on Christianity so as to purify the political system and society itself from the dominating lack of morality. Maritain, a neo-thomist who wants to bring Aquinas's philosophical doctrine closer to society, culture and science, stresses the fact that the human person transcends the political community. He is a strong defender of natural law ethics and sees human rights as being rooted in natural law. He further speaks of each man's call to sanctity in the middle of the world and stresses the importance of integrity. This is also applicable to his idea on European integration, as he regards ethics and moral order as essential components of the idea of European integration. Maritain further emphasizes the need for political systems with Christian thought, respectful to those who think differently, and pleads for an authentic and pluralistic democracy. He sees democracy as an essentially Christian phenomenon; a product of the equality of man and woman which is damaged in the past but restored by Christ. Schuman fully accepts Maritain's view on democracy.

The comparative approach of this chapter has provided the basis for a better understanding of Schuman's thoughts as it has further articulated Schuman's distinguishing ideas on European unification, such as his step-by-step method of integration and focus

on the 'European spirit', and made clear that there were more intellectuals thinking along similar lines as Schuman. It has also illustrated the revolutionary state of thinking on European unification in those days. The time was right for a revolutionary act, not because of fear due to the threat of Communism or of another war but because of the fact that the people cried out for a different political, economic and social order. Schuman is the one who would launch this revolutionary act when pronouncing the Schuman Declaration on 9 May 1950, a unique act that brought forth a unique kind of integration.

