The Anonymity of Christendom

Robert Schuman is the founder of the European Union. He was an extremely pious Catholic of unimpeachable moral character. A humble man who took his duties to the people he represented and to the French nation as a minister of state with great seriousness, he eschewed the trappings of office without drawing attention to the fact or diminishing the dignity of the positions he held which were of the greatest eminence. He was Finance Minister, Foreign Minister, Prime Minster and Justice Minister of France. He entered politics at the end of the First World War for reasons of principle and his party allegiances were very clearly determined by principle and not by ambition. It was the complete resetting of the political board by the defeat of 1940, occupation, collaboration, liberation and de Gaulle's retirement from politics that pushed Schuman to the centre of French political life.

Metaphorically speaking, I spent five years of my life in Schuman's company when researching the influence of Catholic Social Teaching and Thomist Philosophy on the creation of the European Union at the University of Aberdeen. I hold him in the highest esteem. I certainly consider that he displayed heroic virtue and is a model for the imitation of the faithful. I hope very much that he is a saint. I pray to him in a private capacity and believe I and my family have been blessed by his intercession. Nevertheless, despite having been a great enthusiast for the European project all my life up until that point, I emerged from my research convinced that the creation of the Communitarian Europe was a mistake that has done great harm to Europe and to the Church. While I was convinced that the European project really did arise from powerful influences within the Church I also came to see that these were the very same influences which have devastated the Church herself since the late nineteen sixties and facilitated the emergence of the culture of death.

A number of questions preoccupied me during my research, somewhat more than they should have done. One of those questions was whether Schuman could really be described as the founder of the EU. The Schuman Declaration of 9th May 1950, when he offered to delegate sovereignty over French and German coal and steel production to a joint authority open to the participation of other European states, is celebrated by the EU as Europe Day every year. This plan could only work because of the favourability of Konrad Adenauer the German Chancellor and the then leaders of Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg. These men too have a claim to be considered founders and fathers of the communitarian

Europe. At the other end of the process Jean Monnet the official and technocratic lobbyist who designed the Plan and persuaded Schuman of its merits could be and often is seen as the mastermind who deployed the political actors as chessmen in the realisation of his vision. In fact, the convergence of the technocratic and secular interests of Monnet with the Catholic aspirations of Schuman is an exemplary application of the theory that formed the Catholic support for the European project; and the divergence of these agendas since is one of the clearest signs of that theory's bankruptcy. The second question that preoccupied me was 'how far was Schuman himself really interested in Europe as such?' Because, to Schuman's credit, it seems to me that his essential preoccupation was not with Europe at all.

Schuman was certainly a man of the frontiers. His father had moved from his home in Lorraine to his wife's home in Luxembourg because Lorraine itself was lost to Prussia (and so to the new German Empire) in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871. On the other hand Schuman's father not wishing to surrender his lands had forfeited his French citizenship and become legally German. Thus Robert Schuman was born in 1886 to a (legally German) French war veteran in Luxembourg as a German citizen. He was therefore predisposed to see beyond simplistic or Manichean conceptions of nationality. His earliest recorded feelings of patriotism related to Luxembourg. He chose to study Law in Germany but precisely so he could return to his ancestral homeland of Lorraine and practice it there. He went on pilgrimage to Lourdes with the unusual (and successful) petition that he fail the medical examination for the German army. He attended the beatification of Joan of Arc in 1909. I am not therefore suggesting that there is any doubt that Schuman's sense of belonging was nuanced and broader than a jingoistic Francophilia but there is little evidence that his Occidental loyalties expressed themselves before the Second World War in conceptions of European Federalism. It is said that he supported Aristide Briand's federalist initiatives vis-à-vis Germany in 1929-30 and I do not doubt it, but this support was measured enough that it cannot be independently verified.

This brings us back to the other political claimants to the title of founder of the EU. The reason Schuman's proposals received such a warm reception in the other five of the original European six (France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg) is that these countries were dominated politically at that time by Christian Democratic Parties. Since the French Revolution western parliamentary democratic politics has been dominated by the highly dubious left-right axis: a distinction based on a fundamental

error about human nature and into which orthodox Catholic political and social thought accordingly cannot be forced. Any Catholic who finds himself comfortably allied with left or right has certainly departed from the truth in some way. In the Second World War the extreme anti-democratic Right and anyone who flirted with it was utterly discredited, but the result of the War was an extension of the Soviet Union further west into Europe than the Tsars had ever accomplished. With the right discredited and the left a looming terror Christian Democracy was able to assume an unprecedented position of power in western Europe in the decade after the War greater than it has ever achieved since. Paradoxically, the weak link in this chain was France. Although the MRP, the French Christian Democrats, participated in every government of the Fourth Republic (the French regime from 1945-1958) often supplying many senior ministers and the Prime Minister they never ruled alone or entirely dominated the government. The tradition of laicism which dominated the Third Republic and still constrain the political imagination of France made the achievement in France of the kind of dominance the Christian Democratic Union held in Germany very difficult even in the favourable conditions of the early cold war. Schuman was painfully aware of this difficulty. His own tenure as Prime Minister was brought down by laicist hostility to religion in schools. He sought to come to an understanding with de Gaulle that might have married the charism of the national saviour to the programme of the MRP but the temperament and outlook of the two men were too different for this dream ticket to form. What *is* clear from Schuman's career between the wars is that, whatever warm feelings he may have felt for European Federalism, he was clearly and passionately devoted to Christian Democracy in a way that admits no doubt. It is difficult not to conclude therefore that Schuman's enthusiasm for European Federalism *after* the War is more fundamentally a desire to transfer as much political action as possible onto a plain in which Christian Democracy could dominate. This was indeed how the British government read the situation in 1950 when they decided (one suspects to Schuman's relief) not to participate in the Schuman Plan.

Jean Monnet (the official who formulated that plan) had no such theological agenda. His passion for Europe was 'progressive' and bureaucratic, inspired by an impatience with the nation state and a desire to tidy the paper clips of history. He is the father of the bureaucratic edifice of the EU and insofar as the EU is essentially a bureaucratic enterprise his claims to paternity are strong. Should then the communitarian Europe be filed, as a friend once suggested to me, under 'International Catholic Conspiracy (Failed)' and 'International Secular Bureaucratic Conspiracy

(Current)'. I suspect so. Schuman did indeed hope that a natural sympathy between his new Europe and Catholicism would lead to a flourishing of the Church. He advanced his project with the help of many people who cherished no such hope and his hope has been disappointed. Does that make Schuman's initiative disingenuous and underhand? No. I do not believe it does. There was certain degree of gamesmanship in the way Schuman persuaded the French Council of Minsters to adopt his plan but this was because of concerns his coleagues might have raised over national sovereignty not because of his guiding Catholic inspiration. However, for reasons I hope to explain, the reason the Plan was not disingenuous on Schuman's part is also the reason that, from a Catholic point of view, it failed.

Schuman's real preoccupation, the subject of his maiden speech in the French Legislature in 1919, and the focus of his entire life was (to put it more frankly than he would have done then) the restoration of Christendom. Schuman was a faithful adherent of the great body of Neo-Scholastic Papal Social Teaching that was assembled between the election of Leo XIII in 1878 and the death of Pius XII in 1958 and the distinguishing feature of that that teaching was the way in which it separated itself from the efforts made after the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars to restore the social order of Europe before the Revolution while simultaneously insisting upon rigorously integralist and scholastic principles for the remodelling of society. Its solution to 1789 was not to go back to the *status quo ante* but to the principles and ideals of the High Middle Ages. The France in which Schuman began his political career was, however, a country in which anti-clerical secularism and Freemasonry had dominated political life for a generation and won a devastating victory in 1905 with the 'Law of Separation' which repudiated the Concordat with Rome that had obtained since 1801, confiscated all church property, cut off diplomatic relations with the Holy See, and even refused to recognise the legal personality of the French Church and its dioceses. The Religious Orders had already been expelled. Education was completely and aggressively secularised. Schuman was elected to represent the interests of still very Catholic Lorraine now reintegrated into France following the defeat of Germany but promised during the war that it would not be subjected to the same secular measures as the rest of France. Schuman insisted in his maiden speech that Catholicism is a philosophy and a social vision which just like any other has the right to compete for the adherence of free citizens and, insofar as it wins that adherence, apply itself through the organs of democratic government to the remodelling of society. The degree of legal recognition Schuman believed the Church could and should ultimately

demand he made clear in a speech on the Liberty of the Church he gave just before the Second World War when he praised the phraseology of a law then recently enacted in Spain which recognised the Church as a Perfect Society with juridical personhood and the fullness of its rights. He did not favour dictatorship or demand that unbelievers vote for any such measure but he held it would be entirely legitimate to enact if the Church were to regain the full adherence of a 'numerical preponderance' of French citizens.

So far so good. So far so much in accordance with the vision of the great interwar pope Pius XI whose motto was 'The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ' and who instituted the feast of Christ the King in 1925 in order annually to reiterate the "the moral duty of men and societies toward the true religion and toward the one Church of Christ." But, the year after he instituted the Feast of Christ the King, Pius XI did something else rather dramatic which, while entirely consistent with the doctrine of Christ's Social Kingship, would, through its unforeseen consequences, develop the solvent that would eventually eradicate Catholicism as a political force in Europe. On 29th December 1926 Pius XI condemned the French political movement and newspaper *Action française*. This movement was the antithesis of the policy which had been pursued by the Popes since the accession of Leo XIII. It was royalist and nostalgic but led intellectually by an atheist Charles Mauras who sought to restore the *Ancien Regime* in France not because he believed Catholicism was true but because he thought it the necessary civil cult and mythology for a conservative and authoritarian political order which he desired not as the expression of the faith but for its own sake. Catholic adherents of Mauras argued that their collaboration in his efforts was legitimate because they had the same proximate goals even if their remote ideals diverged. In 1892 Leo XIII had in the encyclical *Au Milieu Des Sollicitudes* taught that this perspective is precisely the wrong way around. The reason the church had been so weak in the Third French Republic (which obtained from 1878 to 1940) was that too many zealous Catholics put their preferred form of government first and the subjection of the civil order to natural and divine law a distant second. As a consequence Republican and Royalist Catholics refused to work together and the Secularist carried all before them. But the subjection of the civil order to natural and divine law is non-negotiable while the form of the constitution is precisely a secondary and indifferent matter.

One of the great intellectual figures of French Catholicism who adhered to *Action française* before its condemnation was the philosopher Jacques Maritain. In the wake of the censures imposed by Pius XI Maritain was instructed by the Pope himself to repudiate the movement and defend the

condemnation. The difficulty for the post war European integration movement insofar as it *might* have served a vehicle for a renewed Catholic social and political era was not in the condemnation of *Action française* itself but in the manner in which Maritain chose to defend it. Pius XI (and Leo XIII) emphatically did not require anyone so inclined to repudiate royalism. What they condemned was the prioritisation of a morally indifferent preference for one particular governmental form over the demands of the gospel so as to preclude political cooperation with non-monarchists in pursuit of the social kingship of Christ or admit cooperation with ideologically unacceptable elements for the sake of this merely temporal goal.

Strangely Maritain's reaction to the condemnation of this error was to retain the essential error but abandon monarchism and move dramatically to the left. This manoeuvre led him to develop the philosophy he called 'Integral Humanism'. However, this philosophy was itself built on a more fundamental and (I would argue) fundamentally correct thesis he dubbed 'Moral Philosophy Adequately Considered'. The tragedy of the communitarian European project from a Catholic point of view is that it is founded on these two concepts the second of which is vital and true but the first of which is catastrophically false. Schuman called Maritain 'our great Christian philosopher' and spoke of his 'luminous teaching'. It is clear from Schuman's book *Pour L'Europe* that for him European federalism was fundamentally an application of Maritain's philosophy. "Europe" Schuman declared "is the establishment of a generalised democracy in the Christian sense of the word."

Maritain argued that fully coherent moral reasoning (including political reasoning) is impossible unless one knows the end or purpose of human life but this end cannot be known except by divine revelation because it is appointed by God with sovereign freedom and therefore not just moral theology but moral philosophy is impossible without divine revelation. Without revelation man does not know his destination or the way to it. Furthermore, the affection and true friendship he feels for his kin, his spouse, his companions and his compatriots is exhausted by these four groups. He does not imagine friendship with God is possible, he does not seek friendship with foreigners, still less his enemies or his slaves. When God reveals to man that friendship with Him is *indeed* possible, in fact *available*, but that it is proffered to the entire human race in Christ, these barriers are destroyed, moral life is universalised, and political life is transformed. As Maritain explains:

> [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 group and national group – 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 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 up the temporal realm. That is the deepest principle of the democratic ideal, which is the secular name for the ideal of Christendom.

As that last comment implies Maritain drew a surprising and (I would argue) deeply mistaken moral from this true and important insight. One might suppose that this argument implies that the concept of a civil order in which everyone participates requires the formal profession of Christianity as a justification (and one would be right in this supposition). Instead Maritain concludes that the dependence of democracy (in his terms) on revealed truth and infused charity means that simply by admitting universal franchise and inalienable human rights one has already implicitly adhered to the Gospel and created an anonymously Christian civil order that is naturally harmonious with the Church without any need for the formal profession of the Gospel by the public law. This is the doctrine he called 'Integral Humanism'. Because the Gospel would only be implied not asserted by the institutions of this secular Christendom individuals of all creeds and none would be able to cooperate in and be united under its banner without having to repudiate their own convictions but because only Christianity could afford a fully coherent account of the reason for these institutions the Church would flourish in the context of this new regime. Thus a secular figure like Monnet could devote himself vigorously to the same concrete goals as Schuman and his fellow Christian Democrats without this constituting some sort of manipulation or dishonesty on the part of either man. Schuman could with all honesty say,

The 'Vatican Europe' is a myth. The Europe which 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 the 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 of 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

In the intensity of the Second World War Maritain published a number of extremely popular works drawing out the political consequences of his vision and these in particular seem to have had a powerful impact on Schuman. During the war Maritain argued the universalism of enfranchisement and of human rights which would implicitly harmonise the civil order with revelation would be even more dramatically emphasised by the transcendence of the boundaries of the nation in a European federation. "The acceptance by all the members of the [European] federation" he wrote "of the reductions in the sovereignty of the State required by an authentic international organisation 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."

Between the Wars, despite the horrors and depredations of the various totalitarian regimes, the Church enjoyed the advantage that each of them was offering a comprehensive political and social doctrine of man. Liberal capitalism outside of the United States seemed unappealing and from October 1929 onwards seemed generally discredited. Catholic political parties were formally Catholic rather than ecumenical. The Church did not have to apologize for offering an integral vision. In his maiden speech Schuman defended the right of Catholic Trade Unionists to organise on the basis of their Creed just as much as the Communist Trade Unionists had the right to organise on the basis of Marxism. "Catholicism" he declared "is not only a religious faith, it is a social doctrine. Just as the C.G.T is inspired by a philosophical doctrine, so Catholics have the right to unionise on the basis of their beliefs."

In the twenties and thirties the choice was between rival comprehensive doctrines and decadence. Compared to Marxism, Fascism, Nazism and the decadence which anyway seemed but their precursor Catholicism appeared very attractive. As Pius XI said in 1931 "let all remember that Liberalism is the father of this Socialism that is pervading morality and culture and that Bolshevism will be its heir." After the War everything seemed different. The United States was the triumphant and prosperous hegemonic power. The major alternative was the Soviet Union. The Christian Democratic Parties were re-formed on an ecumenical basis. Maritain's star was in the ascendant. Charles de Gaulle appointed him ambassador to the Holy See from 1945 to 1948. In 1939 Franco's regime in Spain seemed a possible model for political Catholicism (within the spectrum of respectability even for many Catholics who favoured democratic and republican constitutional forms) but by 1945 Franco was an embarrassment. Pius XII told de Gaulle in 1944 that he hoped for a "close union of those European States inspired by Catholicism - Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Portugal" but such schemes were Utopian in the new context of the Cold War. In 1939 Pius XII assured the faithful in his first encyclical that "At the head of the road which leads to the spiritual and moral bankruptcy of the present day stand the nefarious efforts of not a few to dethrone Christ; the abandonment of the law of truth which He proclaimed and of the law of love which is the life breath of His Kingdom. In the recognition of the royal prerogatives of Christ and in the return of individuals and of society to the law of His truth and of His love lies the only way to salvation."

But by 1945 it seemed Maritain's vision was the only viable option to unite the anti-communist forces centred on the United States itself the first western state since antiquity not to formally adhere to the Christian religion. In the Europe of 1946 it seemed the only options were anonymous Christendom or global communism. The Social Kingship of Christ was no longer on offer. Alicide de Gaspari the leader of the Italian Christian Democrats and Prime Minister from 1945 to 1953 who welcomed the Schuman Plan in 1950, was also a disciple of Maritain. Catholics predominated in Western Germany but not so much that the CDU could do without a significant Protestant vote.

For Schuman the creation of the European Community was simply the fullest application of Maritain's theory of Democracy

> "Democracy owes its existence to Christianity. It was born the day that man was called to realise in his temporal life, the dignity of the human person, in the liberty of the individual, in respect for the

rights of each and through the practice of fraternal love in regard to all. Never before Christ had comparable ideas been formulated. Democracy is thus linked to Christianity doctrinally and chronologically. It took form with it, and by stages, and through many trials, often at the price of errors and relapses into barbarism. Jacques Maritain our great Christian philosopher, who we French have had the folly of abandoning to a distant university instead of allowing ourselves to profit from his luminous teaching, has marked the parallel between the development of the Christian idea and of democracy. Christianity has taught the equality in nature of all men, children of the same God, redeemed by the same Christ, without distinction of race, colour, class or profession. It has caused to be recognised the dignity of work and the obligation of all to submit themselves to it. It has recognised the primacy of interior values which alone ennoble man. The universal law of love and charity has made of everyman our neighbour, and upon it have rested social relations in the Christian world since then. This teaching and the practical consequences which follow from it have transformed the world. This revolution has operated under the progressive inspiration of the Gospel which has refashioned the nations by a long labour, sometimes accompanied by a painful struggle. In fact, the progress of Christian civilisation has been neither automatic nor in one direction. Nostalgia for the past and the evil instincts of a fallen nature have held back this transformation and continue to resist it. And if that is true for us who are privileged, who have benefited from a Christian atavism, how much more is it felt among those who are receiving their first contact with Christianity."

But Maritain's theory rests on a straightforward fallacy, the fallacy of affirming the consequent (if A then B, B therefore A). Just because the ideas of universal franchise and inviolable human rights follow from Christian revelation does not mean Christian revelation is implied by these political ideals.

Schuman exhibited some unease on this point contemplating the possibilities if his generalised democracy did not turn out to be so very Christian after all. He warned of the possibility of "supranational egotism" and observed that "Democracy will be Christian or it will not be. An anti-Christian democracy would be a caricature which would end in tyranny or anarchy." On the edge of his consciousness it seems floated the fear that he might have created not a friend but a rival for the Church. Deprived of the resources of grace a state or supranational body Christian in the scope of its

ambition but pagan in content could not but seek to absorb its natural units. A supranational entity would seek to become a super-state, the national state would seek to supress and absorb the functions of the family. "Leviathan is dead" he warned "we should have no pity for his offspring". In the event it turned out that rumour of Leviathan's death were exaggerated.

The potential for anti-Christian democracy may have taken a while to emerge but it did not take long for the Maritainians to lose control of the European project. Already by 1955 the British Government, which had been concerned that Catholic sectional interest lay behind the Schuman Plan back in 1951, concluded that the Christian Democrats had lost control of the European Project "Part of the impetus for a supranational European organisation had come from the coincidence of Catholic leadership in France, Germany and Italy. This element had virtually gone."

The European Convention on Human Rights, a parallel initiative to the Communities, provides and instructive example of the folly of Maritain's vision. When the Convention was signed (supposedly to insure that the sort of atrocities perpetrated by the Nazi's could never happen again) in nearly all (possibly all) the member states of the signatories capital punishment was practiced, abortion was illegal, sodomy was illegal. Within half a century not only were all these positions reversed but it was being successfully argued that their reversal was a requirement of conformity to the convention itself. What is last in execution is first in intention. As Augustine famously declared, "there is no justice save in that Republic whose founder and ruler is Christ."

The word 'Europe' probably means 'sunset' or 'west' as opposed to Asia which is derived from the word for 'sunrise' or 'east'. Hilaire Belloc famously contended that 'Europe is the Faith' and 'Europe is the Church'. As a quick glance at a world map will confirm Europe is not really a continent it is at best a peninsular. To be honest it is a cultural phenomenon with no real geographical basis. It is a civilisation not a place. A civilisation that was originally that of the Mediterranean, the synthesis of Latin, Greek and Hebrew culture, but which became confined to the Eurasian Atlantic peninsular because of its success in assimilating its Germanic conquerors and failure in turning back the victorious Arabs. Christendom (for such it truly is) did not quietly accept its exclusion from Africa and Asia and the Middle Ages defined themselves by their struggle to rescue Byzantium and recapture the lands lost to Islam. When that struggle failed it lost the will to live. It turned its genius to the imitation of the language and architecture of

pagan antiquity and lost itself in sensual pleasures and sterile heretical fanaticism slowly it ceased to call itself Christendom and adopted the name of Europe. Sunset indeed.

Both Schuman and Charlemagne at the beginning and end of the history of Christian Europe have born the name *Pater Europae*. In 1972 Beethoven's setting of the Ode to Joy by Schiller was adopted as the Anthem of Europe. 'Joy brilliant divine spark, daughter of Elysium. Heavenly being your spells reunite that which was strictly divided by convention, all men become brothers where your gentle wing rests.' The poet of the Song of Roland tells us that Charlemagne too was associated with Joy.

> In the mead the Emperor made his bed, With his mighty spear beside his head, Nor will he doff his arms tonight, But lies in his broidered hauberk white. Laced is his helm, with gold inlaid, Girt on Joyeuse, the peerless blade, Which changes thirty times a day The brightness of its varying ray. Nor may the lance unspoken be Which pierced our Saviour on the tree; Karl hath its point - so God him graced Within his golden hilt enchased. And for this honour and boon of heaven, The name Joyeuse to the sword was given; The Franks may hold it in memory. Thence came "Montjoie," their battle - cry, And thence no race with them may vie.

Mont Joy is the name of the Hill from which the First Crusaders saw Jerusalem on 7th June 1099 many falling to their knees weeping. There is an unnerving mysticism in the poet of the Song for it is the spear that pierced Christ's side that opened the "new and living way … through the curtain, that is, through his flesh … with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." As this wound was inflicted so too a sword pierced the soul of the Holy Mother of God "that the secret thoughts out of many hearts might be revealed". For Christ was already dead when His side was pierced it was impossible for Him to merit by this wound, His human soul and body being already separated. It was the Blessed Virgin who merited through the fifth wound winning the subjective application of all that her son had objectively merited on the cross revealing the destiny of each man by the application of sufficient and efficacious grace. Dividing mankind into the two cities: the City of God and the City of the World.

As C.S. Lewis observed Joy is "an unsatisfied desire which is itself more desirable than any other satisfaction. I call it Joy, which is here a technical term and must be sharply distinguished both from happiness and from

pleasure. Joy (in my sense) has indeed one characteristic, and one only, in common with them; the fact that anyone who has experienced it will want it again. Apart from that, and considered only in its quality, it might almost equally well be called a particular kind of unhappiness or grief. But then it is a kind we want. I doubt whether anyone who has tasted it would ever, if both were in his power, exchange it for all the pleasures in the world. But then Joy is never in our power and pleasure often is."

The human race is divided by joy into two irreconcilable kingdoms "[a]t every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardour and assault. At this period, however, the partisans of evil seem to be combining together, and to be struggling with united vehemence". The first of all deceivers began with a lie. That possibility is not open for those who contend for God and for His Christ. Schuman insisted that Europe is not a Trojan horse invented by the Church to accomplish some shadowy design and yet it was conceived as a means of creating a New Christendom without offending the world. But scripture warns us that "friendship with the world is enmity with God". Rights understood in the light of the Gospel are irreconcilable with the pseudo rights generated by those "who follow in the footsteps of Lucifer, and adopt as their own his rebellious cry, 'I will not serve'; and consequently substitute for true liberty what is sheer and most foolish license."

The caricature of democracy in the Christian sense of the word, the anarchy and the tyranny are with us now and all because what the Saviour commanded us to proclaim on the housetops and to say in the light we have instead whispered and told in the dark, if we have told it at all. There are no anonymous Christians and there can be no anonymous Christendom. As the Catechism (161) observes:

> Believing in Jesus Christ and in the One who sent him for our salvation is necessary for obtaining that salvation. "Since "without faith it is impossible to please [God]" and to attain to the fellowship of his sons, therefore without faith no one has ever attained justification, nor will anyone obtain eternal life 'But he who endures to the end.'"

For he that shall be ashamed of Christ and of His words, of him the Son of man shall be ashamed, when He shall come in his majesty, and that of his Father, and of the holy angels. The fallacy at the heart of Maritain's Integral Humanism has delivered the continent under whose name he sought to

build his anonymous Christendom into the dominion and power of the evil one. In 1952 another great French Thomist Philosopher Etienne Gilson, who once even served as a Senator for Schuman's party the MRP perceived the danger and warned that the universal brotherhood of the Gospel cannot be resold under a different name. the civil power must fulfil it duty to recognise Christ and his Church or frankly reject them. "[T]omorrow" Gilson writes "in a century, in ten centuries, they will perhaps still say that the means we propose are unacceptable, but just as today this will still only be a way for them to say that they do not truly desire the end. For it is the end which commands. The human city cannot be built, in the shadow of the cross, other than as the suburb of the City of God." As John Paul II observed on the 1,200[th] anniversary of the Imperial Coronation of Charlemagne the refusal to make explicit formal reference to God and His rights has born bitter fruit,

> I cannot conceal my disappointment that in the [European Union's Charter of Fundamental Rights] there is not a single reference to God. Yet in God lies the supreme source of the human person's dignity and his fundamental rights. It cannot be forgotten that it was the denial of God and his commandments which led in the last century to the tyranny of idols. A race, a class, the state, the nation and the party were glorified instead of the true and living God. In the light of the misfortunes that overtook the 20th century we can understand: the rights of God and man stand or fall together.