

講演

ヨーロッパ統合の深層

——政治・宗教・文化——

1. 実施要領

講師 ジル・フェラギュ（西パリ大学ナンテール／ラ・デファンス准教授）

日時 2010年1月25日（月）午後5時～7時

場所 大学院国際文化学研究科A棟4階中会議室

主催 異文化研究交流センター（IReC）

通訳 箱田徹（神戸大学大学院国際文化学研究科学術推進研究員）

講師略歴

1970年生まれ。西パリ大学ナンテール／ラ・デファンス（パリ第10大学）准教授。

専門はフランスとイタリアを中心とするヨーロッパ国際関係史。19紀末から第一次世界大戦前にかけてのフランス・イタリア外交史研究で博士号（パリ第10大学）を取得。近著に *Le XXe siècle : 1914-2001* (Hachette Supérieur, 2009) (Françoise Berger との共著)、共編著に *Acteurs diplomatiques et ordre international, XVIIIe-XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions Kimé, 2007)がある。

2. 講演

Roots and values in the European being

Gilles Ferragu*

Introduction

Questions or facts: what is a European citizen? Is it a question of race, culture, religion...?

The Turkish dilemma

The discussions, in France, Italy or Germany, in fact in all the European countries and public opinions, about Turkey's application for membership of the EU are acute/sharp. The religious and cultural dimensions of the debate are of course predominant... a strange situation, for a state which claims his secular tendencies and traditions since 1924 and Atatürk. Turkey first submitted an application for membership of the EU back in the 1960s, but it was not until December 2004 that the EU Council made Turkey an official "candidate" by voting to begin formal accession negotiations. A long period, unusually long for the seventeenth power of the world...

And yet, for Europeans, the Turkish problem is a sharp one: hidden behind this candidacy (and his demographic danger), there is the question of the European borders and identity ... and specifically the Christian roots. Is the Turkey a "European" country? There is a bunch of books, speeches, media coverage of the subject and they all ask the same question: is there any European culture, shared by 492 millions of Europeans and 27 states?

Of course, we all know why EU has been created, and what the background of the European integration was. The wars of the Twentieth century have favoured the idea of a union between European states, in order to guarantee peace in the continent, and also the power and the democracy. After the Second World War, it appeared to every government

* Maître de Conférences, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense

victorious or defeated, that only conciliation between old enemies could preserve peace. So, a group of countries fostered by the United States, finally unit themselves in a sort of confederation to become the European Union. That building is the conclusion of a European dream... only the conclusion. But it makes us wonder to know the real task dedicated to the European Union, and what kind of identity the European citizen can proclaim.

Being European: a political culture?

The concept of European identity: the 1973 declaration

A first part of the answer has been expressed at the Copenhagen European Summit in December 1973, when the Heads of State or Government of the nine Member States of the enlarged European Community affirmed their determination to introduce the concept of European identity into their common foreign relations. The declaration was to achieve a better definition of the relations of Europeans with other countries and the place which they occupy in world affairs. The nine have decided to define the European Identity with the dynamic nature of European unification. This declaration must be mentioned here, because it will inspire my line of argument.

It begins by referring to the European history: *“The European States might have been pushed towards disunity by their history and by selfishly defending misjudged interests. But they have overcome their past enmities and have decided that unity is a basic European necessity to ensure the survival of the civilization which they share.”*

This quotation is significant of the influence of the long story of the subcontinent, and the Nine are aware of that influence.

Secondly, the declaration distinguishes between national cultures and a hypothetical European culture/identity (a strange kind of cultural subsidiarity?) and underlines the diversity of cultures within the framework of a common European civilization. It underlines too the attachment to common values and principles, the convergence of attitudes to life, the awareness of having specific interests in common... all of these characteristics are making up the European identity.

This identity / common culture is based on a determination to build a society which measures up to the needs of the individual, to defend the principles of representative democracy, of the rule of law, of social justice – conceived as the ultimate goal of economic progress – and of respect for human rights. All of these are fundamental elements of the

II 講演

European Identity, or maybe, one of the deepest aspirations of European citizens (even if the European citizenship appears only in 1995, with the Maastricht treaty). And it is obviously the definition of democracy, that Alexis de Tocqueville or the Enlightenment philosophers could have written.

So back to the European history, in order to understand how that political identity has been formed and how it became a real political culture. I will present a rapid history of the European idea, and show the various models and ways of a European unity. If there is something common to all citizens, maybe it is a common history and a political agreement about the best way to build union.

The origins of the European idea: from autocracy to democracy

First question: is there a political culture Europe? I would say, that our story encourages us to democracy, after a long time of hesitancy between two political models

The European idea is an old one, maybe an ancient one: the myth of Europe, told by the Greek poet Hesiod dates from the Greek antiquity. According to the legend, Europe was a Phoenician princess (Phoenicia was on the Aegean coasts of the present Turkey) seduced by Zeus, king of the Olympus gods. The god, disguised himself in a Taurus, carried the princess of and installed her in a Greek island (End of the story: the result of that strange union between a Taurus and a woman is a monster called the Minotaur ... maybe a first allusion to the Turkish difficulties to integrate European Union?).

This is the first occurrence of the name "Europe" in the occidental culture. We can notice that Turkey figures a border, a barbarian territory, excluded from civilization. In fact, during the Antiquity, the name Europe designate the countries of the north of Mediterranean Sea...we also could notice that it characterises territories, and not a political entity.

The idea of Europe as a political entity is a bit more recent and dates from the Second century of our era: the Roman Empire is maybe the first European political structure, covering the whole of the Mediterranean basin. It is the time of the *pax romana*, and during that time, a specific culture is raising within the Roman Empire, based on Greek philosophy and Jewish religion: the Christianity. This new religion, born in Palestine – a part of the Roman Empire – will conquer the entire subcontinent, even the north of the African continent in 300 years. Christianity will rapidly establish itself as an administration, first religious, then, civilian, a sort of bureaucracy. And when, at the Fifth century, the barbaric invasions are destructing the political structure of the Roman Empire... the religion

remains, and for two or three dark centuries, the Church – will be the only power able to preserve a culture, a bunch of laws and a tradition inherited from the Roman Empire and given – as a political gift – to the barbaric kingdoms.

In the year 800, Charlemagne becomes, with the help of Church, the new emperor of occidental Europe: exactly, the *Pater europae* (founding father of Europe)... He is the first to receive papa coronation as Emperor of the Roman. The Carolingian empire, during the Eighth century, is, moreover, an attempt to revive the Roman Empire: a successful attempt. His reign will be short, but founder and remains in the memory of the Europeans as a second attempt of territorial and political unity, based on a political model – the empire – and a religious model – the Christianity.

So **the imperial model is defined**: for centuries, it will be the only kind of political structure at European scale. During the middle and the modern ages, the Holy Roman Empire – supported by the Church and the Holly See – embodied the only way to unify Europeans.

But in the Sixteenth century, the dream, made by the emperor Charles the Fifth, to unify under his own rule the entire continent – and recreate a “roman like” empire – comes up against a lot of new obstacles:

- The division / schism between Catholics and Protestants is ruining the religious unity and the power of the Church
- The division between French monarchy and German empire is ruining the possibility of a whole European empire

It is a crisis: a political crisis, a religious crisis, and the European idea is sinking, except when a Turkish invader tries to conquer territories in the subcontinent. A fact we can underline. In the modern ages, as in the medieval ages, the only way to unite Europeans and stop internal wars is the call for crusade against Muslims (called “God peace”)... The numerous battles and wars between Europeans and Ottomans – from Turkish Empire – defined, again and again, the borders of Christendom... which are, from now on, the borders of Europe!

But let’s come back to the political question. The possibility of a real European empire, straighten by catholic faith is over: the other way to build Europe is the maintaining of peace. In fact, that is also an inheritance of the ancient “pax romana,” the roman peace.

But from the Seventeenth century, the theoreticians of a European unification are searching a new political and philosophical model, able to preserve the balance of powers, religions. Within those intellectuals, the lawyer Johannes Althusius (1557-1638) is the

II 講演

inventor of the principle of subsidiarity, the heart of the federal link. The principle of a European federation becomes – slightly – apparent. In the same way, in 1693, William Penn facing the devastation of war in Europe, is calling for a European parliament, to prevent further war, without defining how such an institution would fit in to the political reality of Europe at the time (we could notice that the European idea is more enduring in war times than in peace times). In 1713, a priest, Charles de Saint Pierre, proposed the creation of a European league of 18 sovereign states, with common treasury, no borders and an economic union. A project taken up by the philosophers of the Enlightenment: Montesquieu, the great French philosopher and Immanuel Kant in 1795, with his proposal for an “eternal peace congress”. **Europe became a utopia...**

The federative solution needs however some practical enforcement! And yet there is another political model, far away: the American model. In 1787, the creation of the United States of America, after the American war of independence offers proof that a democratic government is possible. The vision of a United States of Europe similar to the United States of America was shared by a few prominent Europeans, notably Lafayette (the “two worlds hero”) and Thaddeus Kosciusko.

But the empire – the imperial model – will strike back during the Napoleonic era and the French emperor, Napoleon 1st, introduced himself as the successor of Charlemagne and the Carolingian empire... The Roman model, again and again, which survives up to now... As the Italian philosopher Carlo Cattaneo said: *“The ocean is rough and whirling, and the currents go to two possible endings: the autocrat, or the United States of Europe.”* Indeed, we will see the Third Reich and the Nazi dream – rather a nightmare – as the ultimate attempt to impose the imperial model in Europe. **The bloody failure of the imperial model in 1815 and 1945 is a part of the political culture of the Europeans, a dark one.**

The result – after centuries of conflicts – is that the federalist model wins... In the Nineteenth century, philosophers and politicians are all in favor of such a solution. Moreover, we could consider that the Vienna congress – in 1815, which concludes the Napoleonic wars – is an attempt of a European cooperation between the powers: the so-called “concert of nations” is organizing, in Europe, the first congress of all powers, to discuss of political and economical matters.

Europe as a political matter

The first Nineteenth century is rich in theoreticians of a European structure. Europe is becoming a political object, discussed in parliaments, in the academies, in the newspapers. The modernization of the political life, the development of the constitutions in the

European countries during the revolutionary wave of 1848 – the year of “the spring of the peoples” – all those new political phenomenon favored the politicization of the Europeans... and a peaceful Europe, after the Napoleonic wars, is a good goal for political debates.

The best example takes place in 1849 by the French poet and politician – maybe the fact that he was in the same time a poet and a politician, is an explanation – Victor Hugo, who is calling for 'United States of Europe' during a speech at the International Peace Congress, organised by Mazzini, held in Paris in 1849. Hugo favoured the creation of “*a supreme, sovereign senate, which will be to Europe what parliament, is to England*” and said “*A day will come when all nations on our continent will form a European brotherhood... A day will come when we shall see... the United States of America and the United States of Europe face to face, reaching out for each other across the seas.*”

But as a political project, The united states of Europe are also discussed, claimed by the new political forces : the anarchist M. Bakunin, father of anarchism, just said in 1867, during the 1st congress of the League of Peace and Freedom, “*That in order to achieve the triumph of liberty, justice and peace in the international relations of Europe, and to render civil war impossible among the various peoples which make up the European family, only a single course lies open: to constitute the United States of Europe*”. I wonder know what is the united states of Europe for an anarchist? In contrast Trotsky in 1923 raised the slogan “for a Soviet United States of Europe”, the dream of a communist Europe.

The Twentieth century: the era of the activists

The European project will, however, benefit of the war, the first one, the great one: the catastrophe of the Great War offers the proof, for a lot of Europeans intellectuals, that Europe must be more than a political utopia, a banality for the speeches of congresses. Paul Valéry, a major French thinker, says, for example: “*We later civilizations ... we too know that we are mortal.*” (“Crisis of the mind,’ 1919).

In the same text, he gives us a fine summary of the European mind after that war : “*And in the same disorder of mind, at the summons of the same anguish, all cultivated Europe underwent the rapid revival of her innumerable ways of thought: dogmas, philosophies, heterogeneous ideals; the three hundred ways of explaining the World, the thousand and one versions of Christianity, the two dozen kinds of positivism; the whole spectrum of intellectual light spread out its incompatible colours, illuminating with a strange and contradictory glow the death agony of the European soul. While inventors were feverishly searching their imaginations and the annals of former wars for the means of doing away with barbed wire, of outwitting submarines or paralyzing the flight of*

II 講演

airplanes, her soul was intoning at the same time all the incantations it ever knew, and giving serious consideration to the most bizarre prophecies; she sought refuge, guidance, consolation throughout the whole register of her memories, past acts, and ancestral attitudes. Such are the known effects of anxiety, the disordered behaviour of mind fleeing from reality to nightmare and from nightmare back to reality, terrified, like a rat caught in a trap..."

In a second letter, Valéry summarized the fears of all the Europeans: *"But can the European Mind – or at least its most precious content – be totally diffused? Must such phenomena as democracy, the exploitation of the globe, and the general spread of technology, all of which presage a deminutio capitis (loss of influence) for Europe...must these be taken as absolute decisions of fate? Or have we some freedom against this threatening conspiracy of things?"*

The Versailles Treaty of 1919 and the League of Nations is a first, imperfect, attempt to raise a European parliament: a place of discussion, with an international court of justice (visionary too and still active). The reasons of its failure are well known, but we must underline the great hope led by that achievement.

So the Twentieth century is the century of the campaigners, activists of the European cause. Men and women: from 1918, Louise Weiss, a French intellectual, publish a European review, "New Europe" to promote peace among enemies of yesterday, in the name of the European idea. One of the most ambitious campaigners is the Austrian count Coudenhove-Kalergi, father of the Pan-Europa movement in 1922. He wants to promote the Franco-German conciliation by the creation – 1st step – of a Franco-German authority for metallurgical industry, and then, a customs union, and, finally, a common parliament, a common citizenship, a military alliance and common money...

This visionary project is maybe too ambitious for that time, so it is a failure. But the political authorities are taking hold of the idea, as a response to the decline of the European power. In 1930, the French prime minister, Aristide Briand presents a European memorandum to the League of nations, about the organization of a system of European Federal Union... a visionary memorandum, which put the emphasis on the economical links. The same projects are also developed by major European politicians as Edouard Herriot (1931), Arthur Salter (1933), Josef Pilsudski or Gustav Stresemann. And if the Briand project is still a utopian vision, it became the utopia of a statesman: a good omen. With various name (United States, Mitteleuropa...), Europe as a political, democratic structure raised by economical bonds becomes a main topic in the post war Europe.

Even during the Second World War, the European project is the subject of discussions, within the Axis forces and within the Allied forces... except that for the Nazis, it is more a pattern of propaganda than a real conviction. On two occasions (1940 and 1943), the Reich

is planning a European confederation, a “European economic community”, with a customs union and fixed internal exchange rates... and Berlin as political head. The proposition concerns all the invaded countries and the axis powers... and has found followers even in defeated France... Europe may be an illusion too, but a dangerous one.

On the other side of the hill, in the Resistance, there is also a European project, developed in France, Italy, and United Kingdom...

We, yet, could notice, in the Free French Movement, led by Charles de Gaulle, the influence of one of the future founding fathers of EU, Jean Monnet. In 1941, a great French politician, Léon Blum, publish – in hiding – *At human scale*, some thoughts on European integration as a peace factor. In the same time, in Italy, in 1941, the Ventotene Manifesto (the name come from the island of Ventotene), written by Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi will inspire the foundation, in Milan, in august 1943, of the European Federal Movement (MFE). Italian Resistance fighter are convinced that “*if a post war order is established in which each State retains its complete national sovereignty, the basis for a Third World War would still exist even after the Nazi attempt to establish the domination of the German race in Europe has been frustrated.*”

In London, the Polish government-in-exile proposed the idea of Central European union. The talks with Czechoslovakia were already quite advanced, but negotiations died a natural death once Czechs decided to rely more on Soviet Union promises. Also in England, in 1942, Winston Churchill, write a memorandum about United states of Europe, an idea picked up again in September 1946 in Zurich, where the great prime minister will call for a symbolic “European family”... And in 1944, the forces of the Resistance of the whole continent are meeting at Geneva (Switzerland) to prepare a common declaration on the subject.

The second part of the Twentieth century is the time of the founding fathers: the political values of EU are already defined. The time of the construction is coming. From 1945, we could say that the genetic code of Europe is ready, and that it is a democratic one: as the Copenhagen summit said, the identity of EU is a set of values, built by a long history, and centuries of disasters and wars. In the same way, the French historian Pierre Nora noticed, in an article dedicated on the memory places of EU, that “*the idea of a European decline, the WW and the struggle against authoritarianism are the real matrix of European identity.*”

The question of the Christian roots

This question is far more difficult: there is not a consensus between Europeans about this subject. In a first time, I will use history, not to answer, but to propose a point of view.

The Christian roots are there really an historical question?

We have seen that Church has played a role in the birth of the European idea, and, until the Nineteenth century, Europe, as a territory, is linked with Christendom. From the Christianization of the Roman Empire, under the reign of Emperor Constantine (321) to the destruction of the Holy Roman Empire by Napoleon in 1803, the religion plays a major role in the European institutions, preserving the legal heritage of the Roman Empire, inspiring humanism and guaranteeing royal authority with rituals (the absolute monarchy, later theorized by Bodin and Hobbes). The international laws are born in an ecclesiastical framework, with the Spanish school of international law (Vitoria, Suarez...). Even when Europeans are split into Catholic and Protestant, and suffered religion wars, the conscience of being citizens of Christendom, confronted to the Ottoman Empire (Turkey at present) is real. In fact, the religious question inspired – with the Westphalia treaty of 1648 – the first attempt to create a European community of states. As the German author Goethe said once, *“Europe was born in a pilgrimage, and Christianity is its mother language.”* Undeniably, Christian roots are a historical reality... but not the only one, and the European civilization has much more roots.

On this last point, the European (or not) historians are all agree. For the great historian Paul Veyne, specialist of the Roman Empire, the present Europe is democratic, secular, liberal, in favour of feminism, sexual freedom, socialism... some values which are far away from Catholicism... The Christian ethics is a forgotten legacy, and maybe the other roots of Europe could be the philosophy of Kant and Spinoza, the Enlightenment and the French Revolution... If there are Christian roots, it is among a lot of other sources: in the story of a civilization, religion is a consideration among powers, institutions, traditions and its influence on the European way of life is limited.

The historian and Israeli diplomat Eli Barnavi is also convinced that Christian roots are a reality, that Christianity is one of the bedrocks of Europe... not the only one. And in an interview (January 2006), he also noticed that the fact that Europe has Christian roots doesn't mean that Europe must remain Christian...

From another point of view, the expression “Christian roots” could refer to the political background of the Founding fathers. We notice that a lot of European project, developed by

campaigners as Coudenhove Kalergi, are based on a Christian vision of Europe, as Christendom (as it is claimed during the first Pan-European congress, held in Vienna in 1926). More important, the founding fathers of EU – Alcide de Gasperi, Robert Schumann, Conrad Adenauer, Paul van Zeeland... – belong to the Christian democrat party... and their political opponents call them – and their projects – the “pontifical Europe”. Robert Schumann, French foreign minister and the father of the CECA, said, for example: “*All the European countries have been moulded by the Christian civilization: this is the soul of Europe we have to revive... the Gospel is the matrix of the culture and institutions in Europe.*”

We should also notice the role of the Holy See, from the end of the Nineteenth century and the encyclicals *Inter sollicitudinis*, *Rerum Novarum*, which recognized some political and social aspects of modernity. More relevant, the international strategy of the Holy See at the end of 2nd WW consists in defending systematically the Christian civilization against communism. The Church accepts the federal idea for Europe. And in 1948, pope Pie XII sent a representative off to the European Congress of La Haye (Den Haag): the members of the Catholic Church keep up the project of European integration for economical, political and military reasons. For Pie XII, the danger is the growing expansion of communism. The Christian Democrats are also convinced that only a united Europe, supported by America, could resist to the soviet ambitions.

Even the symbol of EU refers to religion and Christian roots: the flag, blue with a golden crown of 12 stars, created in 1986, could refer to an element of the Christian symbolic, the crown of the Blessed Virgin, and the blue colour could also refer to the colour of the coat of the same Blessed Virgin... a slight sign of the Democrat-Christian origin of the founding fathers. And in the late 60's, the Council of Europe had to find a European day... among the 3 propositions, there was the Saint Benedict Day (11th of July) because Benedict had been nominated by the pope Pie XI as “father and patron saint” of Europe.

Is it a political question?

All these facts are important, in the debates, and the drafting of *the Constitutional Treaty of the European Union*. It shows that the real question is not an historical one: probably it is a political question, raised during the debates about *the Constitutional Treaty* in 2004.

On 15 December 2001, the European Council, meeting in Laeken, decided to convoke a Convention on the Future of Europe, which decided in turn to draft a constitutional treaty. After undergoing some amendments following the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC), the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe was adopted by the European Council in Rome on 29 October 2004.

II 講演

But one of the most discussed texts was the preamble. In 2003, the drafting of the preamble of the Constitutional project provoked very sharp discussions in Europe. The problem was to claim, or not, Christian roots in that preamble.

Why not?

The opponents are hostile to a mention that shows an influence and can drive the European Union to a close relation with Church... The accusation of “clericalism” – the political power exerted by Church – has been evoked. My theory is that the preamble is not the very heart of the problem... because the same discussion has occurred for the first time in the drafting of the preamble of *the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union* (Nice, 7 December 2000), and the solution, adopted by the commission, was a very neutral formulation :

Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law.

So the problem is elsewhere, probably in a re-emergent anticlericalism. Because the project of Constitution concerns a major aspect of the Union: the separation between religious and political fields. This is the really problem, hidden behind the question of the Christian roots. For the opponents and for the Church itself, the article 1-51, paragraph 3, the status of the Churches can lead to collaboration, even a form of influence of the Church in the European affairs (and legislation)

Recognising their identity and their specific contribution, the Union shall maintain an open, transparent and regular dialogue with these churches and organizations.

That paragraph had been probably misinterpreted in June 2002 by the COMECE (Commission of the episcopacies of the European Union) as an agreement, a promise of cooperation between the European commission and the COMECE. An interpretation taken up again by Pope John Paul II in *Ecclesia in Europa* (2003)

In carrying out their functions the various national and European institutions should act in the awareness that their juridical systems will be fully respectful of democracy, if they provide for forms of “healthy cooperation” with Churches and religious organizations.

For the opponents, in the tradition of Spinoza, the European Union has to preserve its neutrality towards the spiritual convictions and involvements. This neutrality is a guarantee of religious freedom. In this discussion, the comparison with the specific status of the Holy See at the UNO, a status denounced and criticized by some countries, played a

sharp role. And the claim, from the Holy See, to be involved in the elaboration of the European law, is – at least – clumsy, and questionable.

So why?

For the supporters of Christian roots, it was originally the recognizing of a major, predominant influence on history, culture and habits. John Paul II – a “son of Poland” as he used to introduce him – and Benedict XVI – a “son of Germany” as he introduced him later – are two deep supporters of European Union.

In his apostolic exhortation *Ecclesia in Europa* (2003), one of the major pontifical texts about Europe, pope John Paul II talk about a “spiritual vocation” of Europe:

There can be no doubt that the Christian faith belongs, in a radical and decisive way, to the foundations of European culture. Christianity in fact has shaped Europe, impressing upon it certain basic values. Modern Europe itself, which has given the democratic ideal and human rights to the world, draws its values from its Christian heritage. More than a geographical area, Europe can be described as “a primarily cultural and historical concept, which denotes a reality born as a continent thanks also to the unifying force of Christianity, which has been capable of integrating peoples and cultures among themselves, and which is intimately linked to the whole of European culture.

This claim accompany a real European program: after noticing that with the enlargement of Europe, the European union seems to suffer from a profound crisis of values, John Paul II suggest to give new impetus to Europe’s history, by putting into practice the ecclesiastical principles of subsidiarity and solidarity. But for that result,

Europe must “recognize and reclaim with creative fidelity those fundamental values, acquired through a decisive contribution of Christianity, which can be summarized in the affirmation of the transcendent dignity of the human person, the value of reason, freedom, democracy, the constitutional state and the distinction between political life and religion.”

And as a conclusion for this real European prayer, John Paul II gives his own vision of the European Union, a spiritual and political vision:

In the process of the continent’s integration, it is of capital importance to remember that the union will lack substance if it is reduced to its merely geographic and economic dimensions; rather, it must consist above all in an agreement about the values which must find expression in its law and in its life.

(And also : *This dialogue should aim at building a Europe seen as a community of peoples and individuals, a community joined together in hope, not exclusively subject to the law of the*

II 講演

marketplace but resolutely determined to safeguard the dignity of the human person also in social and economic relations.)

This is a direct reference to an old text written some months before the Maastricht Treaty (1992) that shows us that the Holy See feels itself constantly involved in the European integration, despite the fact it is not a part of the European Union.

In a Europe which is proceeding towards political unity can we accept that the very Church of Christ is a factor of division and discord? (Homily at the Ecumenical Celebration for the First Special Assembly for Europe of the Synod of Bishops, 7 December 1991.)

In the debate, the Holy See has increased the number of speeches, rituals, books to defend the claiming of Christian roots. A real political campaign... The campaign started in 2001, with a common declaration, in Athens in May 2001, at the Areopagus from Pope John Paul II and Christodoulos, Archbishop of Athens and All Greece. A common declaration of the orthodox and catholic authorities is a rare event, supposed to strike the public opinion of Europe.

We rejoice at the success and progress of the European Union. The union of the European world in one civil entity, without her people losing their national self-awareness, traditions and identity, has been the vision of its pioneers. However, the emerging tendency to transform certain European countries into secular states without any reference to religion constitutes a retraction and a denial of their spiritual legacy. We are called to intensify our efforts so that the unification of Europe may be accomplished. We shall do everything in our power, so that the Christian roots of Europe and its Christian soul may be preserved inviolate.

In the same way, a symposium on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of *Pacem in Terris*, one of the major papers of the 2nd council of the Vatican organised by the Spanish Episcopal Conference was held in Madrid on the 20th of November 2003. Peace, human rights, and European identity were some of the main themes of the congress. Cardinal Paul Poupard spoke about the Christian Roots of Europe, and explained why the future European Constitution should make explicit reference to these roots. *"I do not believe in the future of a Europe that abandons Christ and tries to go it alone."* A strong position!

Among a lot of speeches referring to Christian roots, I will present you some of them : For example, a letter to cardinal Schönborn, archbishop of Vienna, on the occasion of the day of Central European Catholics in 2003, where John Paul II said :

The common journey towards the future will be all the easier once Europeans remember their Christian roots and in them find the parameters for their social and political action. Europe urgently needs to recover its Christian identity and live it anew; only then will it be able to communicate to

the world the values on which peace among peoples, social justice and international solidarity are founded.

The reference to Christian Democrat at first, then to a Christian identity – a word which is stronger than “roots”, and a bit exclusive, is interesting for us. It shows the way the Holy See interpret the challenges of the Christian roots, even the proper notion of “roots”. We could also quote the Angelus, for example the Angelus of October 2003:

For her part, the Catholic Church is convinced that the Gospel of Christ, which has been a unifying element of the European peoples for many centuries should be and continue to be today too an inexhaustible source of spirituality and fraternity. Taking note of this is for the benefit of all, and an explicit recognition of the Christian roots of Europe in the Treaty represents the principle guarantee for the continent’s future.

Another great pontifical text about the question of the Christian roots is the conference of the cardinal Martino, from the pontifical council “Justice and Peace”, in January 2003, about the European values. Taking up the ideas of John Paul II, the cardinal Martino put the emphasis on the role of the Christianity of the founding fathers (Robert Schumann, Konrad Adenauer, Alcide De Gasperi), quoting a papal letter to the bishops (6 January, 1984). But this text is more interesting for us, because, in the same time, card. Martino is enquiring about the status of the Church in the new constitution... Maybe the defence of the Christian roots could be – from the pontifical point of view – also the sign of a special fear of the secularist tendencies in Europe... and not only a claim to play a larger role in the European works..

This is also the opinion of Benedict XVI... and a tradition in pontifical diplomacy:

Likewise, peace is rooted in respect for religious freedom, which is a fundamental and primordial aspect of the freedom of conscience of individuals and of the freedom of peoples. (Address to new ambassadors, 18 may 2006)

Conclusion

Finally, the project has not been drafted in the specific sense of the Christian roots:

Drawing inspiration from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, from which have developed the universal values of the inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law... (Preamble, The Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, 2004.)

II 講演

And in May 2005, the French citizens reject the project by 55% of No to the constitutional referendum. A brutal conclusion for the discussion, which does not re-emerge in the drafting of the Lisbon treaty, signed the 13th December of 2007.

But ironically, it remains a political discussion: in France for example, President Sarkozy is in favor of these Christian roots, and in a speech in Germany, in December 2008, he considered that the withdrawal of this mention from the constitutional project was an error and a denial. But his predecessor, president Chirac, was opposed to the Christian roots...

There is, here, a duel between two memories and histories, two visions of the European Union... as Benedict XVI has understood.

Benedict XVI and the Christian roots: Europe as a modern Christendom

Pope Benedict XVI has also largely developed the question: more than his predecessor, he is a European, convinced that the Church has a role to play. For example, his speech in the Clementine Hall of the Vatican, the 26th January of 2006, evokes a "spiritual heritage" and the necessity, for Europeans, to rediscover their Christian roots.

His particular connection with the European history (as John Paul II, he lived, children, in a dictatorship and, like a majority of his German fellow citizens, he has a guilty conscience about the history of his country) explain his specific vision of Europe. In his proper texts, he calls for a purification of the memory (as John Paul II called for a purification of the hearts) prior to a real European Union.

For my part, I come from a Country where peace and brotherhood are treasured by all the inhabitants, especially those who, like myself, lived through the war and the separation of brothers and sisters belonging to the same Nation because of destructive and inhuman ideologies that, beneath a mask of dreams and illusions, burdened men and women with the heavy yoke of oppression. Thus, you will understand that I am particularly sensitive to dialogue between all human beings in order to overcome every kind of conflict and tension and to make our earth an earth of peace and brotherhood. ... (Address to the members of the diplomatic body, 12 May 2005.)

In the question of the Turkish candidacy to European Union, Benedict XVI has also a specific position (a moderate opposition) and we could conceive that in the papal conception, the European Union, as a Christian community, is called for the propagation of values and for the dialogue with others religious traditions (a cautious ecumenicalism...).

In our uncertain and troubled world, Europe can become a witness and messenger of the necessary dialogue between cultures and religions. Indeed, the history of the Old Continent, deeply marked by divisions and fratricidal wars but also by its efforts to overcome them, invites it to carry

out this mission as a response to the expectations of so many men and women in many countries of the world who are still aspiring to development, democracy and religious freedom. (Address to the new ambassador of Bulgaria, 13 May 2006.)

In this conception, European Union is, in the same way, a modern Christendom and a link, with Arab world... The third way?

3. 質疑応答

石川（国際文化学研究所） 2点質問がある。1点目はロシアをどう捉えるのか。講演ではトルコとヨーロッパを対比させていたが、ロシアとの比較も歴史的には古い。正教会との関係、また将来的なロシアの EU への参加の如何についてどう思うか。2点目は、ヨーロッパ史を帝国モデルから連邦モデルという形で整理されていたが、その間には国民国家モデルが挿入されるだろう。ヨーロッパ統合と国民国家モデル、あるいはナショナリズムとの関係についてご意見を伺いたい。ヨーロッパ統合の進展につれて、それに反発するナショナルな動きが各地で高まるという状況もある。

フェラギョ 1点目からお答えしたい。確かに正教会とカトリックの間には千年以上の対立がある。しかしヨーロッパに関して言えば、ギリシア正教会の役割に注目すべきだ。バチカンにはロシア正教会ではなくギリシア正教会を通して正教会との関係改善を行っている。これは史上初めてのことで、なぜギリシア正教会が相手かと言えば、現在のロシア正教会は政治化している側面があるからだ。

次に2点目だが、国民国家モデルについて言えば、かつてド・ゴールは国民国家を単位としたヨーロッパ統合を考えていたが、これは現時点では実現可能性がない。またフランスで言えば国民戦線（FN）のように国家主権の護持を唱えてヨーロッパ統合に反対する政党は確かに存在するが、小国を除けば選挙で勝つことはない。じっさいヨーロッパ統合に敵対的な諸政党はヨーロッパ統合に向けた条約の批准に反対したが、統合プロセス自体を覆すまでには至らなかった。少なくとも現時点では、例えばフランスではヨーロッパ統合支持が多数派となっている。問題はどのようなヨーロッパを構想するかにある。

また地域主義について付け加えると、ヨーロッパ統合は地域（region）に権限を委譲する大きなチャンスだ。それはフランスのような中央集権型の国家にもあてはまる。なおロシアが EU 加盟については、ロシア側は望んでいるかもしれないが、政治的な統合は不可能だろうと考える。もちろん経済的に重要なパートナーであることには変わりはない。

II 講演

坂井（国際文化学研究科） バルカン半島のムスリム（アルバニア、ボスニアなど）が EU 市民になることは、EU にとっては既定路線だろうが、加盟する側にとっての問題はないのだろうか。

フェラギユ EU 市民の 8 割は確かにキリスト教世界に属している。ここでの問題は宗教的というよりも、歴史、政治、宗教などの諸要素が入り交じった混合的な状況にあると言える。バルカン半島の住民はオスマン帝国が支配する以前はキリスト教徒だった歴史もある。今がムスリムだからといって困難な要素だけではない。興味深いのはアルメニア人の位置づけだろう。宗教はカトリックだが、政治的にはロシアと結びつきがある。

大学院生（文学研究科） ヨーロッパの「宗教的統合」の議論に関連して、カトリックとプロテスタントの関係はどうなっているのか。

フェラギユ まずプロテスタントには中心となる機構が存在していない。つまりカトリックと異なりプロテスタント「全体」や「単一の」見解も存在しない。2 つ目として、プロテスタントは歴史的に見て政治から距離をとるという事実がある。

参加者 ヨーロッパの「第 3 の道」とヨーロッパの宗教的統合との関係がよくわからなかったのだが。

フェラギユ 私が言う「第 3 の道」とは、バチカンの働きに見られるようなキリスト教世界の意味だ。ただし、それは他に対して閉じられたキリスト教世界ではなく、他の宗教にも開かれた形での「キリスト教世界」でなければならない。

内田（国際文化学研究科） ヨーロッパとキリスト教とのつながりを知識人層や政治家ではなく、一般の人々はどう捉えているのか。狭い意味でヨーロッパ＝キリスト教世界と考えるならばトルコの EU 加盟は困難だ。他方で現在は EU 各国でムスリムの人口が増えており、事実として多文化主義が存在する。したがって EU がカナダやオーストラリア型の多文化主義を採用するならば、もちろん国家の成り立ちが異なるので同列には論じられないとはいえ、トルコの EU 加盟の道はあるだろう。そのあたりをどう考えるか。

フェラギユ もちろんヨーロッパ市民がすべてカトリック信者でもキリスト教徒というわけでもない。世俗主義の伝統はかなり根強いものがある。トルコの EU 加盟問題は EU にとって難しい問題だが、同時に中東と再びつながる大きなチャンスでもある。ただしトルコ加盟を支持する意見が、例えばフランスで多数派を占めることができないのは、一つに

は政治的側面、具体的には人口の問題がある。EU に加盟すれば、トルコの人口はドイツに次いで2番目となることについて抵抗があるからだろう。

フランスの例を続けるが、ブルカの着用を巡る議論がムスリムの社会的統合という問題と結びつけられていることもある。こうした議論が「イスラームは危険」だとか「ムスリムはテロリスト」といったステレオタイプと結びつくことで、トルコが世俗国家であるにもかかわらず、加盟を支持する動きがなかなか高まらない原因にもなっている。

もう一つ付け加えると、米国がトルコ加盟を支持していることが一つの障害になっている。頭ごなしに意見を押し付けられていると感じることが、フランスの中での反米感情と結びついてトルコ加盟が支持されない側面はある。

三浦（国際文化学研究所） 古代ローマとヨーロッパをつなげた議論はどちらかと言えば地中海文明という枠組みの議論ではないか。ヨーロッパ文明の起源ということであれば、12世紀にイスラーム世界とヨーロッパ世界が分かれたことが重要になるように思われる。

フェラギユ 歴史的にはご指摘の通りだが、事実として、ローマ帝国はヨーロッパ人の間に「ヨーロッパ」というリアリティの一部として機能している。また歴史的に見ても、ヨーロッパの政体などにはローマ帝国からいわば相続した部分がある。この点でもやはりローマ帝国と現代のヨーロッパの間にはある種の連続性があると言えるだろう。