

A Tale of Two Peoples: *Introduction*

Robert Royal

This book explores two delicate questions. First, it examines the ongoing ups and downs in the relationships of Christians—particularly Catholics—and Jews. As we near the end of the twentieth century (and nearly fifty years after the Holocaust) those relationships are, perhaps, better than at any time in our common history. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews meet regularly in a variety of forums (especially in the United States and Europe) to support one another and discuss mutual problems. These contacts have not produced unanimity any more than the conversations among various denominations within Christianity or among the several groups within each denomination have reached agreement at every point. Yet Christians and Jews have discovered a common root and interest living within what are now aggressively secular societies that call for greater efforts from all religious people in finding a delicate balance between profound respect for one another and frank fidelity to their individual traditions.¹

¹As Rabbi David Novak has often pointed out, dialogue is far easier between professed Jews and professed Christians, than in a falsely “ecumenical” atmosphere in which no one says what he truly believes or is, therefore, willing to engage the other in his or her fullness. (Unfortunately, Novak’s very fine remarks on Jewish/Christian relations delivered at the Georgetown University conference in the fall of 1991 that was the occasion for most of the essays in this volume could not be included here.) For another recent Jewish attempt to grapple seriously with questions that divide Jews and Christians, see Jacob Neusner, *A Rabbi Talks with Jesus: An Intermillennial, Interfaith Exchange* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1993).

But there is a second delicate question that emerges from these essays: the role of Jacques Maritain in defining a new Catholic understanding of the Jewish people and their mission in the world. Maritain was a central figure in the development of doctrine that received official endorsement at the Second Vatican Council with the promulgation of the document *Nostra Aetate*. Vittorio Possenti's essay, translated here for the first time in English, describes both the evolution of Maritain's thought and his efforts as French ambassador to the Holy See (long before Vatican II) to prepare the ground for precisely such a statement. In fact, Maritain argued in favor of even more forceful formulations condemning anti-Semitism and promoting respect for the Jewish people than were finally adopted by the Council. For example, he supported a clause stating: "The Church condemns (Lat., *damnat*) hatreds and persecutions of the Jews." In the final text, *damnat* (a word usually applied to heretics) was changed to *deplorat*, i.e., "deplores." Maritain's influence led to a major victory, but one that he wished would have gone even further.²

Yet Maritain probably never held at any time in his life views that would be entirely beyond controversy in the current Jewish/Christian dialogue. As Rabbi Leon Klenicki and John Hellman, two admirers of Maritain in general, argue in their contributions, Maritain believed when he made his first efforts to analyze Jewish issues that some forms of public restriction (a *numerus clausus*) on what he called disproportionate Jewish influence in certain social sectors might be justifiable in a Christian society. Maritain is clear from the very first that the traditional hatred toward Jews should be given no quarter in Christian circles; he even urges an affection for the elder race among the peoples of the Book.³ When the Nazi monster reared its ugly head, he unequivocally denounced the invidious racial nonsense directed toward the Jews (according to Ramon Sugranyes de Franch, that stance and his opposition to Spanish fascism earned for Maritain vile attacks from the extreme right for years after the war). In his later

²On this history and for a good general overview of the development of Maritain's views on these issues, see Bernard Doering's "The Jewish Question," in his *Jacques Maritain and the French Catholic Intellectuals* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983), 126–67.

³See in particular the notes to his 1921 lecture "*À propos de la question juive*," Jacques et Raïssa Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires; Paris: Édition Saint Paul, 1982–1993) vol. 3, 1196–97.

writing, Maritain moved toward his well-known vision of an integral humanism within a secular state; that type of society would place no limits on participation by any individual or group, while at the same time retaining certain universal principles derived from Jewish and Christian thought.

For some of the writers in this volume, however, traces of disturbing or anti-Semitic attitudes remain in Maritain to the very end. Rabbi Klenicki, for example, examines strands in the Jewish theological tradition that make any easy opposition of the putative Jewish reliance on the Law and the Christian dependence on Grace difficult to maintain. Maritain would doubtless have welcomed this clarification as one of the fruits of that very increased respect and knowledge of one another that he fervently desired.

John Hellman traces the contours of anti-Semitism in France during the first decades of this century and its influence on Maritain. Léon Bloy, George Bernanos, Paul Claudel, and—to a much lesser extent—Maritain did display some traits we would classify as anti-Semitic today and Hellman's insistence that we not lose sight of these features is a useful addition to the historical picture. Yet some of his more bald assertions should be read together with essays such as William Bush's complex analysis of Bloy and Vittorio Possenti's careful exposition of Maritain's career. Possenti reminds us, for example, that as early as 1908 Maritain was no longer under the spell of Bloy's *Le Salut par les Juifs*;⁴ and Bush, from a very different perspective, show why Maritain refers so little to Bloy throughout his work. This whole period of Christian-Jewish relations in France calls for deeper and more extensive study.⁵

In addition to the essays by Klenicki and Hellman that underscore what some people still see as disturbing elements in Maritain, others are included here who argue for a much more positive reading of a gradual enlargement of Maritain's intellectual vision and human sympathies. Michael Novak, James V. Schall, S.J., Bernard Doering,

⁴See, for example, note 5 in the Possenti essay. Maritain writes to a priest: "I would not undertake the reprinting of this book [i.e., *Le Salut par les Juifs*] whose obscurity once seemed to me full of profundity."

⁵John Hellman has recently published a volume expanding on his harsh criticism of Catholic anti-Semitism, *The Knight-Monks of Vichy France* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993).

Msgr. John M. Oesterreicher, and Ramon Sugranyes de Franch present analyses and personal testimonies of Maritain's influence. Raymond Dennehy even argues that moderate realism, as it exists in Aristotle, Aquinas, and Maritain, makes racist anti-Semitism literally unthinkable for Maritain. While each of these authors makes a unique argument, there is a certain repetition in the sources on which they draw. I have let these repetitions stand so that the interested reader may see the diverse interpretations that exist about Maritain's work on the Jews, even among those who praise him highly and agree on the key texts to be examined in his *oeuvre*.

It is tempting for the editor of this volume to try to resolve these disputes beforehand, tempting and also impossible since I can claim no monopoly on insight into Maritain's thought and actions. Some of the disputed questions in the following essays may eventually be resolved. Others will probably remain controversial in light of the developing dialogue between Christians and Jews. In significant ways, failure to reach total agreement does not matter. We have now moved on to a stage in that dialogue that, I believe, Maritain would have approved of and perhaps anticipated. What lies beyond dispute, however, is that if we wish to identify the preeminent Catholic figure among the various popes, clerics, and lay persons who over the last century have contributed to the creation of the new engagement of Christians and Jews, it would be difficult to find a more appropriate name than that of Jacques Maritain.

Personal Relationships and Their Meanings

The development of Maritain's thought on the Jewish people did not take place in a vacuum. In fact, he met daily at home living witnesses to the Jewish tradition: his wife Raïssa (née Oumançoff) and her sister Vera, both of Russian Jewish lineage. One of the most touching passages in all of Maritain's work describes Raïssa:

In her passion for concrete certitude, in her respect for wisdom and her love for justice, in her unshakable good humor and her readiness to question, as in the ardor of her blood and the precision of her instinct, everywhere she carries about with her the nobility and privilege of the race from whom she comes, of that Elder Race, to whom God entrusted Himself and who contemplated his angels, who alone is at home in heaven, alone the depository of the promise, is at home everywhere on the earth, will perish only when the world does, and who has the right to consider all

other peoples as guests, but late-comers, in its patrimony, as uncultured and without a past, heirs of the Lord by adoption, not by birth. *Puella hebraeorum!* Her native pride marches before her; I have heard Jews declaim on the purity of her type. *Ecce vera Israelita, in qua dolus non est.*

And he credits both sisters with the “same quickness of mind, that same delicate sensitivity, an almost airy perceptivity.”⁶

In a sensitive and penetrating reading of the life and writing of Raïssa Maritain, Astrid M. O’Brien explicates the ways in which the Hasidism of Raïssa’s Russian forbears and the spirituality of Catholic mystics were united in Raïssa. Professor O’Brien points out that, for a true Christian, anti-Semitism is a form of matricide. Jacques and Raïssa came to believe as much within a short time after their conversion. But for the intense and introverted Raïssa, a mere intellectual appreciation of Judaism—and of her Jewish background—was not enough. The examples of Bergson and particularly Léon Bloy oriented her toward a prophetic and ascetic Judaism: “my maternal grandfather was a Hasid. . . . And my father’s father was a great ascetic. I have all that behind me.”

As O’Brien shows, this was a double recuperation. Raïssa did not convert from Judaism to Catholicism; she had already been torn from her religious as well as cultural roots by her family’s move from Russia to France. The family had largely lost its Jewish character and ceased to observe the Sabbath. In her scientific education, Raïssa was further removed from a deep connection to religious truth, though she continued to hunger and seek for certitude and a trustworthy spiritual path. In becoming a Catholic, then, she discovered Jesus, but also the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

O’Brien makes some fine discriminations about the often asserted neuroticism of Raïssa. In the first place, Raïssa embraced the truth, common to both Testaments, of the necessity to suffer in following God. For her, suffering was not something desirable in itself, as many seem to believe about her; rather it is a necessary stage in the detachment from self of which the mystical tradition is full. Nevertheless, says O’Brien, there was a side to her personality that was introverted and required retirement and solitude for much of each day. To extroverted Americans, this stance may have appeared pathological.

⁶Cited In Doering, 131–32.

But O'Brien cautions that this is an unwarranted conclusion based on superficial appearances. The evidence we have in Raïssa's writings and in the testimony of friends points to a personality that was withdrawn, but sound in its consistent pursuit of truth, detachment, and illumination.

Judith D. Suther's contribution, "Images of Indestructible Israel: Raïssa Maritain on Marc Chagall," provides an enlightening commentary on both figures. The interested reader will appreciate Suther's text even more by examining the works by Chagall that she mentions (unfortunately, copyright restrictions have made it impossible to include reproductions of those works in this volume). Suther shows how Raïssa's approach differs from, but is not inferior to, the usual art-history approaches.

Chagall and Raïssa resemble one another in their refusal to take an abstract, external view of the images in the paintings. Neither engaged in a reductive theological or historical "explanation" of work that had come from deep within the imagination and the Jewish experience (mixed with Christian elements) in Russia. For Suther, the word testimony "may be the best word to describe the genre of [Raïssa's] essay." Like Chagall, Raïssa had seen some of these images in her youth and felt their significance from the inside. In her comments here and in her splendid book *Raïssa Maritain: Pilgrim, Poet, Exile*,⁷ Suther identifies some of the characteristic ways that Raïssa used imagery. It is no wonder that when Jacques Maritain wished to promote Chagall in America after the painter's arrival in New York in 1941 that he thought it appropriate to arrange for the Éditions de la Maison Française in the same city to publish Raïssa's short *Marc Chagall*.

Maritain's friendships with some of the pivotal figures in French intellectual life at the beginning of this century, particularly Bergson, Péguy, and Bloy, receive treatment in almost all these essays. Ralph Nelson's "Maritain and Bergson: A Friendship Regained" explores with careful philosophical discernment the issues that divided and, ultimately, re-united the two French thinkers. Maritain's early attack on his former master, who had led Maritain (as he had Péguy) to see how a proper respect for empirical data led beyond all materialism,

⁷Judith D. Suther, *Raïssa Maritain: Pilgrim, Poet, Exile*, (New York: Fordham University Press, 1990).

has been often censured for its harshness. Maritain himself later came to realize that he had perhaps done some injustice to a man to whom he owed much.

Nevertheless, Maritain detected early some difficulties in Bergson's thought. In this he was not alone. Charles Péguy, too, who venerated Bergson and never broke with him, even when Bergson refused to write a preface to a selection from Péguy's work that might have settled some of his financial problems, noticed in *Creative Evolution* (1907) a troubling pantheistic unity.⁸ This was a departure from the early Bergson. Péguy never lived to see the *Two Sources*, but anticipated some of Bergson's later development in his own work.

As Nelson well shows, Maritain's initial attack on Bergson was driven more by aversion to theological modernism than by a philosophical critique. Maritain's comments on Bergson after the *Two Sources* indicates a recognition of a closing gap, but also the persistence of some irreconcilable elements in Bergson. By the end of his life, Bergson had come to see Catholicism as "the complete fulfillment of Judaism" and probably would have taken the final step of baptism had the Nazi invasion not put Jews in danger. Not wishing to give anti-Semites fuel for their persecution, even though he had been rather ridiculously offered honorary Aryan status by the Germans, Bergson died after standing in line to register as a Jew. The heroic strain in his life, as well as his late appreciation for the mystics, says Nelson, were two qualities of the man that Maritain admired even if philosophical differences persisted.

William Bush explores Maritain's relations with the "Ungrateful Beggar," Léon Bloy. In spite of the many indications of the impression that Bloy made on the Maritains, says Bush, Jacques quotes Bloy sparingly and with good reason: Bloy's mystical apocalypics and the view of Jews it entailed ran contrary to what Bush regards as the strongly humanist, almost modernist, element in Maritain. Maritain is concerned mostly with establishing just social structures. By contrast, says Bush, Bloy "dazzled as it were by the divine glory, thinks only in terms of reaching out to God, of trying to touch God."

⁸For this history see A. E. Pilkington, *Bergson and His Influence: A Reassessment* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976). See also Leszek Kolokowski's *Bergson* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Bloy's view of God, Christ, and the Jews involved him in grand speculations about ultimate conversion, the blood of the poor, and money. In a revealing reading of these concepts, Bush explains how what some would regard as anti-Semitic traits in Bloy actually reflect a wholly different register. Bloy even believed that the Jewish role in the Crucifixion might actually be the work of the Holy Spirit rather than of the Evil One: "in the eternal and unfathomable mystery of God, the Evil One can be identified somehow with the Holy Spirit, the resolutions of this mystery being left for final reconciliation in God's divine economy at the end of time."

Bloy would never have accepted, however, according to Bush, those passages in Maritain where the Jews and the Church are presented as playing equal roles in the drama of salvation. Speaking explicitly as an Eastern Orthodox Christian, Bush concludes that liturgical practice captures better than philosophical analysis the great mystery contained in the stories of the two great peoples of the Book, and recommends the Psalms as the place where Christians and Jews may most fruitfully meet "whether on the common ground of the Prince of this World, or along the paths of the Lord."

My essay on Charles Péguy, another great influence on Maritain, seeks to flesh out some material also covered by Bernard Doering. Many people now regard the Dreyfus affair as a mere secular episode, evidence of anti-Semitism at the highest levels of French society and the turning point for full secular control of the French government. Secular control there was indeed—by the Socialists. But as Péguy was quick to notice, once the Socialists (his former comrades) came to power, they were as quick to jettison their Socialist *mystique* for a partisan *politique* as had the Catholics and Royalists earlier. Within months of the assumption of power by the Combes government, for example, thousands of religious institutions and schools were summarily closed. Péguy and some of his close friends such as the Jewish writer Bernard-Lazare watched the Socialists become as unjust toward Catholics as the more conservative elements had been toward Dreyfus and the Jews.

Maritain doubtless reflected on this lesson, even though by the time Péguy came to write his great essay, *Notre Jeunesse* he and Maritain were much less close than earlier. (Maritain had made a mess of acting as an ambassador to Péguy's unbelieving wife after Péguy's conversion.) Péguy's argument in that rambling text is that the Dreyfus affair should not be viewed simply as one of a series of injustices

perpetrated by states that eventually have to be set right. His view was that the Dreyfus affair reflected a "crisis in three mystiques": the Jewish, the Christian, and the French. Seen in the mystical terms Péguy elaborated on sound enough religious principles, Dreyfus did reflect a strange turning point in France. But it would take several decades after Dreyfus and Péguy, decades shaped in part by Maritain's reflections on the state, before a secular government would emerge that was fair to all, believers and non-believers alike.

Bernard Doering shows some of the ways in which that development took place in Catholic circles, particularly with regard to Jews. (Doering's *Jacques Maritain and the French Catholic Intellectuals* is still the best guide to the whole period, and his essay draws on that book.) Maritain found himself involved in conflicts with his fellow Catholics like Paul Claudel and Georges Bernanos as a result of his thinking before World War II on an integral humanism and what it would mean for all religious groups. Claudel rejected the politics, although, as Doering's text shows, his position toward the Jews was not as anti-Semitic as is usually assumed. After a close study of the Bible and a candid appraisal of Christian responsibility for much of the evil in the modern world, Claudel still thought Jewish revolutionaries a danger to society, but many passages in his work manifest a heartfelt appreciation of the grandeur of Jewish history.

Bernanos, of course, was another case entirely. This disciple of Edouard Drumont and *Camelots du Roi* for *La Libre Parole* showed violent anti-Semitic tendencies.

Temporal and Eternal

One of the characteristics that almost anyone reading about Bloy, Péguy, Maritain, and Bergson will notice in our time is how concretely mystical they often were in their reading of contemporary history. Believers from all backgrounds, Christians and Jews alike, are much less inclined to such readings today than were these French figures at the beginning of this century. Yet it is a serious question whether these figures were not closer to both Christian and Jewish tradition, and we more distant, perhaps even unfaithful. Those of us who find our God in the Bible must recognize that he is the Lord of History there before he is "I am who am" or the philosophical Absolute Being. Our unwillingness to see God's action in the concrete details of public events may reflect our belief that pluralistic secular societies

are the best form of government for our time and condition. That unwillingness, however, goes wildly astray when it leads us to believe in the depths of our hearts (as opposed to the times and places where we engage in secular public discourse) that events simply occur outside of Divine Providence. Maritain and his friends may have drawn some wrong conclusions from their belief in Providence, but no one who is a believer in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob can deny that they were recognizing an essential *biblical* category in reading contemporary events through the lens of revelation.

In that regard several of these essays address directly the continuing relevance of Maritain. James Schall, adding to his already impressive body of work on modernity and political philosophy, shows here why the concrete particularity of the Jews matters to Christians, and why both are despised by “the world.” Jews and Christians represent something that much modern thought claims to prize, an embedded life that cannot be reduced to abstract categories. Schall, following the novelist Walker Percy, explains why a culture that cannot make sense of a chosen people cannot possibly value a particular man who claimed to be the messiah foretold by a chosen people. Modern instrumental reason has no use for the historically singular. And even the philosophers who oppose rampant instrumentalism seem to have a low regard for the most enduring examples of concrete historical communities in the modern world: Jews and Christians.

Schall does not try to minimize the differences that also exist between Christians and Jews. In fact, he points out that the weak contemporary notion of tolerance, which refuses to respect the other sufficiently to take his position as distinctive and *significant*, is really a form of disrespect. Christians and Jews would respect each other a great deal more by becoming better informed about their unavoidable differences from one another. But Schall cites Jewish writers such as Irving Kristol who have come to realize that our contemporary situation is such that, as Maritain and others foresaw, the same movement that aims at isolating Christianity from contemporary life must also weaken Judaism. Many other American Jewish writers have come to a similar conclusion.⁹

⁹For a stimulating range of fresh Jewish views on these questions, see David G. Dalin, ed., *American Jews and the Separationist Faith: The New Debate on Religion in Public Life*

If Jews in the United States are only just coming to understand that their destiny is linked more and more to the destiny of Christians, Christians are only slightly ahead of Jews in returning the recognition. It should be admitted at the outset that attitudes toward Jews in France early in this century and even Jacques Maritain's views for a good part of his early life, bore a good deal of prejudice. As Bernard Doering, one of the most judicious historians of Catholic intellectual life in France earlier in this century shows in his essay, "The Origin and Development of Maritain's Ideas of the Chosen People," appreciation for the mystery of Israel by Catholics came slowly and in stages. Maritain, for example, accepted Péguy's concern for justice toward Jews and Bloy's mystical speculations about the Chosen People. Furthermore, Maritain had the profound example of his wife Raïssa, of Russian Jewish origin, constantly before his eyes. But Maritain remained mired in suspicions of Jewish conspiracies against Christian society throughout the twenties, though, as Doering makes clear, he warned against uncharitable modes of responding to such problems.

It took the rise of the Nazi menace in the 1930s and its theories of racial supremacy to stimulate Maritain's thought to show that, on Christian grounds, no such racism could be tolerated. Maritain had accepted a false view of what Catholic social teaching demanded proposed by his spiritual director, Father Clérissac, after his conversion. It is one measure of the independence and force of Maritain's mind that despite associations with *Action Française*, he understood the papal condemnation of that movement and also began to see the errors in the teachings of certain Catholics about the Jews. Later in life, he would publicly repent of such associations.

Raymond Dennehy, in a highly original examination of how Maritain's moderate realism entails certain views about so-called races, shows how significant philosophical principles are to proper social views. Many contemporary intellectuals talk blithely, following Hume and Nietzsche, about the absence of a true human nature and essence that all people share. For the most part, they do so under the impression that such deconstruction of the idea of humanness will free individuals

(Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1993). This volume contains the Kristol essay, "The Future of American Jewry," to which Schall refers.

from confining dogmas about human purposes and limitations. In fact, as Dennehy demonstrates, such a position opens the floodgates for those who would exercise the will to power. If everyone does not have an essence worthy of equal respect and dignity, then those who can impose on others will do so by a kind of natural superiority. The opposite extreme is equally harmful. Those who regard all human beings as absolutely equal, in spite of the empirical divergences that we observe all around us, often resort to politics, i.e., the coercive powers of the state, to assure that status and outcomes will reflect that equality. The former Marxist states in the East and certain currents even within the democratic systems of the West reflect that further misunderstanding of human nature.

Dennehy explains how the ancient philosophical disputes between empiricism and idealism, nominalism and universals, carry enormous consequences for our public questions. Contrary to the common perception, philosophical clarity about the ways in which human nature reflects both equality and difference is absolutely essential to the rightly ordered free society. Maritain understood the importance of these issues for the Jewish question and Dennehy extends his insights to more than a few contemporary—and doubtless future—problems.¹⁰

Desmond FitzGerald expands the scope of the inquiry by comparing some of the attitudes of Hilaire Belloc with those of Jacques Maritain. For those who regard some of Maritain's early remarks on the Jews as anti-Semitic, the contrast with Belloc is revealing. Belloc was far from being a wholly anti-Semitic writer and had many Jewish friends. Yet Maritain cannot be even remotely classed with a Catholic figure like Belloc. FitzGerald traces with care the conscious intentions and the sometimes offensive results of Belloc's work. The balance sheet may still leave Belloc wanting in several essential respects, but FitzGerald's usefully complexifies our view of a brilliant but polemical figure.

Peter A. Redpath takes up another line of inquiry. Departing from an Aristotelian explanation for the emotion anger, he shows how the Jewish presence and Jewish business success could not help but

¹⁰Among the texts Dennehy cites, it is especially worth reading Maritain's essay "Human Equality" in *Redeeming the Time* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1944), 1–28.

provoke anger within the two totalitarian movements of our time: nazism and communism. There are marked parallels, says Redpath, between the Jewish unassimilability to universal, abstract schemes, and the capitalist belief in basic liberty in the marketplace with only minimal controls. Redpath concludes with a warning that the aggressively secular “democratic” states harbor within them some of the same totalizing will-to-power as did the totalitarian movements. Christians and Jews, he argues, would do better in the type of personalist state Maritain envisaged.

This volume concludes with three personal memoirs and a poem. Unlike many memoirs, those by Donald A. Gallagher, Ramon Sugranyes de Franch, and Msgr. John M. Oesterreicher are more than sentimental recollections. Each shows how a crucial set of public issues took on a personal dimension for the writer. Gallagher reflects on the need for what he calls “protophilosophy” to enable those who are occupied in other fields—be it law, medicine, politics—to have the basic principles needed to orient them in a complex world. Ramon Sugranyes de Franch situates Maritain in the context of two intense personal trials: the “uncivil war” in Spain and the Nazi persecutions. John M. Oesterreicher, a convert from Judaism, gives a moving personal testimony to Maritain’s concrete centrality to many Jews looking for a sympathetic interlocutor at a time of severe distress. (Sadly, Msgr. Oesterreicher passed away while this volume was in preparation.) Leo Ward’s hitherto unpublished poem adds another personal touch to the remembrances of Maritain here.

We have been fortunate in being able to include Charles P. O’Donnell’s bibliographical listings of writings by Maritain about the Jews, augmented by some of my own discoveries. (Unfortunately, he too passed away in the past year.) The reader who wishes to explore further any of the topics raised in this comprehensive volume will find ample guidance to other sources in this listing.

I would like to thank Anthony O. Simon for his various services in helping to bring this volume into existence. Gretchen Baudhuin, of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, worked patiently and with skill in the preparation of the manuscript.

In conclusion, perhaps it would be fitting to dedicate this volume in a style Maritain would have recognized as belonging to his old friend Péguy. Péguy, the good Bergsonian, used it to remind us that to remember the past is not a mere exercise in antiquarian curiosity.

14 ROBERT ROYAL

To remember the living past is also to orient oneself toward the future.
And so, let us hope this volume will serve

non solum ad memoriam sed ad intentionem Jacques Maritain.

Robert Royal
Washington, D.C.