

COMMENT ON HOW DO WE 'REPLAN THE JOURNEY'

JUAN JOSÉ LLACH
THE CRISIS, THE AFTERMATH AND
THE NEW DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

VITTORIO POSSENTI
THE GOVERNANCE OF GLOBALISATION:
GLOBAL POLITICAL AUTHORITY, SOLIDARITY
AND SUBSIDIARITY

HANS F. ZACHER

My task is to comment on the papers of Prof. Llach and Prof. Possenti. The task is not without some complications. The first part of this morning dealt with the same general subject. But the rapporteurs were asked very basic, central and general questions. The rapporteurs of the second part of this morning, however, were to draw and explain more special pictures. And they did it in correspondingly different ways. Professor Llach concentrated his presentation on facts and numbers: facts and numbers showing differences in wealth and shortage. Professor Possenti concentrated his presentation on ideas: ideas formulated within papal documents, and philosophical works. Let me try to formulate some observations in both directions.

Professor Llach's report is above all a pre-eminent challenge. Its main merit is to surprise. To surprise fundamentally. It questions our 'normal' picture of the distribution of wealth and poverty, of economic resources and lack of them, of economic power and economic weakness. Mainly looking back on the past: the past years, the past decades. Sometimes looking into the future. The furthest view going as far as 2040. What can we learn from these exercises? We know the question is: 'How to replan the journey?' What lessons can we draw to answer the question rightly? I think questions

are the main harvest of reading Professor Llach's report. What are the adequate criteria to differentiate and to quantify realities? To make differences and to neglect differences? This analysis, however, has two sides to start from and to aim at. One is social reality – especially the economic, demographic, and potentially also the cultural reality or other features of reality. But what time of finding should be the decisive one? The present time alone? The experience of what past? The expectation of what future? The other side from where to approach the analysis of relevant structures is global governance itself. How do the elements of social reality interact with the institutional elements of global governance? With the elements of the given system? With the elements of a potentially reformed system? One sees what wide net of unknowns opens up behind the selective assumptions of the report. But how to approximate an effective solution?

At this point let us turn to the other report, which is to be commented here: Professor Possenti's presentation. It starts out with the side of the organisation of global governance, and this with a very helpful definition: 'By governance I mean the whole of the functions of government and control, authority and direction, decisions and purposes that it is necessary to exercise in the political, economic, legal, social and communicative fields, for the achievement of a positive outcome and of an equitable allocation of public goods'. Starting from this point the report shows that this system must not be concentrated on economics – neither on the social forces running the economy nor on political bodies responsible for economic matters. On a varied way of ideas he argues that global governance refers to a very wide field of human conceptions, principles and attitudes like morals and behaviour. This way culminates in the observation that the most urgently missed development is a global authority, which when adequately structured implements subsidiarity and solidarity. And adequately structured means 'polyarchic'. Thus the river of our thinking comes to the mystery of a solution, which is already shown by *Caritas in Veritate*. It is a productive puzzle. It shows us a responsibility, a task. In this point *Caritas in Veritate* and the report match.

To summarize: What do we, having behind us this stage of work, know more and better? I think we know more about our uncertainty. That is good for preventing us from acting under the false precondition of certainty. But is it enough to reduce the risks of wrong action or even non-action as far as possible? Is it enough to show at least the directions and the methods to come nearer to feasible projects of action?

I put these questions as this meeting demonstrates very intensively the intention which lead to the foundation of this Academy. The *raison d'être* of our Academy is formulated in our statute: to offer the Holy See elements for the development of the Social Doctrine of the Church. When I was confronted with the invitation to offer a comment and when I studied the program and the papers I became disturbingly aware how the conditions for our being and our responsibility over the sixteen years since our foundation have developed. I asked myself: What part of our work could the Pope have made use of? What did He make use of? What part of the Pontifical Teaching with which we agree is our merit? What part of the Pontifical Teaching with which we disagree could have been prevented if we had worked more convincingly?