

THE PONTIFICAL
ACADEMY OF
SOCIAL SCIENCES

EXTRA SERIES

9

Closed Session



VATICAN CITY
2006

1 May 2006

Closed Session

1 May 2006



VATICAN CITY
2006

CLOSED SESSION

1 May 2006

GLENDON

Welcome to our closed session, which is a very short one. It opens with one of the most pleasant things we do in this Academy: we are welcoming a new member this year, Professor Kuan Hsin-Chi. Kuan Hsin-Chi is our newest member; we are so happy to have you. In a moment Professor Kuan is going to present himself but first I am going to present him with official indication that he has been appointed by Pope Benedict XVI to the membership of our Academy. We thank you so much for your presence here. I have asked Professor Kuan to say a few words to introduce himself to our members.

KUAN

Thank you. Since my short bio has already been printed in the programme, I think I only need to add a few more words about what I do – apart from my administrative, teaching and research responsibilities at the Chinese University of Hong Kong – particularly with respect to my community service, broadly defined. I am active at the Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong in the following capacities: first, I am a member of the Education Commission of the Diocese and I am a member of the Council of Governors of its Holy Spirit Centre, and I am the co-chairperson of a monitoring committee for the Synod that was conducted in 2003. The Synod has passed some 170 resolutions to promote activities in Hong Kong and, among these over 170 resolutions, the Synod decided that there are ten top priorities to be carried out by the Diocese in its various units within the coming ten years. To realise these, a monitoring committee has been established to look after the follow-up actions. Apart from this I have engaged myself in a number of community services, the most important one referring to my membership in the Hong Kong Council of Volunteering Service. The Council was established some ten years ago to promote the spirit of volunteering in Hong Kong and we cooperate very closely with a dozen professional associations such as the Bar Association,

the Medical Council, the Nursing Association and so on, in order to govern a team of expertise to promote very specially-designed volunteering for the persons in need in Hong Kong. So that is all I wish to add to the short biography you have already had the chance to read. Thank you.

GLENDON

Once again, we are so pleased that you are with us. You bring so many strengths to our Academy and we plan to exploit them to the fullest. Soon, in addition to the parchment you have received, you will receive a beautiful golden-coloured necklace, the insignia of membership in the Academy.

Now, since we have so little time and two members have asked me to have the floor briefly, I will recognise them, but I will ask each of them to try to keep his remarks to five minutes, because this is the only Closed Session that we have and there are perhaps many others who have matters they would like to discuss. So first I recognise Professor Malinvaud.

MALINVAUD

I did not explicitly ask for the floor; I suppose you want me to say something about the conclusion to be drawn from the session of last November. I will be very brief. I should refer you back to the document that has been given here to you, and to a decision that was taken this November when we met in the Closed Session. More precisely that was at the end of a general discussion but we went from the general discussion to a closed session very quickly. You see, on page 24 of this green document, the summary of a general discussion as given by our President. She says a few things – they are, in order, one, two and three – and I would like to draw your attention to second point: ‘The people who are interested in writing synthetic essays will do so. I know Professor Malinvaud will write an essay that will be an introduction to any publication that we have. I am delighted that Professor Archer is going to do double work here and produce another essay. Anyone else who wants to supplement this volume should feel free to do so’.

Now, for the time being, this decision has not been followed much. I did write an essay which was not exactly what I had probably meant when I had spoken in November. Indeed on page 25 you will see what I had said, namely I did not know exactly what my essay was going to be. So the essay I wrote was a little different from what I had meant to do when I spoke then. This essay was distributed to you. It is something which is more personal that I would have liked it to be, but it is there. Except for that, I do not think I have any other essay to report, that I

know of, but perhaps someone has an essay in his pocket and is going to show it. No? So that is all.

Perhaps I should add simply that I presented in this general discussion what was my conclusion about the choice between four options that I had myself listed earlier and I said that I was voting myself for option three. Option three was to have in our file for internal use of the Academy, a report of what was done at the session in November. What I did I think is a beginning that is certainly kept in the archives of the Academy and is available to Academicians when they want to see it if they have lost it. I do not know whether we should do more, but at least that is one thing on which there was a realisation.

Now I have thought a little bit over what I could recommend, apart from that. Considering how thin was the mail I received on these matters, I came to the conclusion that probably we shall not want to have a meeting in the coming years on the same subject: I did not see anything that was coming out as being sufficiently prepared to being implemented in the next coming years. Perhaps I should moreover recommend that the concern we had in November, namely to follow exactly what was the conceptualisation of the human person that was done in the various social sciences, should be a permanent preoccupation of the Academy. For instance we might create a special permanent committee, which would study, whatever proposal may come in the future. That is all I have to say.

GLENDON

Thank you. I think your final suggestion is a useful one and a reminder that the reason why we devoted a session to the concepts of the human person that are operating in the social sciences is that we thought that this set of questions should be present always in everything that we do – whether it will involve a committee or just a heightened visibility of that set of questions. We can put a question to the Council about whether they want to constitute a committee, but it will be very good to have your report in the records. I think I should say that the Proceedings of the November meeting probably will be published around July, with Professor Malinvaud's introduction. Now, Judge McNally asked me for the floor, and I now turn it over to him.

MCNALLY

Thank you, Madam Chair, it is a little unfortunate that we have – and I have – to make remarks of the nature I am going to make in such a rushed environment with a five-minute deadline and everyone looking at

their watches. It arises partly out of a reading of the Compendium, partly out of certain remarks I made, I think, in November – a hasty look at the record of the Closed Session suggested that it may have been airbrushed out of what I said then – but I want to talk about the Compendium and to focus attention particularly on Chapter 5 which deals with the family, because I think it is something that it is important that this Academy should start working on urgently. There are 46 clauses in Chapter 5 about the family and they contain statements based squarely on Papal Encyclicals and Apostolic Exhortations and documents of diminishing, but significant, theological weight, and I am not disputing the theology but I do believe that the sociology underlying and underpinning some of the assertions would benefit from a revisiting, as we lawyers sometimes say, a reassessment in the light of modern social scientific knowledge, a reappraisal in the light of modern conditions and a reviewing in the light of that wonderful new Encyclical, *Deus Caritas Est*. And indeed in clause 9 of the Introduction, as we were told yesterday when the thing was presented to us, it says: ‘However, it must not be forgotten that the passing of time and the changing of social circumstances will require a constant updating of the reflections on the various issues raised here in order to interpret the new signs of the times’. Now, I have skipped some of the things I have said but what I am trying to say here is that perceptions do change over the ages, perceptions of even quite fundamental things change over the ages. I need not dwell on the horrors of the Crusades or of the Inquisition or on the story of Galileo, I mentioned them to illustrate my point, that perceptions do change, fundamental perceptions change fundamentally and you cannot dismiss these changes by giving them the opprobrious label of relativism. And against this background I would like to deal with three points, not in any particular order of importance. The first is clause 228 of the Compendium, it is the clause which deals with homosexual unions. I do not intend – what I am going to say will offend many of you enormously so I do not want to offend you more than I have to – I do not intend to argue in favour of the equating of homosexual unions with marriage but I do think that I should comment on the statement in that clause, which reads as follows: ‘Homosexual persons are to be fully respected in their human dignity and encouraged to follow God’s plan with particular attention to the exercise of chastity’. It seems to me, with great respect, that this is an excessively facile dismissal of a very complex problem. It is almost an evasive dismissal, as if one would say, ‘I respect singers, provided they do not sing’. It reminds me that I read on the Internet some three years ago a

long statement, which unfortunately I did not download and which later I lost, by some international association of Catholic doctors, to the effect that, and I deliberately parody their conclusion for the sake of emphasis, that homosexuality is essentially the result of incorrect potty training. I believe that the Church should re-examine this thinking and that such a re-examination should most appropriately be conducted by this Academy.

I turn next to clause 223, which refers to contraception. In Africa this is a huge problem, a life or death problem because of the existence of AIDS, not only and so the question whether in combating AIDS the use of condoms should be permitted. There is also an awful family dilemma: so often you have an HIV-positive husband and a disease-free wife. Unless they are allowed to use condoms, the husband will inevitably infect the wife, who will then give birth to a child with AIDS. The impact of the Church's teaching is brutal in such cases. In these circumstances I think the Church should surely seek to update and to reappraise its social doctrine in relation specifically to contraception. It would be interesting to see an historical analysis of the development of the teaching and the reasoning behind it. There is an interesting article which touches on the views of Jacques Maritain and Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., on contraception in the recent October-December 2005 edition of the *Notes et documents* of the Institut international Jacques Maritain at pages 65 and 66 and I recall reading in the secular papers in England, just before I came over here, that one of our more respected Cardinals has made a statement, something to do with contraception, but I hesitate to say what he said since I have only seen a brief report in a daily newspaper. But here, as perhaps in other cases, and again with great respect, the Church should not condemn an action when its real purpose is to condemn the abuse of that action. It must be noted too that, in full submission to the Church's teaching on the integrity and dignity of the human person, I am speaking only of contraception and not of abortion. Again I suggest that this Academy would be the natural forum for such a reappraisal, perhaps in consultation with our sister Academy, or, as a result of what we heard this afternoon, perhaps with a number of other Church dicasteries.

And, finally, I have to say that the whole of Chapter 5, which deals with the family, contains an idealised picture of family life and of parenthood which obviously we should all attempt to live up to but it should not blind us to the reality that many do not live up to that ideal, there are many marriages which are to a greater or lesser extent dysfunctional, marriages in which the parties destroy each other, spiritually, morally and sometimes

even physically. Moreover, they destroy their children and by a curious and horrible paradox, their children replicate these problems from generation to generation and it must be open to consideration whether such marriages are made in heaven. And the Compendium, in clause 225, shows, I am afraid, the Church's failure to grapple with this problem, it just talks about the wonders of bringing up children in a happy marriage. Well, for heaven's sake, we all know that! It dismisses divorce as a plague on society, and leaves it as that. Remarriage after divorce is sorrowfully condemned in clause 226. A mere two paragraphs on two of the biggest problems facing the Church may be contrasted with five paragraphs on the subject of disarmament. My grandchildren sometimes say to me, 'Get real, Grandad!', and I suppose I am saying to the Church, 'Get real, Grandma!'. The Academy in my view should undertake a study of the sociology of marriage and should not shrink from considering what solutions the Church should offer to the problem of dysfunctional marriages in the light of our growing understanding of the nature of interpersonal relationships.

Now, my dear colleagues, I should end by stressing that what I have said is not motivated by any personal considerations. I do not have a hidden agenda. I have been blessed with an extraordinarily happy marriage for almost fifty-two years, I have seven graduate children who rejoice in each other's company to our great delight, I have no homosexual tendencies and I do not intend to alter any of those three situations! I speak out of concern for the Church and its members, I have no desire to suffer the fate of Galileo in the predecessor of our sister Academy, but I do sincerely believe that if we are to fulfil the function for which we were founded, we should be looking at the real problems of the Church today and offering our social scientific expertise to the Church. The Compendium, by its very clarity, invites us to reflect on these matters and for this reason I welcome its publication, but sometimes I think it should have been printed in a loose-leaf form. Thank you.

GLENDON

Thank you very much, Judge McNally. Certainly none of us who have known you all these years would ever doubt your heartfelt sincerity and the way that you keep not only the good of the Church but the common good and especially human suffering so close to your heart. When I am asked questions about the Academy, as I travel about, I think people have a stereotype of us as being monolithically Catholic and all marching to the same tune (these are questions from people who do not know the Catholic

Church very well.) At such times, I am very proud to be able to say that we are a diverse group of many faiths, people of faith and of no faith, with a common commitment to keeping the human person at the centre of concern. And I also like to say that, even among the Catholics, in our Academy we are like a family that has some pretty rowdy discussions around the dinner table, and that is as it should be. I do say and believe that there is no subject that Catholics cannot discuss. After all, we pride ourselves on faith and reason, and reason is our guiding light here. So I am going to throw open the floor for general discussion, and I am going to follow my own rule about time-limits and only point out that matters that are up for discussion concern the programmes for 2007 and 2008. I would like to see us start thinking in terms of a multi-year plan, because if we can start planning for two years from now and three years from now we can get the speakers we want and we can have the precision we want in the topics. So I will tell you that, up to now, the Globalisation committee and the Intergenerational Solidarity committee are both working very hard at formulating proposals for 2007 and 2008. We hope that those proposals will be, not finalised, but made more concrete by the end of the day tomorrow. So this would be a very good time to have your input on what should be examined under either of those headings. Certainly the remarks of Professor Malinvaud and Judge McNally are also open for discussion.

BUTTIGLIONE

Shall we really discuss the statements of Judge McNally? It would take a long time, I think. But just to say a few words on that. I think that the real issue is the concept of sin. The moral doctrine of the Church does not to pretend to give us an agenda that is at the reach of each one of us. The Church believes that we are all sinners, I myself. I had a friend, he was a very well-known playwright in Italy, Giovanni Testori, now he is dead, he was a homosexual, and he was a Christian and he would say, 'Look Rocco, I am a sinner, don't think that you are any better than me, you are a sinner too, in a different way'. And I said, 'Yes, Gianni, of course, each one of us stands in need of God's mercy'. When I listen to these kinds of discussions on homosexuality what strikes me is that most people have lost the idea that we are all sinners and each Christian should have a penitential attitude and so the fact that I cannot live up to the standard, the very high moral standard set by the Scripture, is considered as, 'Well, it cannot be true'. No, many things are true that I cannot live up to. Quite different is the political problem: in society and in politics of course we must all stand

for the principle of non-discrimination but it is what the Catechism says. If you look at the Catechism it says, it is evident that we stand for non-discrimination, we are against any kind of offensive attitude against homosexuals but still the Church thinks it is a sin. A third level is whether you can put on the same level homosexual behaviour and heterosexual behaviour from the point of view of policies that support, not forbid but support. Should we support homosexual behaviour? Perhaps not, because in heterosexual families children are born and we need children because without children we have no taxpayers for the pensions of the elderly, each generation lives out of the support of the young ones and if you break this chain, then society collapses. So there is a social function of the family that cannot be extended to homosexual groups. And regarding the problem of contraception and AIDS, everybody who has read St Thomas Aquinas knows, do not do it, but if you have to, take your precautions, this is just traditional and moral doctrine. There is no objection to the fact that in our campaigns for instance in Italy, the campaigns that I have supported, first of all we suggest that you keep to the general principle, do not enter into too many sexual relations with people you do not know, sex should be something precious, even for those who do not adhere to a Christian viewpoint, one should not have many sexual partners in his life. Perhaps if it is not a Christian I should not say one, but not many and all well known. If you cannot hold to this moral rule, that is also a prophylaxis rule, then at least make use of the condom. From the point of view of a policy, not of the Church, of the State, I think it is quite acceptable and the Church also would not have anything to say against it. But look to the figures, those countries in which you find strong campaigns in favour of marriage and a strong presence of the Catholic Church have a lower rate of diffusion of AIDS, because it works. Of course, we should keep discussing these issues for a much longer time, but I just wanted to give a friendly first reaction.

ZACHER

At first I want to express my deep admiration for the courageous statement of our friend McNally. I agree vitally with his standpoint. I especially share his deep concern about the way the Church thinks and speaks about these challenges. But I agree no less with the reaction of our President. I also have doubts that this Academy is the right place to discuss the policy of the Church. The Church, especially the Vatican, approaches the problems addressed by our colleague McNally from the standpoint of individual morality and the message of the Bible – not, however, as a topic of Catholic

social teaching, at least not on the basis of the social sciences. Yet social sciences and Catholic social teaching are the field of our responsibility.

My second point refers to the demand for possible subjects of the Academy's work. Insofar I would like to start with an appeal above all to finish the work on globalisation and intergenerational solidarity. Last year I published, in widespread Catholic intellectual papers for German-speaking countries, two articles reporting on the Academy and its work. The most intensive reaction I got was the question: What are the final results of the work on globalisation? I think we should perceive the message behind that question.

My second suggestion is a much more normal one: the doctrine and the practice of common goods. I am not speaking about 'the' common good, but about the plural of 'common goods'. I am thinking of manmade common goods like the education system, the health system and the manifestations of those systems. But I am also speaking about non-manmade goods like water or climate, which are not only used and consumed by man but can also be damaged by man. Thus they lie in the hands of and under the responsibility of man. This subject of common goods is at the crossroads of so many alternatives of our current social situation: government versus society, politics and administration versus market, profit versus non-profit, socialist versus liberal. All these problems are vital in the context of common goods. A central denominator of this subject is: development. Common goods are the backbone of every development. And deficits of common goods are the main causes of deficits in development. Another denominator for the experience of common goods is: transformation. The socialist regimes politically monopolised common goods. Now they should be re-'socialised' towards civil society – opened towards civil society, opened for pluralism. Let me finally mention the example of the welfare state. In the past, the western welfare state has concentrated on social benefits. Social benefits represented money for the individual, offering the individual a maximum of freedom. The individual could buy the respective goods from markets, from administrations, etc. This kind of welfare regime has passed its zenith. And we see more and more that society needs general services. General services for everybody prove to be an essential element of a balanced welfare state. I would say: equality by generality is an essential complement of individual monetary distribution. The instruments needed to produce that generality, however, are common goods. All that constitutes a very important field of experience, involving failure and probation within the reality of globalisation.

POSSENTI

I would like to express my personal consideration to the question raised by Judge McNally. It is a real problem, but I would like to postpone the discussion on contraception and homosexuality to another time, and to stay on the point of possible programmes for next year and 2008, suggesting two possible matters. The first one is tightly connected to the concept of person in the social sciences, the subject developed in last November's Plenary Session (2005). I think that the Academicians who selected this matter made a very good choice and I am personally grateful to those who prepared the project and elaborated a programme. In my opinion, we should also consider how to proceed, because the concept of person is central in all social sciences and on it depends a lot of political, juridical and social decisions. So I would suggest not to postpone too much a new reappraisal of this problem, thinking to a second Plenary Session, where some crucial problems that it was not possible to deepen in the first one, could be deepened.

The second suggestion concerns the vital question of political and social justice at the international level. Perhaps something like this was present in the words of Professor Zacher, through the problem of peace, the problem of common goods in the plural and common good in the singular. International justice is a crucial problem in its political, institutional, social and economical aspects. A project of this type could inscribe itself in a trajectory we have already begun with the problem of globalisation. In international literature this subject has been mainly deepened through the question of economic globalisation, a very important matter but not the whole picture, while political and institutional dimensions of globalisation are much less treated.

The matter of international justice is also present in the first Encyclical by Benedictus XVI (*Deus Caritas Est*), where justice is the leading star of politics and perhaps another name for common good. With international justice arise both the problem of transnational governance, as we have a lack of real governance at various levels, and the questions of international law and global goals. This domain includes problems such as the new tensions which arise in the international order; the building up of international public powers, the multilateral approach to the problems of peace.

GLENDON

Thank you. I am sure that all of those suggestions will be very valuable to the Globalisation committee as they work today and tomorrow to try to

formulate perhaps even a two- or three-year programme. You were mentioning governance issues. In the early years of the Academy, we have from time to time dealt with international institutions and governance, but certainly there is much more to be done, so thank you very much. And now, Professor Zulu.

ZULU

Thank you Madam Chair. I am finding myself caught in a dilemma here. What questions do we ask ourselves about certain issues, or how do we formulate our problems? I thought that the role of the Church is to give moral guiding principles to both the body of faithful and to the world in general. And the next question that one asks oneself is, to what extent is the Church influential in certain spheres of life and to what extent can the Church push a position successfully in certain spheres of life? Turning back to Judge McNally's suggestion, I would have felt that in spheres like the family, and in the regulation of individual human behaviour, the Church plays a very direct and influential decision. If the Church makes a pronouncement on the issue of condoms or on contraception, is it going to be more influential than if made a pronouncement on the issue of international relations, where other players, I am not trying to apportion priorities to what I think we should be researching, there are certain role players which play a bigger role than the Church in certain issues, the markets, the issues of peace, etc. and there are certain arenas where the Church plays a direct role on individual ascetisms: marriage, divorce, contraception and homosexuality. Is it the role of this Academy to apportion such priorities or is it the role of this Academy to provide sufficient research information on certain issues to enable the Church to formulate a policy, and it becomes the role of the policy-makers in the Church to determine which spheres they think they have an immediate direct influence or a remote indirect influence. It is a dilemma that I am trying to puzzle in my own mind. If I were to think within my narrow experiences, I would think that there is much more likelihood of the Church exerting a greater influence on individual parishioners with regard to how they conduct their private lives than the Church being able to exert an influence on states with regard to how they conduct their international relations. I am not trying to say that there should be greater priority given to the issues that Judge McNally raises, but I think they are also very important and I think, to a certain extent, they impact directly on the behaviour and lives of citizens. HIV and AIDS and, by association, contraception are realities in sub-

Saharan Africa. I happen to be called to the education office in the Church and I have had to face certain very thorny issues from women, from wives of migrant men who say, how do we handle the issue of contraception when we know that our husbands are working miles away from us and that they do 'misbehave' wherever they are, and is there an immediate guideline that the Church could forward towards such individuals. The same issues, in poorer countries, of homosexuality and adoption, are realities that are very immediate to the lives of citizens and not remote via governments and other policy formulators. Again, I am not trying to vie for priorities and apportioning priorities to what we should research first and what we should research last but I think there are burning issues, the issue is that probably burning issues are not evenly felt across the globe. There are certain priorities which pertain most immediately to some areas of the globe rather than to others and, again, I am not trying to say let us make a choice between whose priorities become much more paramount than whose priorities but there are certain issues that we cannot sweep away from the agenda because they are very immediate. Thank you.

GLENDON

I think it always a good idea to go back to the *Motu Proprio* that created us and to go back to our Statutes and remind ourselves of what Pope John Paul II created us to do and what the Pope has other people doing for him. For example, we are social scientists, not moral theologians, and the Holy Father has moral theologians who work on these very difficult issues. Obviously there is not an iron fence between moral theology and social science, but what he asked us to do was to help the Church in formulating the social doctrine, which is quite different from moral theology and much more subject to the need to be adapted to the changing manifold of historical and economic and social circumstances. He put people with certain kinds of expertise in this Academy, but we do not have moral theologians in this Academy. Another matter that is relevant here is, when you read the social Encyclicals you find John Paul II saying over and over again (and now Benedict saying the same thing it is almost a formula) that the Church does not propose specific programmes and policies. The Church speaks at the level of principle, and then issues its call to us lay people. (I used to think, poor John Paul II, he sends all these letters to the laity and we do not answer them, it is as though we let them pile up in the mailbox). He said it is up to the lay people who are active in the public sphere in various ways, wherever you work, wherever you teach, in the parliaments, in the

universities, in the family. So our responsibility is a very great one in the Academy, but the area of our responsibility does not extend to everything, and it does not extend to those areas where the priest has to figure out what to say to the person in the confessional. That area of pastoral practice I am sure is very nuanced and very careful and very humane, but it really is not our domain, I think. Is that helpful at all? Is it helpful to think in terms of the scope of what we were constituted to do?

ZULU

Yes, I think definitely, I thought the scope of what we do is to research and bring to attention whatever we think is falling within this scope of the acts that set us into motion.

GLENDON

And research is not limited just to accumulating data. After a social scientist does research, one has a responsibility to draw conclusions from the data and, of course, all of our conclusions are tentative and subject to revision in the light of further data. That is the process of human knowing: you have experiences, you reflect on experience, you hope for insights, then you use the logics to sort out the insights and you come to a judgement which then you subject to examination in the light of new experience.

ZULU

Well, definitively, but I thought the question here was what is it that we research and in which order, I thought that was the key question underlying the whole debate, what is it that we research and in which order do we research it.

GLENDON

And again I think it is helpful to look at our Statutes where we are told that there are four principal areas, and those areas are: law, political science, social science and economics. So that is where the Holy Father thought he needed expertise in order to keep the social teaching grounded and relevant.

Who else would like to be recognised? Professor Sabourin.

SABOURIN

Madam Chairman, I have been working at the Vatican for twenty-two years. I have had many occasions to say goodbye because of the pressure I

had at home on various fronts but I always said that it is possible to change if you work very hard, if you have faith and if you are going to work in a climate which is open, which is democratic, and where you are assured that no one is going to punish you for what you are saying. In the last twenty-two years I have had immense satisfaction. I do remember when I came to the first meeting of Justice and Peace and with Cardinal Etchegaray, whom I think is a great man, we looked at the issues that had been studied in the previous years since the existence of Justice and Peace and I said to the Cardinal, I think it is all very nice to speak about peace, about this, about that, but never have I read a line about international issues that are dealing with realities: trade, the debt, investment, the financial institutions. So Cardinal Etchegaray told me, 'Yes, Sabourin, you are coming with new ideas', but most of the members of Justice and Peace at the time knew almost nothing at all about international debt, about trade, about north-south relations in the real, political sense of the word, so today, twenty-two years later, this is an accepted fact in the Vatican. You meet with Presidents of various dicasteries who will talk about these issues at the international scale, many priests, many representatives. Msgr Martin was a leader in that field, took the problems, the position of the Church in many many areas. A couple of years later, Cardinal Etchegaray invited 20 or 25 economists, I do not remember exactly, to discuss these issues and gradually the thinking started to change. So I have great admiration for Judge McNally. I may disagree on certain issues but he has the courage to bring us back to reality. I told you that in my province the Church was crumbling: we have no more new priests, no more new nuns, 95% of our young people are getting away from the Church, for what? Not for problems of faith but for problems that are moral issues. So, I do not know what is the answer, but what I would like to say, Madam Chairman, is that I do appreciate the climate of openness that you are trying to implement. We must not be afraid to raise other issues and we cannot on one day discuss the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church and say the next day that we cannot discuss it. As a matter of fact, we did not have a single real discussion but that would be maybe a way to develop closer ties with the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, to discuss with them the Compendium and there our friend McNally could explain his point of view. If we want to disagree with him we will disagree with him but if we want to agree with him, we will do it in a practical context. I repeat and I end with this, we cannot one day discuss the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church and be told a number of things we would like to discuss, most of us would have liked to discuss this,

and the next day say that it is not within the context of our jurisdiction to discuss the issues risen in that particular book. Finally, I would like to agree with Professor Possenti on his way of looking at globalisation and of course I would like to congratulate all those members and I would not like to forget anyone, who prepared the last statement on Education and Globalisation, I thought it was a magnificent way to improve our work within the Academy and I think we should go on like that. Merci beaucoup, Madame le président.

GLENDON

Well, friends, I think it is eight o'clock. Since our dinner is going to be, in a sense, a Closed Session (I do not think there will many people there except this hardy band of Academy members) I would like to suggest that, like the big family that we are, we continue this discussion over dinner, and perhaps to some extent in the general discussion that we will have tomorrow. Thank you very much again everyone who gave us your suggestions.

The Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences
Casina Pio IV
December 2006

I believe we must commit ourselves to reconnecting these two parts of morality and to making it clear that they must be inseparably united.

Only if human life from conception until death is respected is the ethic of peace possible and credible; only then may non-violence be expressed in every direction, only then can we truly accept creation and only then can we achieve true justice.

I think that this is the great task we have before us: on the one hand, not to make Christianity seem merely morality, but rather a gift in which we are given the love that sustains us and provides us with the strength we need to be able to 'lose our own life'. On the other hand, in this context of freely given love, we need to move forward towards ways of putting it into practice, whose foundation is always offered to us by the Decalogue, which we must interpret today with Christ and with the Church in a progressive and new way.

(Pope Benedict XVI, *Discourse to Conclude the Meeting with the Bishops of Switzerland*, Vatican City, Thursday, 9 November 2006)

