

THE PONTIFICAL  
ACADEMY OF  
SOCIAL SCIENCES

EXTRA SERIES

11

# Closed Session

of the XIII Plenary Session  
on  
*Charity and Justice in the Relations  
Among Peoples and Nations*

27 April – 1 May 2007



VATICAN CITY  
2008

# Closed Session

of the XIII Plenary Session  
on  
*Charity and Justice in the Relations  
Among Peoples and Nations*

27 April – 1 May 2007



VATICAN CITY  
2008

## CLOSED SESSION

1 May 2007

PROF. RYAN

I don't know whether this is the time you want to devote to future meetings, but I would like to make two suggestions. They're very different. The one is about something that, I must admit as a great surprise, hasn't been part of our discussions and has come up very briefly. And it seems to me, in world society today and certainly in the relationships between the Church and the world, it's something of an elephant in the room and I'm talking about Islam. Our Pope has opened the door, either purposely or accidentally, I don't know, but it would seem to me that this group, with its enormous resources and its perspectives, could add to the dialogue. Clearly, Christians are terribly disadvantaged. The symbol of Rome having the largest mosque in Europe, and in Saudi Arabia the Christian Bible is not allowed, is a situation that I think just calls out not for antagonistic discussion but for serious conversation for the good of Islam and for the good certainly of the Christian community. So I would suggest that, at some point, sooner probably better than later, we would address that.

A second suggestion was reflected again in the message we received yesterday from the Holy Father, and that is this concern about the concept of the human person, particularly the Christian sense of what a human being is. I sense that this is being held by fewer and fewer people around the world and I think the reason for that is that our educational system, particularly the Catholic educational system, whether we are talking about programmes to introduce the very young, or our universities, are just sinking in terms of their promoting understanding of the Christian worldview. And this move of secularisation of education is just blotting out something that we are sort of dedicated to upholding and adding to the store of knowledge. So I would suggest that we would look, in the future, at the issue of the secularisation of education and the promotion of the Christian worldview.

PROF. SCHAMBECK (originally in German)

Madam Chair, I'm sure that we could discuss a number of subjects and different items but I must say, at the outset, that I'm very happy that we

have addressed this letter to Madam Rémond. Professor Sabourin has just given us such a wonderful picture of this man, as a professor and as a scientist. At the start of every workday we always celebrate Mass: I hope that we shall be able to stay a prayer for Mr Rémond in the future. Could we introduce also the possibility of having a Memorial Mass for our deceased friend? We were founded by John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI has visited us and we remember how great an important John Paul II attached to Europe and the building of Europe and we have also received representatives of the Russian government, Mrs Suchocka (?) and Mr Skubiszewski so I would like to suggest that in the future Central Europe as well as Russia be represented in our Academy. If I look at the list of invited speakers who've come from many different areas of the world, I think that we should also give an opportunity to representatives of Central and Eastern Europe and I hope the Holy Father will consider this. We know of the spirituality of Averintsev and we know we can receive the continuity from Msgr Kasper and others and the Holy See can continue the dialogue. I personally will be going to Moscow in June and will raise this point. A few years ago I was interviewed and I know that in Russia they have a great interest for our Academy. We are very pleased that Prof. Llach is a member of the Council and I know how much the Council can do. I know that he can mirror whatever was said here during our assembly meeting. We have always been able to select topics that are a follow up to all those matters that we have discussed here. I'm sure that Mr Lacks and Mrs Glendon have realised that there are many lectures, professors, who would be willing to provide follow up on other themes in our discussions. I hope that this will be done through the Plenaries. We have heard comments from personalities, from the Holy See and then we gave our comments but perhaps we should do the opposite. We could be the lecturers and ask the Holy See to express its views and give its comments and I wish to thank our Chancellor and President Glendon who have prepared our work so well. *Deus caritas est* has truly been considered in all its different aspects. I'm sure that our Academy can do very much and I'm sure we will continue with this approach.

PROF. VYMETALIK (originally in German)

Yes, thank you, I'd like to go back to the point regarding our conclusions. Some people say, why do we really need conclusions? Because the material is being developed, the issues are very very complex, so really a question we should be asking ourselves is how far we should go in our conclusions. Of course we want to be concrete but conclusions should be discussed before being adopted and I think that it could be a little difficult to do that. It might

be an idea to set up a working group that could work on the conclusions. It may be worth some thought. But what really matters is how far do we really want to go with the conclusions. I think that it would be worthwhile not to keep things too vague and general but be more incisive.

PRESIDENT GLENDON

Thank you, Prof. Vymetalik. I think there will be a workshop toward the end of this year where the Globalization Committee will work on a Final Report. Let's keep in mind here the Final Report that Prof. Zacher prepared on Democracy and the meetings that went up to that.

MSGR. SCHOYANS (originally in French)

Thank you, Madam Chair. Dear Colleagues, I have two rather different comments I'd like to make.

My first comment has to do with a fact, something that we all learned about. I would like to say how surprised I was about the lack of a representative of the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace during our session. We have, of course, a privileged bond with that prestigious pontifical body. And Cardinal Martino came and spent a few hours with us. But except for that, as far as I know, there haven't been any other representatives of this Council. Yet the work of this Council is obviously closely linked and directly influenced by our Academy. Therefore I'd like to suggest that it might be a good idea for us to provide a sort of regular *debriefing* of our activities. We should ask ourselves loyally to what extent our work has an impact, or does not have, on the Social Teaching of the Church today. What usage is being made by the Roman Authorities and by Episcopal conferences of the publications of our Academy? Did they quote them? One of the goals of our Academy is to fuel this continuous *aggiornamento*, this continuous review of themes. Perhaps there would be merit in thinking about this?

In a broader context, I think we need to make more of an effort in the future than we have in the past to make sure that our work is divulged more widely. I refer, of course, to the exemplary publications provided thanks to our Chancellery. But what about other channels? I know that efforts were made to have this work made available on the Vatican Website, etc. Nevertheless, if we talk to our colleagues or university students, who are writing essays, papers, doctoral theses or whatever, we realize that they know little, or nothing at all, about this source that could be very useful for their preparation. So that is simply a first thought.

The second comment as I announced before is of an entirely different nature, it has to do with a possible research project for our future work.

After listening to a good number of remarkable presentations on globalization, seen in particular from an economic or sociological standpoint, perhaps the time may be right to look at the *foundations of law*. We know that the United Nations started in 1945, the *San Francisco Charter* approved the same year, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* adopted in 1948. But we realize that there has been a gradual moving away, a process of forgetfulness of the 1948 *Declaration*. A new idea or concept of law is making headway in the United Nations and in the European Union as well, and is asserting itself in different ways both at the international and national levels. We now live in a society in which *juridical positivism* is pervasive, and pervasive in a different way in the national and in the international concepts. This should be of concern to us and should refer us to the foundations of human rights, the roots of a general theory of law or a philosophy of law. There's work for us to be done in this field! Just to give you two or three simple examples: we know that many new international instruments are the outcome of discussions leading to *consensus*, and consensus leading to pacts, treaties, conventions or restrictive conventions, protocols, etc. In the end we don't really know what all of this diplomatic agreements or international law rests on. On which basis are the international instruments being used, oddly enough, to 'validate' national laws?

That is a subject that we have come at from different angles, but it would deserve a more thorough investigation. I don't think it's taking it too far to say that today we entered in a new 'cultural revolution' which is based on a mutation of the concept of the law itself, with a gradual abandonment of a realistic concept of law.

So what is the foundation of the basic human rights? How should the foundations of constitutional law, family law or public international law be conceived? And then again, we should meet anew, from a new point of view, a crucial point we have dealt with in several occasions, a point that has come up again and again in our discussions, the principle of *subsidiarity*. Even more: a relatively new discussion has emerged, questioning the *sovereignty* of nation states.

If we wish to contribute with our reflections to the actions of the Church, we could seize this opportunity. There's room for us to do some very original and useful work. Presently, the Church is almost the only global agent. We should support the Church and the Secretary of State in this reflection. May I mention, en passant, that I was really happy to see His Excellency Msgr. Celestino Migliore, Permanent Observer of the Holy See at the UNO, New York, attending our session. That is a very positive signal. This is a kind of relationship we should cultivate and develop in the future,

and, as I said before, not only with the Council of Justice and Peace, but also with the Secretary of State and with the concerned representations of the Holy See and at the Holy See. It's relevant and will be fruitful, for both parts, to sustain this relationship and cooperation.

Mr Morel referred to this in his last comment. He said, and I actually jotted it down, a single discourse is once again possible. Indeed, there is an aspiration that has not yet met an answer: the aspiration for a return to a vision of *human nature*, with all of its ramifications, in terms of nations and international relations. This is simply my second suggestion.

Thank you, Madam Chair, dear colleagues. I have two rather different comments I'd like to make. My first comment has to do with a fact, something that we all of course learned about, and I would like to say how astounded I was, how surprised I was about the lack of a representative of the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace. We have, of course, a privileged bond with that Pontifical body. Cardinal Martino came and spent a few hours with us, but except for that, as far as I know, there haven't been any other representatives of this Council, yet the work of this Council is really closely linked to ours and directly influenced by ours. Therefore I'd like to express my surprise and suggest that it might be perhaps a good idea for us to provide a sort of debriefing of our activities and ask ourselves what sort of impact our work has or does not have on the Social Teaching of the Church today, what usage is being made by the Roman authorities and Episcopal conferences of our Academy. One of the goals of our Academy is to fuel this discussion, this continuous *aggiornamento*, this continuous review of themes. Perhaps there would be merit in thinking about this and in a broader context I think we need to make more of an effort in the future than we have in the past to make sure that our work is disseminated not only through the wonderful publications that we produce but that we make them known more widely. I know that efforts are made to have this work made available on the Vatican website etc., but if we talk to our colleagues or university students who are writing papers or doctoral theses or whatever, we realise that we know little or nothing at all about this source that would be very useful for their preparation. So that is simply a first thought. The second comment as I said before is of an entirely different nature, it has to do with a possible research project for our future work. After listening to a good number of remarkable presentations on globalisation, seen in particular from an economic or sociological standpoint, perhaps the time may be right for us to look at the foundations of law. We know that the United Nations was founded in 1945, the San Francisco Charter, the Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 but we realise that there has been a grad-

ual moving away, forgetfulness of the 1948 declaration and a new idea or concept of law is making headway in the United Nations and internationally and is asserting itself in different way at the international and national level. As I said before, we now live in a society in which legal positivism is pervasive and pervasive in a different way in nations and in the international concept. I think that this should be of concern to us and should refer us to the foundations of human rights, the foundations of a general theory or a philosophy of law. I think that there's work for us to be done in this field, because just to give you two or three simple examples, we know that many new international instruments are the outcome of discussions leading to consensus, consensus leading to pacts or contracts, protocols, and in the end we don't really know what all of this legal work or international law rests on and it is now used, oddly enough, to validate national laws. I think that it's a subject that we have come at from different angles but it would deserve a more thorough investigation. I don't think it's taking it too far to say that today we are in a sort of cultural revolution which is based on a mutation of the concept of the law itself, with a gradual abandonment of a realist concept of law. So what is the foundation of the basic human rights? How should the foundations of constitutional law, family law or public international law be conceived? And then again, the subject that we have dealt with in several occasions, a point has come up in our discussions, the principle of subsidiarity but also that of sovereignty of nation states, I think there is room there, if we wish to contribute with our reflections, to the actions of the Church. I think there's room for us to do some useful work. The Church now is almost the only global agent from this point of view. I think we should support the Church and the Secretary of State in this and may I mention, en passant, that I was really very happy to see that Msgr. Celestino Migliore attended our session, that is a very positive sign, it's a sort of relationship we should cultivate in the future and, as I said in the beginning, there may be a lack of attention, I hope a passing one, on the part of the Council of Justice and Peace, it's important for us to have this relationship and cooperation, the presence of Msgr Migliore is important and the participation of the Cardinal Secretary of State.

Mr Morel referred to this in his last comment, he said and I actually jotted it down, a single discourse is once again possible. I think that that is an idea, I took it to mean that there is an aspiration that has not yet met an answer, but it is this aspiration for a return to a vision of human nature, with all of its ramifications, in terms of nations and international relations, there's this aspiration. This is simply my suggestion.



PROF. DASGUPTA

Thank you. I'm reflecting on Prof. Ryan's suggestion and Msgr. Schooyans and I guess we should take the long view, from the Academy's point of view, work does not stop tomorrow, nor the day after nor the day after, and so forth, so I wanted to reflect on that because many of the questions that came to my mind in the past four days of intense discussion and reflection also on our part, I wonder whether there is a case for trying to build on these two suggestions that have been made, and I wanted to speak a little about that. Two years ago we had a plenary on the concept of the person, and unfortunately I couldn't come to that because it was shifted to November, if you remember, but in any event I have had a look at some of the papers and they are very illuminating, but let me try out what I have in mind to see how to accommodate both Prof. Ryan's and Msgr. Schooyans' suggestions. It might be an idea for us, the papers that were given in 1995, at least the cursory reading I had after I received the volume, in some sense fell short of a kind of problem I, as an economist thinking about societal... the way resources are allocated, that is my specialisation I guess, I am increasingly coming to the view that, in some sense, some of the biggest mysteries in the social sciences remain. What enables a community to progress and what makes it collapse, or not even be a starter? In a way, all the answers that we have effectively are 'after the event' kind of facts. We haven't got the magic bullet. I am not suggesting that we, at the Academy, would be able to do that but one of the things that increasingly has come to my mind is the conception of the person as part of the community. I am using community now in a very limited way, the relationships he or she inherits at birth and then the ones he or she finds, accumulated over time and the ones he or she disregards, and so forth. In short, I think one of the biggest problems we have now is understanding something about the nature of personal identity. The philosophers talk a lot about that. We as social scientists and humanities people outside philosophy have not really come to grips about it. There is one view which is currently very popular, which is that you, basically, we shop for identities, like at Wal-Mart. We go in and decide which identity to have. That is one extreme. And on the other hand we observe, in other parts of the world, a kind of, at least, from outside we have a feeling that there is a very narrow notion of an identity and, in some sense, people are locked into it through either education or from the pulpit of some kind or the other, and yet, of course, our futures depend enormously on how we come to terms with these two polar cases that I have just now mentioned. So there's a huge amount in my judgement that we need to understand because we want... the way I see the international

problems which we have been discussing here, is that it is an outgrowth of millions and millions of small pockets of emerging people: the family, the community, the village, and then they interact. It is hard for me to understand the superstructure without digging into it at the earliest stage. And you can see why that might be connected to Msgr. Schooyans. Where does a norm, how does a norm eventually become a law? If indeed that is the route in which it happens and there is no reason to believe that that is necessarily how it does happen. But communities abide by norms of behaviour which are not enshrined in any legal... it does not have any legal status and yet people follow it in a massive way. Increasingly I have come to the view that, without some intelligent understanding or even articulation of this problem, we are far from understanding the economic world, and that is the one I am involved in, because some communities work and others do not. We know that. What is it that makes it? That might be the question to which we will not have an answer, probably, and I would be surprised if we do, but I am not sure whether we even have a good language, at the moment, amongst economists certainly, maybe sociologists have it, we are a multidisciplinary interdisciplinary community here and I keep on thinking that we ought to be approaching problems which we have the sort of expertise, or, put it this way, we have as much of a chance of coming to grips with it as anyone else, and I was wondering whether these reflections could be used as a way of marrying these two ideas, but not necessarily integrate them into one, but we do have sort of three, four or five-year plans and we could work on it. I personally think both suggestions are extremely good. I think it will be a very good idea if, for example in the case of identity issues, we were to have guests from various belief systems, in the way Prof. Ryan mentioned, Buddhists, Muslims, and so forth, because I have a very limited conception of how we think of ourselves embedded, as we are, in a social structure.

#### PRESIDENT GLENDON

That comment really is a useful reminder of the fact that we have two missions under the Statutes that created the Academy. The one we always talk about is that we are supposed to provide the Church with elements that may be useful in developing her social thought, but the one named first is 'to contribute to the progress of the social sciences'. These suggestions that we have been hearing really do raise questions that the social sciences themselves, in their fragmented and compartmentalised way, have either pushed aside or else have answered in a way that would not be very satisfactory from the point of view of, let's say, those of us in law who think that

Positivism is not the whole story. E.g, what makes law binding if it's not just the armed mind of the state? So thank you for those suggestions.

PROF. SCHAMBECK (originally in German)

Madam Chair, dear colleagues, if you take the theme of the human person and personality and identity in the different religions it's interpreted in many different ways. Family is also linked closely to this notion. We are in a situation of partnership. Islam takes things from a different standpoint. As sociologists we deal with different religions and we see the clash of the different cultures and we must also look into this. As far as the identity of the human person is concerned in private law, the human person is seen in different ways and every time it is an entirely different topic. We have fundamental rights however and we have published already quite a few papers and we could continue and Mrs Glendon has also told us that our task in the Holy See is for the Catholic Church and I recall that the Archbishop of Dublin, whom I met before he became Archbishop was a member of the Council of the Laity and also of the Family, where Msgr. Crepaldi is now. I would truly like to thank the Archbishop of Dublin for everything he has done for Justice and Peace and also Msgr Minnerath, the Archbishop of Dijon because he took part in the first project for the social catechism. And all the members of the Academy who were with me will recall that at the meetings of the Council I always asked questions about the preparation of the social catechism which we know was only printed once. We were never involved when the social catechism was actually published. It's a remarkable work and the Secretariat of State had asked us to present some comments, which I did every time and I spoke in the 90s on *Centesimus annus* at the meeting in New York, which I shall never forget. And Prof. Zacher has raised the point of natural law. The Holy Father himself, during a meeting, spoke about natural law. There are so many of these rights that are recognised in the Charter of Human Rights. Do we want to add something that is not part of these rights, for instance by saying that there's no partnership in a family and that the father is the head of the family? That's something we can no longer state these days. I think we should be guided by reason. Father Utz, the founder of our Academy, has written very much, as well as Father Schasching and we have a great deal of interesting literature available. I would like to thank all those of the Academy who have worked so far for that publication. Msgr Sánchez is the Chancellor of two Academies. He is about to publish very interesting work while he was preparing our meeting he was also preparing some papers for publication. I think we should send out a list to see who wants to receive these publica-

tions because we have a whole list of personalities that are very important in the social and political life and who have many contacts with the newspapers, they know what is important, and I believe all these people should receive our publications, we want our books to be read, and therefore it would be very important to see to it that these excellent publications are taken into consideration, read and I think we should present a critique. This would give us returns and funds for our Academy. We Austrians have also given donations for this Academy and Italy, France, Spain and others could also contribute. It would be very important if these publications could be presented to the outside world. Please send us a list of people who wish to receive these publications and we can add their names to our list. This would make it possible for everyone to recognise the excellent work we have done here and once again I thank Msgr Sánchez for his efforts.

PROF. FUMAGALLI

Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to suggest a topic for future meetings. The topic of humanitarian emergencies has come up also in this session. Prof. Llach spoke about it very briefly but left the door open for interesting follow-ups. Now, Cardinal Bertone, the Secretary of State, has also spoken about humanitarian emergencies. Speaking of governance, Cardinal Bertoni mentioned the right to humanitarian intervention, actually the duty and right to humanitarian intervention. I would like to tell Msgr. Schooyans that in human rights papers it is a relatively new category. Within the United Nations it was strongly supported by the Holy See. It was John Paul II who, I believe in the year 2000 or 2001, mentioned the duty of humanitarian interventions. I think we should take this theme up in a future meeting. I don't know, as I have heard informally, whether we will deal again in the future with subsidiarity and solidarity. If so, my advice would be to intertwine subsidiarity and solidarity with international relations. In the context of international relations we should not forget the right to humanitarian intervention, which jeopardizes the concept of state sovereignty. The post-Westfalia model, as Prof. Kissinger said, poses new problems of juridical construction, economic answers and sociological analysis, therefore it is one of those topics in which the interdisciplinarity among the various branches of science present in our Academy can be very useful. Thank you, Madame Chair.

PRESIDENT GLENDON

As a matter of fact, humanitarian intervention was one of the specific areas that the former Minister for Relations with States suggested that we

look into in connection with subsidiarity. The thought came to me as you were speaking that it might be a good idea in this Closed Session if either Prof. Donati or Prof. Archer were willing to say a few words about the programme for next year. Would either of you like to do that? I think it would be really great to let people react to it.

Since I already know a little about this I am going to turn the chair over to Prof. Sabourin for a minute.

PROF. DONATI

I think the suggestion by Prof. Fumagalli Carulli is very interesting and could be easily accommodated within the programme for the next year, which is still under development and which will be composed, I suppose this is the main idea, of a plenary devoted to 'Pursuing the common good' through a new vision of the interchange between solidarity and subsidiarity. In fact, as we well know, the social doctrine of the Church is interpreted in many different ways when people speak about subsidiarity and solidarity. As we know, subsidiarity is mainly understood as a *laissez-faire*, something that says, 'give things to the lower levels of society', and solidarity is interpreted just as the opposite, 'you should not leave things to the lower levels but you have to get people all together and make them solidary in some way or another'. I am really very roughly speaking of course. So the idea of the programme is to look at what is built up in society as a common good through an interlink of subsidiarity and solidarity, how subsidiarity and solidarity can work together in order to construe the common good. The idea is also to attach to the main papers/presentations also practical examples in terms of new forms of economy, for instance the economy of communion, in terms of corporate social responsibility, not only towards the physical environment but also towards the social environment, the community, the family and so on, the subsidiarity between the state and the family, and so on and so forth. So I think that the idea of having, for instance, a round table focused upon the duty of a humanitarian intervention in international emergencies could be appropriate, it could be an interesting example of how subsidiarity and solidarity interlink together in that case, in that situation. More generally, the idea suggested by Prof. Archer and me about the possible tentative programme for next year is precisely to look at how civil society, let's say, both at the national and international level, can build up new institutions in terms of common good and so I would like also to have a look at how we can arrange the suggestion by Msgr. Schooyans when he says that human rights should be, in some way or another, put into our agenda. And in fact I think that if we think of sub-

sidiarity, solidarity and the common good as three pillars of a good society, they could be also a way though which we can also understand, or get a new understanding, of what human rights can be. So this is the main idea, I do not know whether it is clear. Prof. Archer could add a few words.

PROF. ARCHER

Very few words, because I think that was an extremely economical summary of what we are planning and where we have got to. I think the only thing I would like to add is to link also what Partha Dasgupta said about the actual, well, putting it into my terms as a sociologist, the actual structure and structuring of the ways in which social groups at various levels manage to find organisation, articulation for their goals and then different forms of interaction, sometimes integration, sometimes more conflictual, with larger institutions in society. So I think you are quite right that, since the old days, meaning roughly 1950, when we could talk fairly confidently about the existence of such things called communities, and we mean something geolocal by this, well, it was very clear from our paper today on migration that for millions and billions of people geolocality is no longer the main basis of the way in which they are knit or networked into society. But equivalently, this is just my observation on the literature, we have two trends, one of which is confusion and the other of which is individualism. I think the literature understands these changes that are the side effects of globalisation very badly. So we have had many journalistic social scientists rushing into the gap and writing books about the new individualism as though the decline of what we used to understand as community has been replaced simply by state powers and often supra-state powers and individuals who are strange monads with capacities for complete and capricious self-reinvention. So by now it is no surprise that I am talking about people like Ulrich Beck. It doesn't help, it doesn't help form social policy, the kinds of things Kevin Ryan was talking about cannot be addressed through that kind of model, but on the other hand there is a lot of confusion about what kinds of social institutions constitute and represent subsidiary institutions so very often in the literature one finds a complete interchangeability between the third sector, the voluntary sector, the non profit sector. In fact, subsidiarity is a much more extensive principle than simply these kinds of institutions. So that that is the kind of issue that we want to conceptualise analytically and then explore its practical consequences on the ground, which is why we attach just as much importance to practical instances where this is working well as we do to the exercise of our own workers' academics in clarifying what the principles and concepts at work actually are.

PROF. KUAN

Thank you, Madam President. I wish to add my 5 cents' reflection onto the reflection of Prof. Dasgupta, a reflection in response to the theme of Prof. Ryan about the conception of the human person and the hypothesis of Msgr. Schooyans' search for the fundamentals, for the basics, that underline norms and law. I pick up a question raised by Prof. Dasgupta to the effect that what makes a society progress or fail. And that question reminds me of the book by Stiglitz, *What Makes Globalization Work*. And again I am reminded by the title of another influential book by Robert Putnam, *What Makes Democracy Work*. And I then remember also a great book by Richard F. Ames, *The Rise and Fall of Nations*. All these books seem to ask the same question, what makes society, community institutions of human beings work. Of course, what is meant by 'working' can be very different. On the one hand it may mean stability, or a question raised by a very influential political scientist in the 1950s, the question is, what holds the people together. What holds the people together. It is about the bondage, the social bondage, about dynamics that promote social cooperation and prevent social conflict. What is meant by efficiency and effectiveness? That is what Prof. Robert Putnam has in mind when he asks, 'what makes democracy work?' All these questions have to do with institutions, with the factors that may hold people together, that may energise people towards a common goal or consensus, that may motivate people to make some sacrifices in search of the common good. And it seems to me, when we dig into the answers provided by those authors, they all refer to very fundamental values and norms. For Robert Putnam for example, trust underlines the working of a social capital that in turn contributes to governmental efficiency, etc. By all this I mean that, if we are searching for a comprehensive and broad theme for future research, we could perhaps focus on very fundamental, very basic values that we want to propagate, we want to understand, we want to translate into workable institutions. What these values are, it could be love, it could be trust, or subsidiarity may be a value, although it is not yet understood or recognised as such, so a research of fundamental values that relates human persons to human persons and makes up the ideal society that we desire, that may be the future. Thank you.

PRESIDENT GLENDON

Thank you. Your remarks, Prof. Kuan, make me think of the phrase that one of our former speakers, Francis Fukuyama (who, incidentally, wrote a book on trust) used. He used the phrase 'the great disruption' to



refer to the huge social and economic changes of the late 20th century that have had the effect of eroding the seedbeds of all those qualities that tend to be taken for granted by economists, lawyers and politicians. I think this is one of those areas where Catholic social thought really is in uncharted territory along with all the social sciences, because for centuries it has been possible to take for granted certain seedbeds of character and competence, such as families and other small-scale institutions. These were so deeply unsettled in the late 20th century that we have some new questions, and so I think all these suggestions that are coming from various parts of the room are coalescing on a very good and useful topic for us.

PROF. DASGUPTA

Really just a response to what you are saying. We are zeroing in on something terribly important and I apologise to both Prof. Archer and Prof. Donati for not having known what lies in store next year, so I was not giving you any fresh... it is all there, at least in parts. When I was saying, I think we are zeroing in on something very important, earlier I said that, in a sense, we economists who have written on what makes markets work, etc., we have scratched the surface in the following sense. Basically our answer is, it works when it works and that is not deep. And the deep thing is the one you have just now identified. So we can say, what makes globalisation work. OK, so we can set up the rules and regulations. What makes people expect that others will comply by the regulations? It is that bootstrap, which I still have not, by your own bootstraps you hang (?) onto one in which community trusts one another through the expectations, in other words, collapses through mistrust. The parameters may be the same in both the societies. Maybe there is no answer to it, by the way. We should not expect a solution. But maybe by framing the question in this way and then moving on to the terrain, I do not want to lose sight of what Prof. Ryan wanted us to think about, or Prof. Schooyans, but it would be very nice to see... because increasingly we will be mixing, as you were rightly saying, into inter-group interactions, and there the issue of trust becomes much more novel in some sense.

PRESIDENT GLENDON

Let me say again that it would be enormously helpful – because we are accumulating a lot of ideas that are related – if, when you go home or in the airplane, you could jot down your thoughts and formulate a topic. We can't do it in a minute but there are some great ideas here.



PROF. VILLACORTA

Thank you, Madam President. I was inspired when I reread just now the letter of the Holy Father to you, and also when you mentioned the Statutes' mandate that we help develop the social sciences, and secondly, that we provide elements that might be useful for the further development of the social teachings of the Church. I was just wondering whether sometime in the future, we could contemplate having a conference on the changing role of the Church, or the role of the Church in a changing world. Over the past years, it seems to me that we have discussed certain pressing issues, such as intergenerational solidarity, human person, democracy etc. I wonder if we had given sufficient attention to the role of the Church. So why don't we do it the other way around. We start with certain hypotheses on the changing role of the Church given the more pressing demands of the world today. I realised this need when I was interviewed during the press conference the other day and a lady journalist asked me the question, 'How powerful do you think the voice of the Church is these days?' It is indeed a good question because the only remaining voice that has moral ascendancy in the world today is the voice of the Church. If we really look at it as objectively as we can, who has the moral voice in the world today? We are not just talking about religion, we are talking about leadership, even political and social leadership. It's the Church. So I think that this topic, which is — speaking of coalescing and encompassing ideas— would cover all the fields that are represented in the Academy. For example, Prof. Allot had just talked about the transformation of international law. Prof. Ryan spoke of moral values in the context of economic progress and social stability. We can invite some academicians from the Pontifical Academy of Sciences to talk about current and emerging issues in science and technology. Moreover, as Prof. Ryan mentioned, Islam is a timely concern. There could be a panel on this subject. Is there *de facto* competition intensifying among religions? In other words, what are the social dynamics of inter-religious relationships? Thank you very much, Madame President.

PRESIDENT GLENDON

If it is outlandish we are really in trouble, because it is my impression that that sort of question has to be central to everything we do at every meeting. Prof. Ryan will tell me if I misinterpreted what he said, but I think that he agrees with you. He says that right now the Church, with her heavy responsibility of being at least an influential voice in the modern world, is falling down on its job of transmitting the faith from one generation to the

next. If the Church is not able to do that, then that voice is going to become fainter and faint. The challenge for us, as social scientists, is that in the world today we now have the most highly educated laity that we have ever had, and if the Church cannot speak to them at least on the same level of sophistication and with at least the same amount of persuasiveness, then her transmission of her values will become secondary to the transmission of value systems that leave out moral and ethical questions. So I don't think you are out of line at all. Thank you.

PROF. ARCHER

I wasn't trying to jump the queue but it's just a continuation. No, I think far from being out of line you're opening up a very interesting area. But I think we should look at the black side of it as well as the bright side, what should we do? By the black side I am more and more aware of the growing forces that are pushing the Church out of public life altogether. We have examples of this in things like adoption agencies, hospitals and child care clinics, but I think it is much bigger than that and this is something that is worth examining, that that actually is a new kind of militant atheism abroad, atheism or at least they used to be logically consistent and call themselves 'agnostics', now they don't bother, they are militant atheists, and that militancy is an attempt to muzzle us, to make us shut up, to tell us that not only do we not have the right to run private voluntary institutions, we don't even have the right to an opinion, let alone to intellectual or moral or normative leadership in the world. And I think we could be doing, in terms of our Statutes, exactly, quite a good service to the Magisterium in picking up this trend pretty soon after it has turned nasty, i.e. about the last three years, and devoting some time to analysing from where it's coming, in favour of what, why there is now hostility rather than this tolerant dismissal, which is how we used to be greeted for decades, because, as far as I know, we all experience it but there are no actual studies about it.

PRESIDENT GLENDON

I think we are really getting a wonderful collection of suggestions here that somehow are going to be able to be tied together.

PROF. RAGA

Thank you, Madam President. I'm not sure, but being seated at the back of the President one accepts the role of being a marginal Academician, so I'm just going to raise a marginal suggestion. In the line of Msgr. Schooyans' first intervention, I think that most of us agree on that but we can cor-

roborate this situation all along the meeting room these days, since either in the coffee break or in the corridors, some of us have been approached by invited persons saying more or less something that has been settled publicly by M. Perigot, today, just in the session after lunch. He said, I would never have imagined that a meeting like this would happen in the Vatican. This has been said by M. Perigot today but just in a fraternal situation where we have informal talks. So the question is, we need to be louder; otherwise we keep for us all that we are dealing with. This doesn't make much sense, it's a self-satisfactory situation but it ends there. To me, my concern is not as much that persons like M. Perrigot or Prof. Hsin (?) make such an assessment that they would never have imagined that this type of meeting could be held in the Vatican, but even persons inside the Church would never imagine that these meetings could be held in the Vatican, and to me this is the main concern and I'm talking about the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace. I'm sure, except for the officers and for Cardinal Martino and for His Excellency Msgr. Crepaldi, except for them, from the members of the Council, I doubt it that they realise what we are doing in our meetings. This is now my suggestion, maybe through the Chancellery if the Chancellor considers it could be correct, it is to include, we are going to have a member of the Council, we are going to have the meeting next June, then why don't we suggest that in any agenda of the meeting of the Pontifical Council of Justice be one point just to inform what has been done by the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences. Why not distribute for the members the last book published by the Academy, and why not put it on the website of the Pontifical Council as a reference, as a document that can be gone through, with a short abstract in order that the people that are related to and interested in social doctrine can know that there is a publication from the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences that can be interesting for them and for their studies, this could be my suggestion.

#### PRESIDENT GLENDON

In connection with these suggestions about better liaison with Justice and Peace, Prof. Sabourin said that I should tell the assembly about our recent experience. Almost five years ago Prof. Sabourin and I were asked by the Council of Justice and Peace to contribute essays by a certain deadline to them for a volume they were publishing, and being the good little scholars that we are, we wrote our essays, we submitted them by the deadline and then year after year went by and I got another letter from them, they said, would you write an essay for another volume? And I said, well, how about the essay that I wrote four years ago? And finally just yesterday

we found that the volume containing our essays written in 2002 was finally published. So they may be on a different timetable from us but it is a good idea that we should try to get on their website because we publish a book each year so they would have something to put on their website!

PROF. ZACHER (originally in German)

In these years I started working on my text on Democracy and I always noticed one thing, and that is that in the Church's Social Teaching often those who write the texts don't know what the local Bishops' Conferences are saying on the social teaching. Often the problems are different and there don't appear to be any collections of the regional works, comments or contributions on the Church's Social Doctrine. We've seen now that what is contained in the Compendium is only that which was written by the Popes. There's very little if anything apart from that, but it would be interesting to know what the Church as a whole does, how it understands the theme of subsidiarity in this light and to see what the reactions of the bishops and the faithful is locally. That's the first remark I wanted to make.

My second remark is on an entirely different subject, and that is the new elections. Of course this is not the time now, but there are a number of vacant seats in the Academy and it's a pity not to have the benefit of competencies for the future or to leave certain regions under- or non-represented. It also would be a pity not to have experts, we know how important experts such as Prof. Archer and others are who write texts that we can publish so I think we really need this and therefore it's important for us to continue to work and to work hard and it will be more and more difficult to do so if our numbers dwindle. The Statutes make it possible for us to have a larger number of Academicians. I believe that we should think about this and we should think about the future elections of new members.

Now, coming to the future themes, I think we should also consider the format of our work. We've talked about demography, globalization, I think we should try to tie threads together and I think we did so when we talked about the human person from the viewpoint of different disciplines. It's important to come to conclusions, though, and we certainly haven't thoroughly discussed the subject of globalization but I think it might be better if we could perhaps consider this theme again in a different or broader context. Prof. Dasgupta mentioned a theme that is very similar to that which Pierpaolo Donati and Margaret Archer have already suggested: What makes the human society work or not work really is the fundamental question we should be focusing on. As we've seen in our work on globalization, and we saw what it means in terms of mobility of population, we saw what

it means in terms of the important international organizations. We have to understand what will allow human society to be successful or to fail. We often refer to solidarity just as we speak of subsidiarity, perhaps we should begin to include other principles: participation, inclusiveness, which is a very important need, and integration. We have also spoken about confidence in particular. Madame Chairperson you mentioned confidence and also the security implications. Prof. Dasgupta made his proposal after that of Prof. Archer and Prof. Donati. I think it would be a good idea to choose this theme but broadening it somewhat and it may have to be dealt with in more than one conference. Thank you.

PROF. ZACHER (originally in German)

In these years I started working on my text on Democracy and I always noticed one thing, and that is that in the Church's Social Teaching often those who write the texts don't know what the local Bishops' Conferences are saying on the social teaching. Often the problems are different and there don't appear to be any collections of the regional works, comments or contributions on the Church's Social Doctrine. We've seen now that what is contained in the Compendium is only that which was written by the Popes. There's very little if anything apart from that, but it would be interesting to know what the Church as a whole does, how it understands the theme of subsidiarity in this light and to see what the reactions of the bishops and the faithful is locally. That's the first remark I wanted to make. My second remark is on an entirely different subject, and that is the new elections, of course this is not the time now, but there are a number of vacant seats in the Academy and it's a pity not to have the benefit of competencies for the future or to leave certain regions under- or non-represented. It also would be a pity not to have experts, we know how important experts such as Prof. Archer and others are who write texts that we can publish so I think we really need this and therefore it's important for us to continue to work and to work hard and it will be more and more difficult to do so if our numbers dwindle. The Statutes make it possible for us to have a larger number of Academicians. I believe that we should think about this and we should think about the future elections of new members.

Now, coming to the future themes, I think we should also consider the format of our work. We've talked about demography, globalization, I think we should try to tie threads together and I think we did so when we talked about the human person from the viewpoint of different disciplines. It's important to come to conclusions, though, and we certainly haven't thoroughly discussed the subject of globalization but I think it might be better

if we could perhaps consider this theme again in a different or broader context. Prof. Dasgupta mentioned a theme that is very similar to that which Pierpaolo Donati and Margaret Archer have already suggested. What makes the human society work or not work really is the fundamental question we should be focusing on. The human person, human identity is one of the central themes and law also should be considered. As we've seen in our work on globalization, and we saw what it means in terms of mobility of population, we saw what it means in terms of the important international organizations, we have to understand what will allow human society to be successful or to fail. We often refer to solidarity just as we speak of subsidiarity, perhaps we should begin to include other principles: participation, inclusiveness, which is a very important need, and integration. We have also spoken about confidence in particular. Madame Chairperson you mentioned confidence and also the security implications. Prof. Dasgupta made his proposal after that of Prof. Archer and Prof. Donati. I think it would be a good idea to choose this theme but broadening it somewhat and it may have to be dealt with in more than one conference. Thank you.

The Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences  
Casina Pio IV  
May 2008

The Holy See has repeatedly insisted that, while the Governments of poorer countries have a responsibility with regard to good governance and the elimination of poverty, the active involvement of international partners is indispensable. This should not be seen as an 'extra' or as a concession which could be postponed in the face of pressing national concerns. It is a grave and unconditional moral responsibility, founded on the unity of the human race, and on the common dignity and shared destiny of rich and poor alike, who are being drawn ever closer by the process of globalization.

Trade conditions favourable to poor countries, including, above all, broad and unconditional access to markets, should be made available and guaranteed in lasting and reliable ways.

Provision must also be made for the rapid, total and unconditional cancellation of the external debt of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) and of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Measures should also be adopted to ensure that these countries do not fall once again into situations of unsustainable debt.

Developed countries must also recognize and implement fully the commitments they have made with regard to external aid.

(From the Letter of His Holiness Benedict XVI to Dr. Angela Merkel Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Vatican, 16 December 2006)