

THE PONTIFICAL  
ACADEMY OF  
SOCIAL SCIENCES

EXTRA SERIES

1

# Closed Session



VATICAN CITY  
2002

11 April 2002

# CLOSED SESSION

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF ACADEMICIANS

(11 April 2002)

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: It is a great pleasure to me to begin this general assembly in handing over to our two new colleagues their diplomas, which have been officially stamped. I shall then ask for two short self-presentations, first from José Raga, who was appointed on the 7<sup>th</sup> of May 2001, second from Paul Kirchhof, who was appointed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November 2001. My congratulations and my best wishes for a fruitful participation in the Academy.

PROF. JOSÉ T. RAGA GIL: Thank you, Mr. President.

Emotion and foreign language cannot be compatible in the same person at the same time. But anyway I'll try to do my best, and I am going to make a short presentation, as you asked yesterday, that will be brief not because of my capacity for synthesis, but because of the insignificance of the person's life.

My life starts in year '38 – you don't need to keep this as confidential information – in Valencia, it's... just to place yourselves, on the Central East coast of Spain, and then I got the degree in Law at the University of Valencia and in Economics at the University of Barcelona, finishing my PhD in Valencia again.

Now, I would like to split my short curriculum in two channels, only for methodological purposes: the academic channel on the one side and the engagement with the Church tasks on the other.

My academic career starts in year '61 as lecturer, as most of us started, in the field of Economics and Public Finance in the University of Valencia, becoming afterwards assistant professor in the University Complutense of Madrid, and finally, in year '77, full professor with chair in the University of Salamanca, coming back to the chair in Madrid in year '81 on a lifetime basis. Nevertheless in 1994 I accepted the proposal of a new Catholic University in Madrid, Universidad San Pablo – CEU, to become Rector (President) in order to push this University to the highest level. I accepted such a duty, because I considered that the project was an interesting mixture of academic and apostolic mission, and then I moved on there and I served as Rector during five years, remaining now there as professor, quite far from the administrative duties.

The research since the beginning of my career starts basically with the topics related to regional economics, to continue in the mid seventies on economies of the energy – it was the period of the oil crisis – and concentrating in the third period, I would say, on the research on the public sector economics, with preference on the expenditure side. In parallel with this, in the last twenty years, I developed a quite active action – I would not say successful, but at least a couple of pages – on matters related to the Social Doctrine of the Church and on the social goods, specifically education.

The visible result of the research is represented in a bit more than a hundred titles between books, readings and articles on scientific journals.

Member of the Royal Economic Society, the American Economic Association, the Mont Pelerin Society and the International Institute of Public Finance in Saarbrücken, in which institution I served during almost ten years as a member of the Board of Management, and during three additional years as Executive Vice President.

What's about the Church engagement? Disregarding functions at the Dioceses bodies' level, like Pastoral Council and Economic Affairs Council of the Dioceses of Madrid, and taking in consideration only those matters much more related to the purposes of this Academy purposes, I must mention my Presidency of the Social Weeks in Spain since 1980; that's a nomination from the Spanish Bishops Conference; being the pur-

pose of the Social Weeks, to spread the social thought of the Church into the community.

This institution, familiar for someone of you, is exactly the type of body that our friend Belisario Betancur mentioned that is required in order to be the loudspeaker of the Church in the social doctrine. The first start of the Social Weeks was in France in 1904, just as a consequence of *Rerum Novarum*, and one year later the first Social week took place in Spain.

I'm also member of the Social Committee of the European Union Bishops' Commission (COMECE), representing the Spanish Bishops' Conference. In this Social Committee we deal also with the social doctrine of the Church at the European level.

Let me now pay tribute to recognition because of some unmerited distinctions I've received. Following the chronological order of concession, I got: A) the Gold Medal of Honour from the University Complutense of Madrid in '95; B) the Great Cross of Alphonse the X<sup>th</sup> called the Wise, from the Spanish Government in '99; C) the Great Cross of Saint Gregory the Great from the Holy Father in the year 2000; and finally D) elected Academician of this Pontifical Academy in May 2001. And it is particularly for this very last nomination, Mr. President, that I want to finish my presentation by expressing the honour that I feel in appearing before you all today in this my first plenary session of the Academy. Accordingly, my words must be of gratitude for being elected, which, you know better than me, is exclusively due to your generosity and to the benevolence of this Institution.

Furthermore, in professing my faith to the Catholic Church I wish to make clear my filial gratitude to the Holy Father who has chosen me to form part of this Academy. I promise you, Mr. President, that my most wholehearted desire is to carry out the task assigned to me to the very best of my capacity, and I beseech the Lord that the results of my works bear fruits. I put my hope in Him more than in my abilities.

Thank you very much.

PROF. PAUL KIRCHHOF: President, Ladies and Gentlemen, allow me to express my warm thanks for this extraordinary honour to be member of this Academy that I may reflect and put forward advice together with you. I see this as a commitment, and I hope with my modest skills I'll be able to contribute to our joint work.

I was born in '43. Today I'm professor at the Law Faculty of the University of Heidelberg and director of the Institute for Finance and Fiscal Law. I studied in Freiburg and Munich, where I had in '68 my first teaching appointment. In '75 I was appointed as professor in Münster and director of the Institute for Fiscal Law. For three years I was Vice President of the University there. In '81 I went back to Heidelberg, and since then I have been a member of the University and also Vice President of the University Council.

Between '87 and '99 I was a member of the German Constitutional Court. This was a very active period with the reunification of Germany (how to bring together two States with totally different structures). We were also seeking to be more and more integrated in the European Union. At the same time the progress of sciences (nuclear physics, medicine and biochemistry) put totally new questions to the Constitutional Court, which had to provide new answers from the old texts.

According to German law, a Constitutional Judge can only be in the Court for 12 years. So I am now relieved from this work.

Presently, I'm one of the two publishers of a large encyclopaedia of public sciences in ten volumes. In particular, 130 professors worked to produce a volume describing the different powers of State law, according to different interpretations. Professor Zacher made a very fundamental contribution to social law. You can imagine the job of publishers is very stimulating, but also very tiring.

I am the President of the German Association of fiscal legal experts, which gathers the fiscal scientists of Austria and Germany. In this capacity I am presently commissioned from six German Länders, which consider reforming their fiscal laws to such an extent that proposals will have to be submitted to Parliaments.

I was a student of the Cusano's work out of which resulted an episcopal work for people who wished to conclude their studies in a very meaningful way in order to follow career paths. As a University professor I am the tutor of a number of students. I am also a member of the Committee of German Bishops for the scientific topics.

But the most important part of my work, or rather of our joint work, comes from the fact that my wife and me have four children and three grandchildren. Thank you.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Thank you very much Professors Raga and Kirchhof. Accept our best wishes for your coming work with us and for your other activities. This evening, dear colleagues, we must consider various questions, which I must now list. We must speak about what was already achieved in this session and about what will follow on the two first themes discussed so far. Today, after a probably brief reference to our work on democracy, we should seriously discuss the programme of our next Plenary Session in 2003 about globalization. We shall not speak today about the third theme since I hope that most of you will be there on Saturday morning. We shall then speak about our activities concerning intergenerational solidarity. Today, I shall moreover bring you up to date about our project of a forum, which was the main item at our General Assembly last year. We shall then have still time, I hope, for other business.

Is this division into three parts of our present meeting clear to everyone? So, I first call on whoever wants to speak about the workshop on democracy or about general issues raised by the organization of this week or about the publication of its proceedings.

Since nobody seems to want the floor at this stage I shall just comment on a suggestion made by Professor Kirchhof. He suggested that this Plenary Meeting should not be reflected in a single volume of proceedings, in which globalization, democracy and intergenerational solidarity should be brought together, but that we should rather publish three separate workshop booklets. This seems to be a good idea. I would like to know whether it can be accepted by the General Assembly, but this may come later.

At this point I am asking Professor Sabourin to tell us what are his ideas after our discussions of Monday and Tuesday, and what he envisages about the choice of the programme for next year.

PROF. LOUIS SABOURIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like first to personally congratulate the Academicians who have joined us officially today, Professor Raga Gil and Professor Kirchhof. I'm convinced that they will definitely bring a lot to our discussions of next year.

Secondly, I would like to thank and congratulate Professor Zacher for the meetings of the last two days that have been very interesting.

Thirdly, I would like to thank those of you who have communicated to me their congratulations regarding the way in which the Colloquium on globalization was run and regarding the contributions from our guests. Of course anyone of us can be frustrated about the fact that the time given to each one of us was limited. God knows that personally I would have wished that we could have had more time. We have, however, learnt a lot. So we hope that all these discussions will be published soon. We shall particularly appreciate corrections and adjustments to the texts that speakers have sent us.

Now, regarding next year. During the first meeting of this week I did mention that five themes had been proposed by several people. I did indicate that they had to do with (i) civil society and globalization, (ii) the risks of globalization, (iii) the challenge that globalization represents for the Church, (iv) the social doctrine of the Church in the face of globalization, (v) new governance and the needs of such governance in face of globalization. I had meetings with several of you. I heard your presentations and the opinion stream in the colloquium from yesterday afternoon. It came up that, according to 95% of you, we need to address the issue of governance.

These observations and conclusion will be examined by the Council that will meet on Saturday.

So, the theme still needs to be decided upon, but it will most probably be “governance in the face of globalization (analysis, comments and recommendations).”

Concerning the process leading to the treatment of this theme, we would like to propose that small groups be organized so that people who share a common discipline meet during the two coming days here at the Vatican and later continue discussions via E-mail. Our colleague Villacorta has proposed that we might hold a meeting in his country financed by organizations other than the Academy. Just one remark, in passing. This needs to be studied closely, without forgetting that we face the perspective of April or May 2003. The gathering of funds and the organization will require a little more than a year. This is a very interesting suggestion but requiring to have a rather long-term vision.

More precisely concerning next year, part of the work might be articulated around an initial group with Professor Glendon, and other jurists who are also members of our Academy, for example Professors Zacher,

Schambeck, Kirchhof and Suchocka, Judge McNally. It will be their responsibility under the leadership of our distinguished colleague, to choose their approach, the organization of a work session, to be held during a morning or an afternoon. This will have to do with legal and judicial responsibilities of the Church in front of globalization. Another group might be organized around our colleague Professor Archer, and made up of sociologists. It could discuss education, migrations and how to address these themes from a governance point of view. Our colleagues Morande, Ramirez and Zubrzycki would of course take part. A third group would be articulated around the structure of governance in front of economic globalization; our colleagues Llach and Dasgupta have accepted to think this over, and also Professors Tietmeyer, Raga Gil, Arrow and Nojiri would be called to join them, and of course you, Mr. Chairman. One of you could chair this group, and another could prepare the actual arguments to be discussed in a specific work session, and you could choose an external expert who would then be able to bring comments. You could decide all these things.

Another group could be articulated around theological and philosophical questions. Monsignor Schooyans, Professors Zulu, Villacorta, Zampetti, Betancur, Vymetalik could, together with me, reflect and consider the political and historical conditions of governance and how this concept has developed. After four specialized work sessions, a final session would draw a synthesis prepared by the coordinators of each workgroup.

These are my recommendations, after suggestions by some of you. I thank you all sincerely. These are initial proposals, which we can discuss now. I shall present the conclusions at the Council on Saturday. I do wish that we came to a decision regarding these small work groups, so that we may have a programme at least by September.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Thank you very much. An exchange of views would be very welcome now. Is there anyone who would like to intervene? Some of you have been mentioned as having certain responsibilities to assume. I assume that, as long as you are silent, you are in agreement. Professor Tietmeyer.

PROF. HANS TIETMEYER: I just have one question. Should the special groups meet before or during next plenary meeting? The best solution, in



my view would be if the groups had some separate sessions at the beginning or before the next plenary meeting. They could then report to the plenum and their reports could provide a basis for the discussion there.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: As Chairman, I have to remind you that we do not have any means to organize preliminary meetings or seminars. The group could get organized just through letters. Alternatively they could hold Internet meetings.

PROF. LOUIS SABOURIN: The question that Professor Tietmeyer has just raised is very relevant. As the Chairman has said, we don't have special financial means, but maybe some progress could already be made here before Saturday.

PROF. HANS TIETMEYER: I have only expressed my preference. If such organisation is, however, not possible, I am not insisting.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: That is why I am saying that your question is very pertinent. According to what is proposed by Prof. Sabourin, we would all meet together from whichever background we come from. We would have time to look all at the works put together by our colleagues from other disciplinary backgrounds. It is only for preparing the specialized sessions that disciplinary groups would be formed and already get here in touch for the purpose. Professor Schambeck, would you like to say something?

PROF. HERBERT SCHAMBECK: President Malinvaud, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to broach just some fundamental topics.

I would like to express my pleasure at the nomination of the two new colleagues. I am very pleased that Prof. Raga Gil is a representative of Spain, because Spanish Universities played an important part in the history of Europe, and because the contact between you and the Spanish Catholic Church is of great importance. And I'm very happy to have Professor Kirchhof amongst us, because since the beginning, at the foundation of the Academy, I found it very regrettable that we didn't have a prominent representative of fiscal law amongst us. In those years during which Professor Kirchhof was in the Constitutional Court in Germany, I

think important knowledge was gathered for the social doctrine of the Catholic Church, and for Christian principles of a State order in a pluralistic democracy. I would like to thank President Malinvaud who has offered us such a week where so many matters could be discussed even among ourselves. In that sense I would like to include Professor Zacher and Professor Sabourin because in all these months and weeks, together with President Malinvaud and with Monsignor Sánchez, I have devoted so much time to preparing this meeting. I am not just a member of the Academy, but also a member of the Council.

Moreover I must recall the spirit in which I contributed since 1988 to launch this Academy and to provide a financial basis for its activities.

In Austria, I was a parliamentarian for many years. I was then motivated by the idea that the Holy Father could benefit from a series of activities that would all be financially covered. We have to think what financial framework is possible, so that we don't undertake too much, compared to our means.

I would like to say something very clearly: we are a Scientific Academy not a school, and none of us has the right to classify someone else. We are all colleagues here. But I always found it exceptional that all share in our reflections and participate, because there is great collegiality amongst ourselves from different corners of this planet. That this actually happens is wonderful.

Well, now, after these years since we have existed, are we asking what echo our publications have in the public? Well, the plenary meetings of the Academy are announced. I would like to thank Monsignor Sánchez for that. I would like also to make a very concrete proposal right now, that in the future we should make a more determined effort: at the beginning of every plenary we should set up a Committee that works on the material discussed, so that, at the end of the meeting a statement be published by *L'Osservatore Romano* in the different languages. When we go home people ask us: what was the outcome of your meetings on the very topical subjects you discussed?

What kind of echo have the previous publications of the last five years had? Let us look at the distribution of these publications. Let us wonder what reviews these publications get. I think that, if we deal carefully with the echo of our publications, we shall be able to carry out far more activities.

As to the future plenary meetings, I think it would be important to reflect on how to make them more effective. We should avoid overlap with other important meetings in the Vatican. We should insist on a full application of our Statutes, with in particular the regular participation of a representative of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. In the past, Monsignor Martin was always here in the plenary sessions and the Council meetings. I very much regret moreover that the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, which should be available to the Holy See, does not deal with the preparation of the social Catechism. Thank you.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Thank you very much. Who would like to intervene now?

MONSIGNOR MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO: I'll speak in Spanish. As I have said before at the Council meeting, I believe that the question of education should be at the very heart of the debate on globalization. We have examined the question of inequalities, we have spoken about religion and poverty, about ethics, but we've not discussed education, and that's of primary importance. Look at the title there on *L'Osservatore Romano*: the Pope is saying, "Educate". When I had to prepare a conference on globalization I went to look at the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and there it speaks of education under the word "globalization." When I represented the Holy See in Budapest at a meeting organized by UNESCO, and the central point was again education, they said that education would resolve the problems of all inequalities. I believe it is of primary importance that the Academy addresses this issue, not only governance. Of course we need to speak about financial means and economics, but the central issue is education and this is the mission of the Church.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Thank you very much. This definitely is part of the duties of what Professor Sabourin was handing over to the sociologists, if I have understood well.

PROF. MICHEL SCHOONYANS: Let us not forget that we have a specialist as Professor Raga Gil, if we discuss education, and I would like very much that this theme be taken into consideration. I believe that we would be able to include in our group people who dedicate themselves to edu-

cation. For instance, we should look at the different congregations, which historically devoted themselves to education and would be coming from different areas. We must also look at how educators can transmit our ideas around the world.

PROF. JOSÉ T. RAGA GIL: I am going to speak in Spanish, in order to follow the way in which this session started.

I believe education is the central point of the XXI<sup>st</sup> century. Modern society needs to pay attention to the education process in which spiritual values should take an important role. We are still living under the influence and heritage of “modernity.” The modernity’s philosophy proposed a model for society consisting in the idea that all things that man cannot touch and measure do not exist at all, are not real. Present people are mostly borne in this materialistic view of the world, and this is incompatible with the way we see globalisation where wealth and poverty coexist.

So, education is a social capital and brings a whole spectrum of intrinsic values at social, familiar and individual level. This is the reason why education must be considered as a common good and, as such, of public interest. The acceptance of this principle will bring us into a different parcel of the problem: it is that of the financing means for education activities. Concerning this aspect, it is very difficult to justify that public resources are only addressed to public schools and not to the private ones. The qualification of the good is for the good itself and not because of the institution developing such activity. Some developments must be done in this sense. We need to go on with this thesis, as Monsignor Schooyans said before. In Spain, the Federation for Religious Education, both at primary and at secondary level, was surprised because of the fights they had to handle in this matter but, in spite of that, I think it’s not too optimistic to consider that this model will go through a certain evolution.

The low fertility-rate has caused the fact that some more opportunities are available, concerning the capacity to choose, but not on equal opportunities. Religious schools, or private schools, they have at present a long waiting list of children willing to be accepted and, at the same time, there is overcapacity in public schools.

I’ve heard much and read much on the subject, and I can say that the socialist thesis starts by saying that financial means handed over to pri-

vate institutions are taking away financial possibilities from the public education system, as if the two forms of education were not the same common good.

PROF. PARTHA S. DASGUPTA: I hope very much, when we reflect upon these issues raised this afternoon, we do not see education and governance as being two separate subjects. Thinking at longer heads, we might even interpret governance as being the enabling form for the financing of education.

In other words, as one of the economists responsible for introducing governance in next year's deliberations, I hope very much we will be able to work in harness with those aspects of our deliberations which have to do with education.

Just as a preliminary set of reflections I would like to share with you, it seems to me the character of education, particularly the character of civic education, has great importance, never mind the scientific truths that are taught reasonably well in western schools and colleges. We see a lot of correlation between lack of education and the inability to get on with our neighbours.

This morning I had to bypass something I value greatly, to be blessed by the Holy Father, because there were messages waiting for me from India and Cambridge. The Hindus are now murdering the Muslims in Gujarat; my sister is pretty much enclosed. Several thousands of people have been killed in the last few weeks. All the horrors that you periodically read about in various parts of the world are being perpetuated in Warora Adilabad, western India.

Now, it is easy to think that lack of education is the fault here. However, the people who flew the 747s into the New York towers were actually highly educated people, in the conventional sense of the term. But the character of education matters, the ability to live with one another. I don't know how this happens. I believe it has a lot to do with our parents, what kind of values they represented, reflected.

I hope very much that, when we think in terms of education, we do not take it as being a panacea of enlightenment. This enlightenment is a very illusive notion. When one sees these horrors being perpetuated, particularly in one's own country, of which one is proud in some sense obviously, one cannot refrain from asking what is the character of upbringing

that enables people to have something like respect for others despite maybe past injustices. In this respect when I say that governance matters I don't mean governance at a family level, but working upwards, the responsibility of the various institutions we established to protect one another from assaults. The right governance there is hugely important.

PROF. MARGARET ARCHER: Just like one point of clarification, we started off talking about one half-day session, which was to be jointly dedicated in some combination to education and migration in relation to the topic of globalization. That in itself is a large subject, but selectively of course it can be managed. Now the discussion about education is growing hugely. I spent 25 years of my life working on the sociology of education.

We are talking about a separate session, if we want to address all these issues about public-private, the historical relationship of the religious Orders in the private sector of educational delivery, the relationship between parental socialization, school curriculum, the issue of educational governance. We are then talking about the evolution of an entire social institution, which in historical and comparative terms has developed very differently throughout the globe, has very different structures, which give access to very different groups of people. Particularly in terms of their centralization and decentralization, these structures seriously condition what processes of change are possible etc.

It would be very easy right now to design a five days' meeting devoted to education, but one cannot do it. This is why I put a point of clarification and say, "Yes, all these issues are fascinating. But we cannot examine them all in the course of one morning."

So, if we are talking still within the context that Louis Sabourin started us off with half an hour ago, we have to be much more modest. We have to select thematically that which is relevant about education, which facilitates migration from particular national educational contexts: it is much more easy to become global for some people than for others, according to their formation and their qualification. That limited subject we can tackle.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Yes. You are quite right. We have to finish one coherent part of our project on globalization by the end of the next Plenary Session. We have to complete one round. We should look at things that are manageable within this time constraint.

Now, it's very good to have the prospect of launching later another programme, which would be a programme on education. This could certainly be a valuable effort for the Academy.

Yes, Professor Tietmeyer.

PROF. HANS TIETMEYER: I would like to support your view. We should not continue as we are doing now: discussions of different aspects of a general theme without coming to some conclusions. It might of course for many issues not be possible to come to a conclusion which can be agreed by all of us. But some selective or interim conclusions might be possible, for example by concluding: on this or that point we all agree or disagree and some issues and aspects are so important that we have to come back to them in another meeting. For example, the issue of globalization is so wide and has so many dimensions that we can go on with discussing it for some years. In my view, we should focus our further discussions on some especially important aspects and we should try to come to some conclusions. I am of course aware how difficult this is. But we should at least try this way. So we should focus our discussions in the next meeting on some specific points and should try to produce for the end of the meeting a short paper with some – maybe interim – conclusions. And such a paper then be transmitted to the authorities in the church and/or sent to the general public.

PROF. JUAN JOSÉ LLACH: I think we can combine both suggestions. On the one hand, to consider some aspects of education regarding globalization in the next Plenary Session in the year '03, but on the other hand, I think education would really deserve a whole session. It would be great to have it in the year '04, and to prepare a session on education is nothing simple. It could be convenient to nominate a Committee which would prepare a project and present it next year.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Professor Sabourin, please, what conclusion are you drawing from our discussion?

PROF. LOUIS SABOURIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank first all the members who have expressed their points of view today, and all those

who have accepted to coordinate the groups I proposed. We shall be in regular contact by E-mail, and as of tomorrow we can begin that.

I would like to thank in particular Mr. Tietmeyer for his very clear recommendation, which ought to fit with our intention to discuss globalization not in a general way, but rather from the governance point of view. How can we put into place programmes and educate politicians to better handle, to better control, to organize certain strategies to handle globalization? We need now to focus on what governance means. Beyond that, I agree that studying later more fully education is a great idea.

And so, to conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank all those who will contribute to the organization and setting up of the next assembly meeting. Of course we leave up to the Council to decide how everything will be organized. That is what I wanted to say.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Thank you very much. So, let me survey a few other points. We discussed publication of the papers presented in this session. The Council is going to look into it. We had three parts. Everything is possible, from one single publication for everything to four separate ones: one would deal with the general aspects (audience of the Holy Father, report by the President and so on); the three others would deal with the different themes that have been dealt with. Other possibilities are feasible, for instance to postpone for two years publication of the paper concerning solidarity between generations. If you have strong feelings about certain aspects and have anything to propose, this is the moment to say so. On my part, I believe that our three roundtables had very different purposes and should interest different readers. So, since no one has to add to the previous discussion, the Council will decide on its basis.

I must talk also today about our project of a Forum. We spoke about it a lot last year. I hope that you remember what was said then and that you also remember the letters I sent you. I must now complement your information.

On the 20<sup>th</sup> of October, when I last wrote to you about the forum, or rather a little bit before, I had received a letter from the Secretary of State which I mentioned. This letter made it clear that Cardinal Sodano had not wished to designate himself who would be representing the Holy See at the Forum. But he approved my proposal to invite Cardinal Ratzinger, Cardinal Martini and Archbishop Martin to participate in a Forum to be held during this session of April 2002.



So, I wrote on the 24<sup>th</sup> of October to the two Cardinals to request the service that they participate in the Forum. I sent them several documents, in particular the two notes which had been prepared for the purpose by Professor Archer and me. I received soon afterwards a letter from Cardinal Martini where he expressed his regret that he could not attend (I have learnt since then that his health was not the best, since he resigned from his duties in Milan). I then contacted our previous colleague Martin, who agreed to attend the Forum but told me that it might not be a good idea to hold a Forum with him as the only representative of the Holy See. When the Council met on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, I was still at the same point. I had received no answer from Cardinal Ratzinger. So, we agreed at the Council that I would send a reminder to the Cardinal, which I did on the 17<sup>th</sup> of December. We then had the perspective that our colleague Ambassador Suchocka would meet Cardinal Ratzinger as Ambassador, and that on that occasion she could bring up some of the problems concerning our Forum. This visit took place around the 20<sup>th</sup> of January, and looked favourable to acceptance of our invitation. Unfortunately, eight days later I received an answer from the Cardinal, but not a positive one.

I was then informed that our colleague Ambassador Suchocka had also had a meeting with the Secretary of State Cardinal Sodano, and that they had then spent some time discussing our project, and examining which other personalities we could invite. Having been informed of this, I wrote immediately to Cardinal Sodano on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February to update him on where I stood personally (there are some moments where the President has to decide by himself without having the possibility to receive the advice of the Council or the Assembly). I showed that I had been informed about what our colleague Suchocka had discussed with him, and I thanked him, Cardinal Sodano, for his interest in our Forum. I acknowledged that irreversible progress had been made during the year toward the implementation of our project. I added that I wanted to ensure that everything be done for the success of the Forum, in particular thanks to a serious preparation with the Church Authorities that would participate. Considering that our General Assembly was to meet just two months ahead, I wrote that I had to postpone the Forum to next year.

I did mention also that with his approval and that of our General Assembly I would write to Archbishop Scola and Cardinal Lehmann,

President of the German Episcopal Forum, requesting their participation in the Forum. Cardinal Sodano gave me his approval in a specific letter. So, we find ourselves today with the prospect of setting up a Forum for 2003. This was announced to the Council last Tuesday, when I also mentioned my intention to meet those who will have accepted our invitees so as to prepare individually with each one of them the discussions at the Forum.

Today I would appreciate if you could give me your approval, so that we may continue to set up and organize a Forum in 2003. I suppose that we shall now hear Professor Suchocka who assumed direct involvement in pleading for our project and also organizing in Rome a meeting on globalization, where in particular Professor Sabourin could present the progress of our work on that theme.

H.E. AMBASSADOR HANNA SUCHOCKA: When I visited Cardinal Ratzinger and Cardinal Sodano, the discussions between us academicians about our project of a Forum had already been so long that my idea was to finalize the sitting of the Forum. I was afraid that, if the Forum could not take place this year, the future of the project would be completely unsure. Indeed, I am still afraid that we could again meet in April next year without result.

I insist on the fact that my role was completely informal. I did it as a member of the Academy, not as a President or somebody who has a special mandate from the Academy, but of course working on behalf of the Academy and thinking about the Academy. So when I had a possibility to meet Cardinal Ratzinger, and I had a very interesting discussion with him, I asked him to revise his agenda so as to be available for us. His answer was rather positive, but exactly after this semi-positive answer, you, as a President, received the letter with negative answer.

And finally I decided to go to Sodano. It was the beginning of February, and I wanted to do something to organize the Forum in April, because I thought that two months gave enough time to find the correct person. Because I said it was a very urgent question, Cardinal Sodano organized a special meeting on Saturday.

He was very friendly to our idea, and he said exactly, "It's important, I would like to help you," etc., etc., and "Please ask your President to write a letter; I would have the letter on my desk on Monday." Cardinal Sodano, also proposed some names. It was his idea to put Cardinal Lehmann and Cardinal Schönborn on the list.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Yes, you realize quite well that I did not exactly follow the strategy proposed by our colleague. Well, I accept the blame. I had to take a decision. I was probably particularly conscious of the difficulty of the operation. I do really think that it is not so easy to make the Forum a success.

H.E. AMBASSADOR HANNA SUCHOCKA: We had different opinions. I thought I could be the hero of a so-called Blitzkrieg. Sometimes it's better to organize things in a very short time.

You also referred, Mr. President, to the workshop on globalization I organized last Friday 5 April with a colleague Ambassador. This was also done in a very short time, motivated as we are to make our Academy more visible and more active. Maybe it was done not very professionally, but I think that echo of our workshop on Friday, three days before we started with the Academy, was exactly very good here in Rome. I meet persons, they tell me, "It was interesting. We would like to have papers," etc., etc. Being now in Rome, I think more generally I can do something more for the Academy. So maybe about the Forum I was too active, Mr. President, in some respect.

PROF. EDMOND MALINVAUD: Well, have you taken note of all this? Of course Academicians are very welcome to encourage me from the back to go forward. I devote a lot of time to these letters that I send to Cardinals. I try to make an appeal, and make things seem attractive to them. Perhaps there are better alternative strategies.

Let me repeat what I intend to do now. I intend writing two letters to H.E. Monsignor Scola and Cardinal Lehmann respectively in which I shall indicate how we want to better accomplish our mission. I shall tell them that, if they agree, I shall solicit appointments to meet them and discuss the holding of this forum with Academicians, for which the Agenda will be then made precise. Well, I see that there are no other opinions to express.

Changing the subject, I am drawing your attention to the fact that the Chancellor very kindly has put this very short report on your desk. This is something you know already, namely the report of our General Assembly a year ago. The record was put in written form in English with just a little of editing. This is an internal document, not to be published.

The Council believes that it is a good idea to produce in the future such a report of our annual meetings. So, if you have no objection we shall do the same for today's meeting.

Also, we need to talk about the date. Some of you have said that you need to know when the next meeting will be held. Our intention is to hold the next Plenary Session from Friday morning the 2<sup>nd</sup> of May 2003 to Tuesday the 6<sup>th</sup> of May 2003 inclusive, four days of work for the whole Academy, Friday, Saturday, Monday and Tuesday. We shall have three days to discuss globalization, half a day for the Forum, and half a day for a report on democracy.

Remember also that tomorrow, Saturday, in the morning we shall have the opportunity to discuss the programme regarding solidarity between generations.

Finally, we shall now spend a few moments to remember Father Utz. Professor Schambeck and Professor Zubrzycki you are welcome to speak.

PROF. HERBERT SCHAMEBCK: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, if the name Professor Utz is mentioned, each one of us has had their own relationship to Father Utz, because for decades he contributed a lot to the Catholic social doctrine with a number of publications, and also volumes. I remember the volume he published with Father Groner. It was a publication in two volumes about the social-doctrine of Pope Pius XII, and then there was a third volume that was added. He worked together with Countess of Galen, which was a historical work to these present times, which was one of the most important historical works, and he made contribution to the social politics of the Church through this Foundation.

A political change occurred, and there was a certain moment of fluctuation when communism fell, so Father Utz for previous decades, when working on the Catholic social doctrine, had made a contribution to this bridge function which was so essential between East and West. And he was extremely present, as Professor Raga Gil knows very well, he was very much present in Spain, where he had a great influence on Latin America. I realized this myself when I was travelling through South America.

Father Utz was not a travelling professor, let's say. He took part in international meetings, at the World Congress of Social Philosophers, at such a World Congress in Vienna in 1960, and I saw him there for the first

time. He managed to speak all languages of the world, he stood in the centre and in this congress between these legal professors he was at the centre and he was surrounded by jurists. So he had Marxists that were there, and Father Utz had a special credibility which went over and beyond the Church.

When he became a Dominican, Father Utz also sought a bond with the Austrian Dominicans. He was professor in Fribourg and he was also in contact with his order in Friesach in Carinthia. Professor Utz in his special style, was in Fribourg, and then he withdrew from his Institute and he was a pensioner. I visited him there.

He was living in a house which contained his entire literature and all his publications and letters, and Countess of Galen was his scientific assistant, who stood by him.

Father Utz participated also in the preparation of the founding of our Academy. I visited him at the beginning of 1990 in Fribourg and invited him to contribute within the framework of his possibilities and wishes to my initiative.

As in 1988 the “guidelines for studies and lessons of the social-doctrine of church in the education for priests” were published by the congregation of the Catholic education system, I was very impressed. They show clearly the continuity of the Catholic social-doctrine in general and of the papal doctrine in special. Those guidelines went happily also into the pedagogical requests of the Catholic social-doctrine. On that occasion, I had in 1988 the idea of how important it would be for the Holy See if, besides the already existing papal scientific Academies, there would also exist one for Catholic social-doctrine which is so actual as recommendation for social-forming of all parts of the world.

As Pope John Paul II has achieved during the many years of his pontificate pathbreaking work for the actual development of the Catholic social-doctrine and the 100-year-jubilee of the social-encyclical “*Rerum Novarum*” was imminent in 1991, I thought that the moment was welcome.

The relevance of the Catholic social-doctrine increased further after the proclamation of those guidelines, so that after 1988 in Central and East Europe the political turn with the ending of communism became apparent, which led to an ideological vacuum that needs reply.

As I knew that the professor at the Papal University of Gregoriana for many years, P. Dr. John Schasching SJ, whom I have known and estimat-

ed already for many decades from his work in Austria, knows the academic life of the Holy See and also the political necessities of the world, I arranged a meeting with him during his holidays in Pörtlach (Carinthia) in August 1989. On that occasion, I told him about my idea of the founding of the Pontifical Academy for Social Sciences. He also answered in the affirmative about the relevance of such a founding and he meant that for this founding an initiative at the Vatican would be necessary and for the realization a committee of international personalities would be welcome.

After the holidays I spoke in Vienna to the Viennese Professor of Catholic social-doctrine Univ.-Prof. Prelate DDr. Rudolf Weiler about this idea of the founding of an academy. He also appreciated this initiative and recommended the Swiss Dominican-scholar Univ.-Prof. P. Dr. Arthur Fridolin Utz for such a committee. I had already known him from literature as a commendable person.

As I presented in the second week of January 1990 at the Vatican as publisher the second volume of the speeches and sermons of the most reverend Cardinal-Secretary of State Agostino Cardinal Casaroli under the title “Faith and Responsibility”, I had the opportunity to speak with him about this intention and to present him for this a memorandum for His Holiness Pope John Paul II.

In the meantime I met Prof. P. Utz in Fribourg after telephonic agreement for a first meeting on January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1990. I told him about my idea of the founding of the Pontifical Academy for Social Sciences and I asked him if he would be interested in participation. He approved with interest.

Afterwards I invited the Professor at the University of Strasbourg, Univ.-Prof. Mons. DDr. Roland Minnerath, who worked many years in a papal diplomatic position and was a colleague of Eminence Casaroli, for collaboration in the committee, for which I had already invited Prof. P. Utz. Following that, I named, for covering of costs of the Academy, the lawyer in Liechtenstein Prof. DDr. Herbert Batliner for a foundation for the purpose of the support of the Academy. For such a foundation, Prof. P. Utz has proposed Cornelius Fetsch and Alfons Horten on the side of the employers. Afterwards, His Holiness Pope John Paul II appointed as representative of the employees the Austrian Christian labor unionist and former President of the Federal Council Prof. Dr. Martin Strimitzer to this foundation for which DDr. Batliner found the finances for the most

part himself and also took over presidency until today. Our Academy has to thank him very much!

After the handing over of the memorandum, in which I allowed myself to propose the founding of such an Academy also to the Holy Father, I had the opportunity to speak at the Vatican about my intention with the most reverend Cardinals Joseph Ratzinger, Opilio Rossi and Alfons Stickler, who were very pleased about this idea.

In the following time I had, concerning the preparation of the founding of the Academy, contact with the today's prefect of the episcopal congregation, His Eminence Giovanni B. Cardinal Re, who was at that time substitute of His Holiness and with the today's prefect of the congregation Propaganda Fidei, His Eminence Crescenzo Cardinal Sepe, who was at that time assessor in the Office of State and, afterwards, was a very understanding chairman at the sessions at the Vatican, where inter alia with representatives of the papal Council Iustitia et Pax, Mons. Diarmuid Martin, and of the papal Council for Culture, P. Herve Carrier SJ, and also with representatives of the already existing Pontifical Academy of Sciences, as Mons. Ing. Renato Dardozzi, the founding of the Pontifical Academy for Social Sciences was discussed.

The reactions to the initiative for the founding of the Academy were various. Some people who afterwards acted in the Academy were at the preliminary discussion against such a founding, that later also temporal was delayed! In this phase of preparation of our Academy Father Utz had the opportunity to speak with Pope John Paul II about the intended founding of our Academy.

I really regret that the Academy was not proclaimed and constituted, as also suggested, already at the 100-year-jubilee of the social-encyclical "Rerum Novarum" in 1991, but only in 1994!

In the meantime, the Apostolic Nuncio in Austria, His Excellency Archbishop DDr. Donato Squicciarini supported in commendable manner the initiative for the founding of the Pontifical Academy for Social Sciences by our Holy Father from the very beginning in every way. He even later invited Prof. P. Utz, Mons. Minnerath and myself to Vienna for a discussion of this initiative for the founding of the Academy and he achieved pathbreaking work for the preparation of the founding! Together with Univ.-Prof. P. Dr. John Schasching SJ, he achieved important work through the preliminary discussion and preparation of the



statutes of our Academy, and he also represents now the Holy See in the foundation to which he was appointed by his Holiness Pope John Paul II.

I do not want to leave unmentioned what Cardinal Casaroli told me in 1994 after the founding of the Academy by Pope John Paul II: that with this founding also a wish of Pope Paul VI has been fulfilled, because he had already suggested the founding of such an Academy during his pontificate, which was not possible because of financial reasons.

Owing to this collaboration on the preparation of the founding of our Academy, Prof. P. Utz, who dedicated his life as priest-scholar during many decades to the Catholic social-doctrine in history and present as well as in theory and practice, had had the pleasure to experience those subjects and the continents-uniting cooperation of priests and laymen as well as scholars of jurisprudence, social sciences and economics in our Academy and the selection of some of its members thanks to its founding by our Holy Father. We all, and I think I can say this in the name of all ladies and gentlemen of our Academy can be grateful that Prof. P. Utz was with us. We will always have honourable and grateful memories of him.

PROF. JERZY ZUBRZYCKI: I am happy to endorse Professor Schambeck's tribute to our deceased colleague. I met Father Utz for the first time in 1981 during my visit to the University of Friburg at the invitation of its then Rector, the late Joseph Bochenski, a legendary figure in Polish émigré circles because of his definitive critique of Marxism. Bochenski and Utz were good friends who not only shared an abiding interest in the evolution of Natural Law from Thomas Aquinas, but also in the thrill of flying in a small aircraft in the Alpine valleys. Bochenski was a pilot well into his seventies while Utz was a keen passenger.

At that time I was keen to build on my earlier studies of Thomistic philosophy and its relationship with the principles of the Church's teaching relating to social solidarity and subsidiarity – the subject of Father Utz's 1969 book. So from then on Father Utz became the principal authority in my development until we met again here in Rome in 1994. I continued to benefit from his great wisdom through his contributions at successive sessions of the Academy.

Finally, on a personal note, I got to know him as a great gentleman and a kindly man. On two occasions when my wife accompanied me to the meetings and we were all billeted at the Hotel Michelangelo,



Alexandra used to return to the hotel after lunch to rest. As many of you will recall, to reach the Hotel Michelangelo we had to cross the Largo Cavalleggeri, an experience fraught with some risk to one's life and limb. But Father Utz, knowing about Alexandra's plans, always insisted on holding her hand as they negotiated the pedestrian crossing to make sure that she was safe! A truly remarkable man of great wisdom, sense of humour and civility.

