

THE PONTIFICAL
ACADEMY OF
SOCIAL SCIENCES

EXTRA SERIES

3

Closed Session



VATICAN CITY
2005

30 April 2004

Closed Session

30 April 2004



VATICAN CITY
2005

The Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences
General Assembly of Academicians

CLOSED SESSION

30 April 2004

MARY ANN GLENDON

We have a number of items to discuss this afternoon, but first, the Chancellor has asked me to read to you a telegram that we have received from the Holy Father subsequent to his audience with us and I gave the original to Professor Malinvaud for a very good reason that you will see when I read it.

“Au moment où l’Académie Pontificale des Sciences Sociales conclut sa dixième session plénière, je salue cordialement tous les participants, appréciant la qualité de leur engagement au service d’une société toujours plus respectueuse de la personne humaine. En cette occasion solennelle, je tiens à remercier d’une façon toute particulière Monsieur le Professeur Edmond Malinvaud, qui a assuré, avec zèle et compétence, la présidence de cette Académie au cours des dix premières années de son existence et qui a contribué ainsi à donner au Saint-Siège un instrument de grande qualité scientifique pour promouvoir l’étude des sciences sociales, les mettant au service de l’évangélisation. En confiant le Professeur Malinvaud et sa famille, ainsi que tous les membres de cette Académie et leur nouveau président, Madame le Professeur Mary Ann Glendon, à la bienveillant intercession de la Vierge Marie, je leur accorde une particulière bénédiction apostolique, que j’étends à toutes les personnes réunies en cette heureuse circonstance” (Ioannes Paulus PP. II).

John Paul II has given us his apostolic blessing and his very profound gratitude to our President Edmond Malinvaud, our George Washington I always think, the first president as we say in the United States, first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen, and Edmond, si je peux, you will always be first in our hearts.

I am going to list some indispensable items that we must discuss at this meeting and I hope there will be some time at the end for other matters.

We are going to begin with a remembrance of our dear colleague Serguei Averintsev and I remind you that, tomorrow morning, we will remember our dear Professor Zampetti with a Mass to be celebrated by Cardinal Re and with some remarks by Cardinal Re, and I also want to mention that Professor Fumagalli has written a beautiful tribute to Professor Zampetti which I will have copied for the members of the Academy and I will ask the Chancellor to include it in the archives of the Academy.¹

Secondly, we will have our new members, Professors Ryan and Stiglitz, who will present themselves to us and we will welcome them to the Academy; third, we will discuss the topic, the programme for 2005, next year; fourth, as I mentioned to you at the close of the last session, we need to have a discussion of 2006, whether you wish to go forward at that time with intergenerational solidarity and, if so, how you think we should focus the question. Then, finally, in fact I think I will take a moment at the beginning to say a little bit about the fifth item that we need to discuss. This year, in response to suggestions made by many many of you over the years, we are going to try to end the meeting with some statement of conclusions, recommendations, questions for further study. You have often said that, when we go home after these meetings, we go back with a pleasant glow but when our friends ask us, well, what exactly did you do over there, and what exactly came out of our meetings, we have not had an official... So what I have asked the major participants in the ten sessions to do, and they have all agreed to do this, is – by Sunday night – they have very kindly agreed to just give me a short statement, if you have one conclusion or recommendation or question that you want to put forward for discussion at our final meeting on Monday, please do that and I would like to invite all of you who participated in the discussion, any of you who want to propose a short conclusion or recommendation, please give me your text by Sunday night and I will try to put everything together for our discussion on Monday. Now, I would like to turn the floor over first to Msgr. Schooyans for his recollection of our dear Serguei Averintsev.

MICHEL SCHOOYANS

Éminences, Excellences, Chers Collègues, Mesdames, Messieurs,

Il y a un an à peine, le 3 mai 2003, Serguei Averintsev terminait son brillant commentaire de l'intervention de Margaret Archer lorsqu'il fut

¹ See appendix p. 29.

frappé par un accident vasculaire cérébral au cœur même de notre assemblée. Il venait de souligner que le problème de l'État et de la nationalité était n'était pas seulement un problème sociologique, juridique ou économique, mais aussi des problèmes anthropologiques. Il constatait – je cite: “Maintenant même, nous vivons une période décisive pour la survie de *l'homo sapiens*. Nous vivons la première époque où la guerre devient à la fois impossible et intolérable, tout en ne cessant pas d'être inévitable”. Averintsev plaidait alors pour que l'autorité morale de la littérature, de la philosophie, de la culture soit reconnue et prise en compte dans la discussion contemporaine sur l'État et la Nation.

Depuis le 21 février de cette année 2004, date à laquelle Serguei est “passé sur l'autre rive” (cf. *Mc* 4, 35), ces ultimes paroles de notre Collègue ont valeur de testament intellectuel et spirituel. Sans doute nous invitent-elles à prendre davantage en compte, dans nos analyses, ce paramètre de “haute culture” qu'Averintsev a servi tout au long de sa vie.

* * *

Ma rencontre initiale avec Serguei remonte à la première Assemblée générale de notre Académie, où, comme plusieurs d'entre nous, Serguei avait été nommé le 19 janvier 1994. Le jour de mon arrivée, je n'avais pu célébrer la Sainte Messe à cause du voyage. Je demandai donc aux religieuses du Monastère des Contemplatives, voisines de notre Académie, de pouvoir célébrer la messe chez elles. Je proposai à Serguei de m'accompagner. Cette célébration fut pour lui comme pour moi un événement spirituel de grande intensité. C'est avec beaucoup d'émotion que Serguei lut l'épître et reçut la Sainte Communion. Puis nous fûmes reçus au parloir et Serguei répondit avec joie aux questions que lui posèrent nos sœurs. Ainsi, sans que nous ne nous en apercevions alors, était né un fort lien entre nous.

Le matin du 3 mai 2003, nous prîmes ensemble la navette allant de Santa Marta à la Casina Pio IV. Serguei me parut alors un peu fatigué, mais il me parla avec feu de ses travaux en cours. Il travaillait à une nouvelle traduction, en russe, des *Évangiles Synoptiques*, ainsi qu'à une nouvelle traduction, scandée, des *Psaumes*. Il m'expliqua que ces nouvelles traductions étaient nécessaires. Beaucoup de textes de l'Écriture Sainte ne sont disponibles en russe que dans des traductions datant du XIX^{ème} siècle, qui ne répondent pas aux exigences scientifiques modernes. C'est pour parer à cette déficience qu'Averintsev entreprit de traduire, outre le livre de *Job*, les *Psaumes*, qu'il enregistra aussi sur CD, ainsi que les *Évangiles* de *Marc* et *Luc*.

Ce matin-là, au cours de la Troisième Session de notre Assemblée, immédiatement après l'intervention relatée plus haut, notre collègue fut terrassé par un accident circulatorio. Très ému, je m'approchai au plus près de l'oreille de Serguei pour lui donner l'absolution et pour murmurer à son oreille le *Notre Père*, l'*Ave Maria*, des versets de psaumes, des prières spontanées. Un médecin présent dans la salle de réunion ne put rien faire, mais une équipe de secours d'urgence du Vatican intervint avec une rapidité et une efficacité exemplaires. Serguei fut rapidement conduit à l'hôpital Santo Spirito, où il reçut pendant des semaines les soins les plus attentifs.

* * *

La personnalité de Serguei Averintsev résiste à toute tentative de classification. Nous avons tous été témoins, pendant près de dix ans, de sa modestie, presque de son effacement. Tous – du moins je le souhaite – nous avons bénéficié de sa cordialité. Ce que l'on sait moins, c'est qu'il a été l'intellectuel russe le plus populaire dans son pays. Expert en la matière, Patrick de Laubier souligne qu'Averintsev était aussi un oecuméniste de premier ordre. Durant les années les plus sombres du régime communiste, il a fait découvrir à ses étudiants, à ses lecteurs, à ses auditeurs des trésors insoupçonnés de la littérature chrétienne. Comme l'a écrit Vladimir Zielinsky, un de ses amis intimes, Serguei était un "vrai évangéliste par le savoir" et il ajoute aussitôt ce merveilleux témoignage: "Averintsev a semé le savoir, mais le fruit de ses semences, c'était la foi". Serguei a osé parler de la foi et de la religion quand l'Église était bannie de la société, réduite à un silence parfois complice, pressurée par le paganisme ambiant, accusée d'exploiter la superstition populaire. Dans cette interminable traversée du désert Serguei n'a pas cessé de mettre son immense érudition, son savoir encyclopédique au service de l'Évangélisation. Grâce à lui, des Russes innombrables, des Ukrainiens, mais aussi de nombreux Européens occidentaux ont découvert des Pères de l'Église. Le secret de son rayonnement ne reposait toutefois pas, en ultime analyse, sur le prestige de son immense érudition, mais sur cette contemplation intérieure permanente qui se reflétait dans son visage d'ange. Dans un message qu'il a adressé à Natacha, son épouse, nul n'a mieux croqué le portrait spirituel de d'Averintsev que le Patriarche Alexis II, qui écrivait: "Sa vie tout entière a été illuminée par sa foi".

* * *

À propos de l'ouvrage *Sophia-Logos*, Constantin Sigov, voulant sans doute exorciser l'*Archipel du Goulag*, évoque avec bonheur de l'*Archipel*

Averintsev. Archipel non seulement pour désigner une multitude d'îlots de sagesse dispersés, voire infiltrés, grâce à *Averintsev*, sous forme d'articles dans "les eaux mortes de la *Grande Encyclopédie Soviétique*"; mais archipel aussi au sens étymologique de mer principale, celle qui sert à communiquer et non à séparer, c'est-à-dire la mer, l'océan de la Sagesse, qui "suppose le franchissement de tout isolationnisme". D'où la mise en garde face à la double menace d'un isolationnisme qui nous guette peut-être ici même, à l'Académie. Menace, d'abord, "que l'Académicien *Averintsev* ressent d'une manière aiguë: ... celle de l'"athéisme par le bas" – la méfiance à l'égard de la parole, à l'égard du sens comme tel. Serguei *Averintsev* reconnaît dans la destruction du verbe humain le souffle corrompteur du néant, puisqu'originellement l'existence commence par la force du Verbe". Menace, ensuite, d'une nouvelle figure de l'aliénation désignée comme un 'isolationnisme métaphysique' qui mérite d'être explicité. Pour *Averintsev*, "le fondement de l'esprit de ce temps ..., c'est un 'isolationnisme métaphysique' – qui 'arrache' le Créateur à la création et la création au Créateur, qui nous sépare du Créateur, du cosmos et les uns des autres". Et Constantin Sigov conclut, résumant notre Collègue: "L'isolationnisme commence là où une île a la prétention d'avoir un statut exceptionnel parmi d'autres, lorsqu'elle rejette la mer comme moyen de communication entre les îles et se sépare elle-même de la mer de la Sagesse".

Peut-être devrions-nous reconsidérer certaines de nos options pour ne pas nous séparer de cette mer de la Sagesse et pour ne pas passer à côté des trésors de savoir et de "haute culture" qu'*Averintsev* a si admirablement servis, et qu'il nous a généreusement fait partager au cours de son passage parmi nous.

Je vous remercie pour votre attention.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you, Père Schooyans, for that beautiful evocation of our colleague. I do not think any of us who were here on that day last year will ever forget the image of Father Schooyans kneeling beside our colleague and praying into his ear – I am saying this in English because I would not know how quite to say it in French – but what an image of our solidarity in the mystical body of Christ. So, thank you and now we are going to hear another tribute to our colleague from Professor Zubrzycki.

JERZY ZUBRZYCKI

Thank you. I cannot possibly match the depth of appreciation given by our colleague Schooyans nor do I actually remember or witnessed what happened this time last year, on the very day when Averintsev lay on the floor and was given last religious rites by my colleague Schooyans, since I lay seriously ill in a hospital. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that Averintsev presented something of a puzzle to most of us, particularly those of us who first met him ten years ago at our very first meeting in October 1994. There was some difficulty in communication, there was some apprehension in some of us about what he really wanted to say and how he was saying that. So from the very beginning of my friendship with him, and we met simply on the basis that he and I were Slavs, I tried to come to grips with it. I recall that I took him for an outside walk, just around Casina Pio IV during the lunch break on that morning of October 1994 and asked him bluntly, what was he as a philologist doing in an Academy of Social Sciences? I recalled later that in his personal description incorporated in the Yearbook he said he was 'studying relevant Christian ideas and symbols in poetry and the art of the late Hellenistic and early Byzantine period'. That seemed to me to be far removed from the hardnosed approach of this Academy, which is mandated to promote the study and progress of social, economic, juridical etc as given to us in our Constitution. But being an inquisitive person by nature, I questioned Serguei on that lunch break as we walked in the gardens surrounding the Casina. But he did not seem to concentrate on what I really wanted to get out of him and instead intoned a beautiful song in Polish, my own native language, namely the so-called *Godzinki*, or antiphone, performed by two choirs singing responsively, and I knew the tune very well and he sang beautifully in my own native language.

The mystery of Averintsev's appointment was partly revealed a year later when he presented me with a recent volume of his, translated into Polish, entitled *Modlitwa o Slowo* (Prayer for the Word). Word is always spelled with a capital W, inevitably in all of his writings. And later that week I saw him present a copy of the book to John Paul in what appeared to me to be a moment of animated conversation. Subsequently I learned that there was a long-term relationship between the two poets, Karol Wojtyla and Serguei Averintsev and they had both defined the word 'philology' in its traditional and now rare meaning, namely the love of learning the literature, more specifically, the love of words and the Word.

It was not until much later when I began to read Averintsev in his Polish translations – on Plutarch, on the search for meaning in the myth of Oedipus, on gold in the system of symbols in early Byzantium – that I came to realise that his penetrating presentation of the Hellenic roots of Byzantine civilisation (and also of early Russian Orthodoxy) was akin to what I could only describe as cultural archaeology, or ‘archaeology of the word’ as he once described it in his book. Averintsev found the ‘word’ in Plutarch’s *Moralia*, in the tragedies of Sophocles, in the poetry of Virgil, whilst searching for symbols in what contemporary sociology would describe as forms of social interaction. But the richness of his scholarship, as I discovered later, is not the standard history of epochs and periods, which could be subjected to Karl Popper’s system of logic and verification. Rather, he offers glimpses of symbols characteristic of a given historical period and demonstrates their deep social significance. Again, this is not a history of ideas in the traditional form, particularly in the late nineteenth century German form, but philology as historic memory. And this brings me to the query I first put to Averintsev: his study of symbols in distant epochs differs from the accepted canons of the social sciences, seemingly a non-scientific pursuit. But it helps the social scientist to understand, in Max Weber’s sense of *das Verstehen*, the social dynamics of civilisation. He was often fond of quoting the nineteenth century German historian Leopold Ranke’s penetrating question, ‘Wie es eigentlich gewesen war?’ (what has really happened, what really was in the past?).

And then there is the question of relationship between Wojtyła’s poetry and Averintsev’s poetry. And here the affinity between two philologists, two scholars with a deep historical background is obvious: Averintsev’s use of symbols of early Eastern Christianity, pleading that the Word be respected by humanity, and Wojtyła’s search for the hidden God in his 1958 volume *Cyrenean Cycle* only to find him in contemporary what he called ‘profiles’ of a car factory worker, of a woman typing eight hours a day, of an actor, of a girl disappointed in love and his own recollections of his work as an almost slave worker in the Solvay chemical factory on the outskirts of his native Cracow in 1941-42. Both philosopher-poets shared the same preoccupation with ‘God’s profile’: the Creator, as Averintsev writes, cannot be seen face to face. Wojtyła finds God in the symbolism of Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel ceiling, especially in his most recent volume of poetry, *The Roman Tryptich*, published last year. In contemplating on the Book of Origin as portrayed by Michelangelo, the poet

muses over the rich symbolism of Michelangelo's art. And I quote from *The Roman Tryptic*:

The mystery of the beginning is born with the Word,
is revealed by the Word
He – the First to see –
Saw, and found in everything a
trace of his Being, of his own fullness.

The poem ends with this chilling picture of the Cardinals assembling 'beneath this wondrous Sistine profusion of colour ... when the time comes after my death' to ponder Michelangelo's vision 'for the con-clave', a shared concern for the legacy of the keys, 'the keys of the Kingdom', hence, con-clave.

It is not for me, finally, to extol the merits of Averintsev's poetry and its links with Wojtyła's meditations. I am not really qualified to fully appreciate the very depth of scholarship beneath the splendid surface of our erstwhile colleague's profound scholarship. But I do recall my last encounter with Serguei Averintsev, when, during the Academy's Eight Assembly, two years ago, I was asked by Professor Malinvaud, then President, to introduce and critically examine Professor Donati's paper 'Intergenerational Solidarity: A Sociological and Social Policy Issue' (Professor Donati was absent during illness) and I spoke in my conclusion, adding my own words, my own interpretation on the disintegration of the *Oikos*, of the family, and of the forces in our culture of immediate gratification that are fostered by the entertainment industry. I concluded by repeating Dante's vision in his *Il libro dell'inferno*. In the ensuing conversation, Averintsev came up to me and supported my use of Dante's symbolism of hell as a consequence of the breakdown of social ties and mutual trust.

And I recalled that particular Dante-Averintsev symbolism and paradigm when I received the sad news of Serguei's death, because my brief conversation with him at the end of my presentation two years ago was the meeting of minds at long last. Then and only then I fully understood why John Paul decided to appoint a humanist to an assembly of hard-nosed social scientists!

I think, Madam President, there is a lesson in all this for myself and maybe for my colleagues, for all our colleagues. Perhaps we err in sharpening the distinction between the humanities and the social sciences too much. We need to distinguish between the sociological and the humane concern. We do need the creative imagination of the humanist – yes, the

philologist. Does it really matter that this person's imagination derives from the study of symbols in Plutarch's *Moralia* and not from a survey of Calcutta's slums? Surely both sources of insight may be equally fruitful in an epistemological sense. I was reminded of this when I dug up in my papers a quote that I preserved for a long time from a meeting in 1960 with someone I greatly admired, the then President of the American Sociological Association, Robert Bierstedt, with whom I shared not exactly a friendship but association because we are both, I a student and he an associate of Florian Znaniecki, the famous Polish sociologist who died in the United States at the University of Illinois. And this is what Robert Bierstedt had to say in his 1960 Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association: 'It is not the methods and the concepts that move our sociology along, but the memory and desire – the memory of other men in other times that have also asked questions about society and the desire that our answers, in our time, will be better than theirs'. Thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you, Professor Zubrzycki, not only for reminding us of what an extraordinary person we had in our midst but also for telling us or reminding us of something important about the social sciences, something that causes some people to prefer the term 'human sciences', thank you very much.

JERZY ZUBRZYCKI

I would just like to add something more. While searching for Serguei's publications I came across a printout from the Library of Congress' online catalogue of his works published in Russian only, excluding translation into German and Polish, and possibly also French. In the Library of Congress there are twenty-six publications of his and I will give the copy of that to our Chancellor for preservation in the archives. Thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you very much. The word extraordinary also applies to the newest members of our Academy and I am now going to ask them to tell us a little bit about themselves and to welcome them most heartily into our group. I will begin with Professor Kevin Ryan.

KEVIN RYAN

Thank you Madam President. The President asked me to explain myself briefly and explain my work. I am a Professor Emeritus, I am married, I have three children, I have seven grandchildren, I was raised in a little village outside of New York City and lived there for the first eighteen years of my life. I went to Catholic schools all the way through and, when I was eighteen, I went off to the University of Toronto in Canada, to study literature and psychology. After getting my degree it was during the Korean War and, like most Americans, I was requested to go in the service and I became a naval officer, spent four years in naval aviation and travelled around the world. Forty-seven years ago this month I came to Rome for the first time, one of the great thrills of my life. After military service I went to Mr Stiglitz's University, Columbia University, in New York, and studied to be a teacher of English. I did that for four years, I never worked harder in my life! The good news was I met my wife in that process, she was a teacher, and we went off together to Stanford University to work on a Ph.D. in education. I left Stanford with my degree for a position at the University of Chicago, we were there for altogether nine wonderful years. The University of Chicago is, I think, the United States' primary university.

In the middle of that, though, I had a one-year fellowship to Harvard and, when my writing project was done, I had about three or four months and I also had a four-year-old daughter, who, as four-year-olds will do, kept asking the question when we would say, 'It's time to go to bed' or 'You should eat your vegetables', she would say 'Why, why Daddy, why?'. And I became possessed with that question and the question of how a child acquires the internal self-control, a sense of what the right thing to do is, and being at the University of Chicago they allowed you to pursue your interests and so I started teaching what I did not know and I really changed my career at that time. I stayed at the university for nine wonderful years and then I went off to Ohio State University, which is a big state university in the middle of our country. I was there for seven years. I had a Fulbright scholarship to Portugal and taught there, and because of that I was invited by Boston University to head up a World Bank programme to prepare the faculties of fifteen new colleges in Portugal – it was part of the effort of the World Bank to facilitate Portugal's entry into the Common Market – and I took my family there for a second wonderful stay.

Fifteen years ago, back at Boston University, I founded something called the Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character, which is really sort of the core of my work, and let me describe my academic interests. My work increasingly is driven by the conviction that state-run education is quietly at war with the human person. Either through a conscious effort to separate children from their religious heritage or a benign but misguided sense of trying to be fair or neutral, public education is, in my view, miseducating young people about the most profound questions: 'What is it to be a human being?', 'What is a worthy life?', 'How will you spend your life?'. This has happened at a time in history and education when the world is becoming more and more dependent on education, both nations and persons. Schooling starts earlier, it lasts longer, it consumes the energies and waking hours of children more and more. They know, when they are very young, whether first world, second world, third world, that their future is increasingly dependent on their schooling, it is in many ways the main event in their lives.

Now, the fundamental question people like myself, people in education, are supposed to answer is, what is most worth knowing? We are in charge of the curriculum, which is society's answer to that question, and once we answer that question we divide it up into courses and semesters and write textbooks and materials and we point to the young and we say, now you learn this, this is your schooling. And much of this, of course, whether we are talking about literacy or numeracy or a scientific sense of how the world works, is extraordinarily important. As our knowledge has grown and our social needs have changed the answer to this question, *what is most worth knowing*, has become more and more vast, more and more complex. And in that there is a problem. Socrates defined education as what we do, what we, as the adult community do, to help the young to become both smart and good. Be virtuous and knowledgeable. What I believe has happened is that this growing priority for education has gone hand in hand with a reduction of our attention to the virtuous life, to what many would call providing the young with some sort of moral compass, some sense of what the virtues are. The state-run schools are uncomfortable and sometimes downright hostile to answering this question and, in trying to respond to my daughter as she is metaphorically all children, the questions of 'why?' and 'what should I do?' have just the thinnest broth, the most empty meals.

But while all that has been going on, while schools have moved further and further away from answering and helping children come to grips with those questions, there has been a real move to reduce the impact of education. When I was an undergraduate at the University of Toronto I had the very bracing educational experience of being taught by Marshall McLuhan, I do not know if any of you remember the name Marshall McLuhan, he was a media guru, he lived in a house in next door and he spoke about all this media world, I remember him saying in a lecture once that in North America, when a child goes to school, he interrupts his education. And, like many things McLuhan said, it was a quip, but increasingly, increasingly this is true, that the first education that our children are getting, I believe, is coming from television, is coming from the Internet, it is coming from CDs, it is coming from a popular culture. And while the first educational system has an extraordinary potential for enriching the human spirit, it is driving us in the other direction. Instead of engaging the child in what is most worth knowing, the various media options take the low road, what is most pleasurable, what is going to give you the most satisfaction. Children come into the world with little to no self-control or self-discipline, with no moral compass, and they are easy victims for the electronic media's masterful, masterful control of the pleasure principle, they have worked this to a fine art. On top of that, the vision of the good life they project is a very warped and narrow one.

So while our state-run schools, highly secularised schools, ignore the good and focus on scientific and a very narrow band of cultural information, our media are effectively teaching children a very vulgar, a very self-centred and pleasure-driven vision of the human person and at the same time, in these last seventy-five years I would say, we, the traditional teachers of the moral life, parents, grandparents, teachers, the community, the Church, have become much weaker, our impact is much lower. Schoolteachers, in particular, have lost what I would call their moral authority. Parents, on the other hand, are so preoccupied with work and with their own robust engagement of that pleasure principle that their impact is being continually reduced.

What I am suggesting is probably something well known, that the connective tissue between the young and the older generation has gotten very very thin and I think while this certainly is probably much more the case in the United States and, as I know, the European situation, this too will affect the third world.

The result is that we have left our young vulnerable to an array of moral viruses, increasingly taking their life direction from a shallow and narrow educational system and a corrupting pleasure-driven and pleasure-obsessed culture. On the other hand, and finally, it is my deepest belief both as a Catholic and as a student of education, that our Judeo-Christian traditions have the answer to these problems, that we can re-engage the young in what is a truer vision of education.

I feel deeply honoured and very humble to be with you and I want to thank all of you for the gracious welcome you have given me.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you so much, we are honoured and grateful to you for being here and we hope you will enjoy your interaction with all of your new colleagues. Professor Stiglitz, welcome to you too and please introduce yourself a little bit to us.

JOSEPH STIGLITZ

Thank you. I teach economics at Columbia, I come from Gary, Indiana, which is a steel town in the Midwest, and I was educated at Amherst College, MIT, and Cambridge. I have had a rather peripatetic academic career – as somebody said, I could not hold a job – so I taught at Stanford, Yale, MIT, Princeton, Oxford at various times. I interrupted 25 years of my academic work teaching research in 1993 when I went to Washington to be President Clinton's economic adviser and then after that to serve three years as chief economist at the World Bank.

The areas of my research have focused on an area called the economics of information. The particular aspect that has been widely discussed is called 'asymmetries of information', which is simply the notion – economists like fancy words – all it means is that some people know something that other people do not know and try to exploit that. The other area that I have worked in is the economics of the public sector. One of my abiding interests has been in trying to identify the appropriate role of the state and, in a way, the two areas that I have talked about, economics of information and economics of public sector come together in that question. One of the central theorems that I have proved or investigated in this area was to re-examine perhaps one of the most well known

propositions in economics, Adam Smith's invisible hand, about the pursuit of self-interest or markets leading to economic efficiency. What my research showed was that when information is imperfect, which is always the case, the reason that the invisible hand often seems invisible is that it is not there, that is to say, that markets are generically not Pareto efficient or constrained Pareto efficient, even taking into account the cost of information. More recently, after spending time at the World Bank, I have become very involved in the discussions, debates about globalisation, the problems with globalisation, where globalisation has been going, why has it failed to live up to its potential. I think in all these areas, economics, the public sector, globalisation, there are fundamental ethical issues, fundamental issues having to do with concepts of social justice and social solidarity, both across and within generations, and these are fundamental issues facing our global society. My observation is that too few of our global institutions have focused on this central issue, and one of the reasons why I am quite enthusiastic about joining your Academy is that it is one of the few global institutions with enormous diversity, a multidisciplinary approach, that is addressing what I think are the central issues facing our society today.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you and we look forward to exploring the puzzles of subsidiarity and solidarity with you for many years.

Now, I would like to turn to a topic that we need to have discussion on. This is an urgent topic because we are talking about next year's programme, the programme for 2005, and of course it is already a little late to be talking about 2005 but I am very happy to report that the topic that we discussed in a general way last year, the concept of the human person as it appears in the various social sciences and as it has been alluded to, outlined, hinted at in Catholic social thought, has been accepted by the Council as the topic, and Professor Malinvaud graciously has accepted to be the overall coordinator of the project and I am going to turn the floor over to him to tell you about where our planning stands as of this week.

EDMOND MALINVAUD

I am not going to give you a fully articulated plan of what we shall do next year because, like the invisible end, it is not there yet. The pro-

gramme is already structured and perhaps we can say a little more about that after the meeting of the Council on Sunday. First there will be a theologian who will be asked to present a paper on Christian anthropology, meant to be the social doctrine of the Church on our theme, the theme of, I repeat, the conceptualisation of the human person in the various social sciences. After that, there will be three or four papers on social theory that will be organised by Professor Archer. Then three or four papers on law and politics, political science I should say, rather, organised by Professor Shambeck. Then three papers on economics organised by me. Then, we add to that two papers – maybe one, maybe three, I do not know – given by philosophers, not that we would claim competence in philosophy beyond our four main disciplines but we think that, on this subject, we have to learn from philosophers. Well, I do not want to expand on that, except that I shall not only be the coordinator but also the organiser of the economics part. So I can tell you more about the economics part before Professor Archer tells you more about the part on social theory. We think now of three papers on economics, which should be, first, a normative economic theory, meant to answer the question, ‘how does economic theory interpret the human values that the economic system ought to support’; second, on positive economic theory, ‘how does economic theory conceptualise the economic agent when this theory searches for explanations of economic phenomena’; and third, on economic institutions and policies with the question, ‘what is the human content of what is being taught to professionals who will be in charge of reforming the economic institution or deciding on economic policies’. Now, you understand, these three parts and the questions that I mention on each one of them are still subject to adaptations, depending on the availability of the speakers on each one of these three topics, on their own inclination to switch a bit, more or less, the question that is so raised, perhaps not as much as the question was switched earlier by our very interesting colleague here, Professor Fukuyama. I do not know whether you match the question that he was asked to comment on and what he did, but in any case, this is the structure.

Now I believe that Margaret Archer, who has thought, over the last twelve months, about how to organise the section on social theory, is very much in advance compared to the other organisers of the sessions and will accept to present to you the purpose she thinks appropriate to assign to the section she is in charge of.

MARGARET ARCHER

Yes, I welcomed this idea very much when Professor Malinvaud first put it forward and wrote immediately to him enthusiastically saying, yes, let us do this, it is foundational to the work of the Academy, and let us by all means extend it, and the idea has grown from here but, until it was approved fully by Council, although I certainly wrote to you, I have to admit I have not done any deep thinking about this in between, but I think the question is fairly straightforward in sociology, fairly straightforward meaning that the situation is very chaotic indeed. It is very easy to summarise, it will not take me two minutes to do and this will be the structure that I am proposing for the, can I call it, 'the day that will be allocated to social theory'? So, if we picture it as a continuum, at one extreme we have a very very powerful majority, I think, these days, of sociologists, social theorists, who say the human being, the social actor, even the social agent, is nothing but a social construct. There is nothing to the person, the human person, other than what the person gains as a gift from society, and I would like to take the most intelligent person articulating this view, to me a very perverse view, one I disagree with and have devoted a whole book to disagreeing with, but nevertheless I think Rom Harré has articulated this social constructionist view better than anybody else. His view can be summarised in one sentence which is almost verbatim from his series of books, *Personal Being*, *Physical Being*, *Social Being*, etc – *Discursive Being* is the last of them – and his view can be summarised in this one statement, 'There is nothing between molecules and meanings', and you cannot have it much more straightforward than that. Another quotation from him is 'The person is purely a cultural artefact'. Nevertheless, he articulates this – to me wholly unacceptable – view extraordinarily intelligently, he is a worthy opponent, he is worth listening to. He is at the University of Oxford, so that has its own recommendation. If we move in from that continuum, we could pick various positions along the line but we only have one day. I am very divided myself, I will think some more about this, I think four papers might be very heavy, perhaps not enough time for discussion. On the other hand, if you have less than four, you are almost caricaturing the array of positions that are available. So I would certainly like to see somebody representing the rational choice theory, presumptions about the nature of the actor; and I think my first preference would be to invite John Elster to do that, again on the same principle, one may disagree with people, but at least choose the most wor-

thy opponent to disagree with and Elster, I think, is certainly that. If we had a fourth paper, I would be quite interested obviously in hearing from all of you, there is a very good American sociologist, Douglas Porpora, who has written an outstanding book about the loss of moral meaning, it is called *Landscapes of the Soul: The Loss of Moral Meaning in American Life*, and he has a view of the human subject as only a complete subject if the person understands their place in the cosmos. And he articulates this from a Catholic position but he is not using his religion to... he is not hiding his religion but he is not predicating his sociological view upon it. And then, finally, at the opposite extreme, we have the realist position that sees us as real actors in a real world engaging in real world practices, having to come to terms with our environment, whether it is our natural environment, our artifactual environment, our social environment or our spiritual environment and I would propose taking that paper myself, but I am very open to receiving objections from the present company if you are justifiably tired of hearing me give a presentation per year, just about. So that is the broad outline of what is proposed for the sociology stream.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you, Professor Malinvaud and Professor Archer. Before I ask for your interventions I would just mention that the coordinator of the law part of this programme, Professor Schambeck, is not with us, but I know his preliminary thinking has to do with the quite strikingly different images of the human person that appear in different legal systems, especially differences between the Anglo-American systems and the Romano-Germanic systems. Now I am sure that Professor Malinvaud and Professor Archer would like to hear your comments and suggestions, and I believe we have one from Professor Llach.

JUAN JOSÉ LLACH

No, no, only a question about the first name you gave, Margaret, I could not understand the first name.

MARGARET ARCHER

That is understandable. It is Rom and its root is from the Romanian verb 'to be'.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Professor Villacorta.

WILFRIDO VILLACORTA

Thank you. Since you mentioned that political science is represented in this project, and I was looking at the yearbook and found out that I am the only political scientist in this Academy, at least by training, I saw it in the index, it seems to be my duty to volunteer to participate in the project, either as an author or as a co-author. I am particularly interested in the human person in politics, the perspective of ancient societies, and in political theory the concept of the human person has been largely influenced by Greco-Roman, Judeo-Christian traditions and, in more recent political science theory, by empiricism and so it would be interesting to explore how different the approaches are, not only in political science theory but even in general outlook in Asia with respect to the idea of the human person as applied to politics. I noticed that, although I am not in social linguistics, it is interesting to point out that in most major languages in Asia the word for the individual human person is the same as the word for a collectivity of human persons so, while you distinguish between person or man on the one hand and people on the other, in many of our languages they mean the same. So, as my countrymen will bear me out, in the Philippine language *tao* means both individual person as well as people, *rakyat* in Indonesian, *ren* in Chinese, and, well, I can give many other examples, so this is worth looking into, and the extent to which philosophical traditions such as Shinto, Confucianism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam have to do with this worldview. And then some practical examples, such as, why was people power successful in the Philippines and Indonesia but unsuccessful in Burma and China, resulting in massacres in Tian An Men, for example? And related also to some contemporary issues, I do not know, maybe I am going beyond political science, but the issue of cloning, the issue of birth control, maybe that belongs to sociology, not political science. And, lastly, implications for democracy, social justice, labour, peace and intergenerational solidarity. Thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Professor Villacorta, I think you have outlined your paper! I will transmit this information to Schambeck as soon as I see him, thank you very

much. I cannot resist adding that the drafters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could not translate the word *ren* when the Chinese participant offered language for the very important first article, and there is a kind of very awkward rendition that is right there in the 1948 document, so I will give you a paragraph for your paper! Thank you. Professor Fumagalli.

OMBRETTA FUMAGALLI CARULLI

Madam President, within the scientific domain I wish to place the emphasis also on law. I have heard that Professor Schambeck, if I have well understood what Professor Malinvaud said, will deal with political significance. Perhaps within political significance Professor Schambeck will want to deal also with juridical significance. You are very much aware of how many reflections can be made on the juridical significance of the person at different levels: the human person in constitutions, in international law, in human rights, in private law, etc. There is not only canon law but also state law, the law of the international community, which is really important today, which deals with the topic of the significance of the human person. For instance, the human person is at the centre of our Italian constitution and around the human person there is progressive solidarity, which was Aldo Moro's idea, who founded the Italian constitution on the person and around it the society, family, school, politics and so on. I think the Pontifical Academy should also address these topics and it is very important to have a close link between the social doctrine of the Church and the law of the states and of the international organisations, and also of the Church.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Yes, absolutely, I think I can assure you that the topic includes both the legal aspects and the political aspects. Do I understand that you would be ready to participate with Professor Schambeck? Thank you. Professor Llach.

JUAN JOSÉ LLACH

The only thing I want to say is that I will strongly support the participation of Professor Villacorta because I think it is very important not to

be so westernised, and I think his approach from Asia would be very beneficial to widen our points of view in order to consider human nature and the social sciences.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you. Other suggestions, volunteers, comments? Professor Skubiszewski.

KRZYSZTOF SKUBISZEWSKI

Thank you. Madam President, I am sure that Professor Shambeck in his planning will include juridical subjects, also international law, and I am ready to help him, thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you very much, I am sure he will be very happy to know that we have collected three volunteers within the Academy already and there may in fact be others who can be recruited.

I would like to turn now to the discussion of where we will go with the topic of intergenerational solidarity. We obviously cannot get very deeply into that today, we will have another chance for a good long discussion on Monday, but certainly after the wonderful discussion we had this afternoon of Dr Tietmeyer's paper, this is a good time to at least begin thinking about whether it is the pleasure of the Academy to devote the 2006 session to a continuation on this topic and if so, what direction do you suggest that we take. Professor Llach.

JUAN JOSÉ LLACH

I think I remember that one or two years ago we mentioned the issue of education, and education per se is an intergenerational phenomenon, so I would suggest that, if in 2006 we decide to continue analysing the issue of intergenerational solidarity or relations etc, we perhaps could include at least one session to begin dealing with education, because I think it is a very critical point and it is a typical intergenerational affair.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you. Professor Vymětalík.

BEDŘICH VYMĚTALÍK

We have been dealing with the problems of labour and unemployment and in these areas we always talk of the acquisition of new technologies that will replace more and more people in the labour market. From this point of view, it seems desirable to try to limit the number of people in developing countries and there are a number of projects of international institutions which are endeavouring to do so. Combating poverty precisely requires more family planning, and today we are talking of the fact that it is very dangerous if the population level drops. It is true but it seems to me that in our meetings we should be dealing with these two orientations, are there too many people in our world or not, and will technology steal jobs from people? So it could be that Professor Zacher has also tried to convey the severity of these problems and from this point of view you have to look at the connection between labour and employment, possibility of nourishment in the world, the betterment of peoples in the world and what capitalism will look like when fewer and fewer goods are needed and less money will be required for their purchase. I think these are certainly noteworthy aspects.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you very much. Professor Stiglitz.

JOSEPH STIGLITZ

I think it would be a good idea to continue the discussion, I think that there are at least three topics that one may want to explore. One of them is the broad environmental issues like global warming that involve very important issues going over large numbers of generations. They are hinted at in some of the papers but I think they clearly require more discussion. The second is some discussion for the political processes in institutions for ensuring that future generations are equitably dealt with, the concern that future generations do not have a direct voice in our political processes, they are not here to register their concerns. Certainly, there

are the fundamental issues of trying to think about how we can better ensure the concerns of future generations are represented as we make decisions about resource allocations for instance. And, I guess, finally, there are a host of philosophical issues, for instance, that are going to be raised in the paper by Ken Arrow tomorrow that he will not be here to fully discuss. I hope there will be a good discussion, but I think they almost surely will need more discussion in a future meeting.

MARY ANN GLENDON

I am glad that you hope there will be a good discussion, Professor Stiglitz, because I see you are the chairperson for the entire morning session and, just for everyone's information, since Professor Arrow will not be here, Professor Zacher has very kindly agreed to summarise the paper and add that summary to what would have been his comment, and Professor Dasgupta suggested that we treat that whole morning session as a unit in which some of the issues you have touched on will be discussed, so thank you very much. Professor Ramirez.

MINA RAMIREZ

While Professor Llach spoke about education, and Professor Ryan is speaking about McLuhan's book, one of the issues I think is very relevant is communication, mediated communication, that influences so much children and youth all over the world and that becomes a competitor of the teacher, the priest, the Church in terms of transmission of values. Somehow, when you talk about education, there seems to be quite a need of bringing a critical view of the media, even on the part of our children who are, somehow without their knowing, brainwashed into the values of what inspires the media, not only that but also the communication technology that is so rapidly influencing the minds and hearts of our children and youth and which causes disruption between parents and children. So I think that is also an issue that should be tackled in relation to intergenerational solidarity. Thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you. Other suggestions and comments at this point about the 2006 programme? If not, I would like to come back to the subject I men-

tioned at the beginning of this closed session, which is our earnest hope that we can conclude this meeting... Professor Possenti, did you want to speak about 2006?

VITTORIO POSSENTI

I would like to add a suggestion regarding our tentative programme for 2006. I would like to suggest something that concerns the problems of war and peace, that is, to tackle this huge problem both from the anthropological point of view and from that of international law, philosophy and politics. The many suggestions that have been put forth this evening in other argumentations are very interesting, but I think that Catholic social thought, the social doctrine of the Church, given that forty years have passed since *Pacem in Terris*, might need some updating on this very important topic that concerns international life, the lives of people always and especially today. I wonder whether we could add to the suggestions that have been made this very radical issue on which I fear very little has been written until now in Christian-inspired thought.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you, Professor Possenti. I am adding that to the agenda, I think we need to find out what happened at the two recent conferences here in Rome on the development of Catholic international relations theory, the two conferences that were held at the Gregorian, one of them just on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week.

Yes, well, the floor is very much open for the rest of this Plenary Session on the subject of where we go with intergenerational solidarity. On Monday we will try to come to some conclusion as I was starting to say, we really hope this time, after this meeting, that we will be able to issue even a short statement. Our sister Academy, the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, sometimes issues a one-page statement after a meeting, that is very modest, we could begin modestly like that, sometimes they issue a very detailed statement, so as I mentioned, I have asked each of the principal presenters of papers to give me just a paragraph, a few lines, what conclusions do you think we should announce, what recommendation do you think we should make, if any? What questions have we surfaced that seemed to us to require further consid-

eration and study? And of course on that last point, that really leads to the programme for 2006, what do we think are the most important questions that we have surfaced that require further study? So I will encourage all of you, whether you gave a paper or a comment or not, to write a few lines, just a few lines – remember, we are thinking in terms of a press release, make it simple, no technical jargon, if you want to talk about asymmetries of information you have to say some people know more than other people – and I will be very happy to receive them, especially if I can receive them by Sunday night so that we can prepare a working document for our session on Monday. So we now have two seconds left, one second... Professor Malinvaud.

EDMOND MALINVAUD

Just reacting to the comment of Llach. You realise that, as was announced in the letter that I wrote on 28 January, which I sent to all of you, there will be a joint colloquium or seminar organised by the two Academies, upon the initiative of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences that asked to make a joint meeting with us on the problem of globalisation and education, and that will be held a year from now. So we still have to see how it will be organised precisely but the programme will be made of four parts: firstly, the effect of globalisation on education, particularly in developing countries; secondly, the role of communication and information technologies in this process; thirdly, education of immigrants and their children; fourthly, education in an increasingly globalised multicultural world. So we have this project – still not precisely organised, in particular I do not have a clear vision of how many people will be there, because the document that was submitted to us by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences is not very precise on all that – and we still have to work on the preparation of this, but there is agreement on, first, a seminar in May 2005 and second, these four parts of the programme. So you have to have that present in your mind when you discuss other projects.

MARY ANN GLENDON

I thank you all very much and look forward to seeing you tomorrow morning.

APPENDIX

UNA VITA A SERVIZIO DELLA SCIENZA E DELLA CHIESA: PIER LUIGI ZAMPETTI

OMBRETTA FUMAGALLI CARULLI

Cristiano autentico e scienziato di grande valore, Pier Luigi Zampetti ha raggiunto il Padre celeste improvvisamente il giorno dei Santi dell'anno 2003.

Una prestigiosa, e talvolta ingiustamente sofferta, carriera accademica lo aveva visto professore ordinario di Dottrina dello Stato in varie sedi italiane: alla Università Statale di Milano negli anni della contestazione studentesca, particolarmente difficili per un cattolico militante dichiaratamente antimarxista, poi a Trieste dove fondò la Facoltà di Scienze Politiche e ne divenne Preside, infine a Genova, dove rimase sino alla fine della sua vita terrena. Molti docenti delle nostre Università gli sono debitori di consigli scientifici ed efficaci sostegni concorsuali.

Avevamo in comune la provenienza universitaria, entrambi laureati nella Facoltà di Giurisprudenza della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Comune era pertanto l'orientamento culturale. Anche a causa della differenza di età, non avevamo tuttavia avuto modo di frequentarci prima di un anno per entrambi significativo: il 1981, quando la Democrazia Cristiana ci chiese la disponibilità di proporre i nostri nomi per l'elezione da parte del Parlamento dei componenti laici del Consiglio Superiore della Magistratura. Entrambi risultati eletti, lasciammo temporaneamente la vita universitaria per dedicarci alla istituzione dello Stato italiano che presiede al governo autonomo della magistratura.

Entrati al CSM (presieduto da Sandro Pertini e negli ultimi mesi della nostra permanenza da Francesco Cossiga) condividemmo le fatiche e le soddisfazioni, gli oneri e gli onori della appartenenza ad un organismo istituzionale tanto significativo quanto spesso nell'occhio del ciclone, come del resto l'intera magistratura italiana. Zampetti divenne Presidente della Commissione speciale per la Riforma giudiziaria e l'Amministrazione della giustizia, particolarmente adatta per la sua preparazione scientifica ed attitudine culturale ed io Presidente della Commissione per gli Incarichi Direttivi. Ci ritrovavamo seduti a fianco

durante le sedute del *plenum* intorno al tavolo circolare dell'Aula dedicata a Vittorio Bachelet ed in quelle lunghissime ore, protratte per l'intera giornata e talvolta anche durante la notte, pur con la doverosa attenzione alle pratiche da trattare, spesso oggetto di contrapposizioni polemiche, scambiare qualche parola con chi condividesse gli stessi valori umani e spirituali era per entrambi un sollievo. Una consuetudine durata quattro anni e mezzo ci consentì pertanto di conoscerci meglio.

Ricordo ancora oggi con quale scrupolo egli cercasse soluzioni eque per le molte questioni che ci venivano sottoposte e con quale rispetto trattasse l'ordine giudiziario, per la terzietà che esso doveva rappresentare a garanzia della eguaglianza dei cittadini. Ma ricordo anche con quale senso delle "cose ultime" egli ogni giorno intorno alle ore 18 comunicasse a me (capogruppo del gruppo DC) che si sarebbe allontanato per partecipare alla Messa in una Chiesa vicina a Palazzo dei Marescialli. Confesso che talvolta, nel bel mezzo di qualche accesa discussione e con il timore che si giungesse ad una spaccatura in sede di votazione con la sconfitta del nostro fronte, la sua mi pareva una *pietas* eccessiva, anche perché mi costringeva ad interventi defatiganti l'uditorio e strumentali a prendere tempo, finché egli arrivasse. Egli invece era tranquillo, sicuro che la Provvidenza ci avrebbe dato una mano. E così in effetti avveniva.

Un momento per lui durissimo fu nel 1985 la morte della sua amatissima genitrice. Egli diceva di dovere a lei un'educazione cristiana non solo spiritualmente attenta, ma anche intelligente nell'indicargli settori di ricerca da esplorare: ad esempio l'influenza dell'economia nella vita politica e sociale. Non aver più al proprio fianco la mamma nella vita terrena era per lui una grande tristezza, soltanto mitigata dalla certezza che ella fosse ormai tra i santi del cielo. Una santa che egli avrebbe voluto fosse proclamata dalla Chiesa tale anche sulla terra: come esempio di madre cristiana, secondo quel principio della chiamata universale alla santità proprio della Chiesa post-conciliare. In tal senso già allora ed ancora negli ultimi giorni della sua vita terrena si adoperò per raccogliere testimonianze preziose per poter introdurre la causa di beatificazione, come ad esempio quella autorevolissima del suo antico confessore e educatore, Mons. Villa, che lo aveva conosciuto bambino e che della mamma serba tuttora memoria come di una anima bella.

Con la profonda emozione, provocata dalla morte di una persona così cara, nei ritagli di tempo del lavoro istituzionale al CSM, Zampetti scrisse un libro assai toccante, che, mi confidò, gli sembrava di scrivere con

prodigiosa celerità sotto dettatura della mamma. Il *Vangelo di mia mamma* (1985), subito premiato con la selezione Bancarella, è giunto ormai alla ottava edizione. La larghissima diffusione e la traduzione in più lingue a lui parevano segni della santità della compianta genitrice.

Autore di numerosi volumi, dopo una fase di ricerca scientifica dedicata alla filosofia del diritto (con le opere: *Il problema della conoscenza giuridica* del 1953, *Metafisica e scienza del diritto nel Kelsen* del 1956; *Il problema della giustizia nel protestantesimo tedesco contemporaneo* del 1962; *Il finalismo nel diritto. Verso una concezione personalistica dell'ordinamento giuridico* del 1967), aveva elaborato e propugnato una teoria alternativa al capitalismo e al socialismo, la teoria della partecipazione, della quale era fiero, pur con quella umiltà che rappresentava un aspetto peculiare del suo carattere o, forse, della sua educazione.

Sin dal 1967, in una relazione “Democrazia rappresentativa e democrazia partecipativa” ad un Convegno di Dottrina dello Stato tenutosi a Perugia, aveva lanciato il concetto di democrazia partecipativa e, successivamente, di “partito di elettori” e di “capitalismo popolare”, come concetti integrantesi vicendevolmente e, se attuati, destinati a cambiare l'assetto della società e dello Stato alla teoria della partecipazione si sarebbe poi ininterrottamente dedicato, come ad una missione scientifica non meno rilevante di una vera e propria missione spirituale, in quanto fondata su quella dottrina sociale della Chiesa, che egli riteneva unica via per la trasformazione della società su basi eque e solidali. In questa ottica inquadrava anche una serrata critica alla società consumistica, come frutto diretto della società secolarizzata, cioè senza valori, e dell'economismo, come visione solo unilaterale dell'uomo.

Si segnalano in proposito diversi saggi, tradotti anche all'estero, nell'arco di quasi quarant'anni di ricerca. Essi già nel titolo rivelano un percorso teoretico di grande interesse: *Dallo Stato liberale allo Stato dei partiti. La rappresentanza politica* (1965); *Democrazia e potere dei partiti* (1969); *La partecipazione popolare al potere. Una nuova alternativa al capitalismo e al socialismo* (1976); *La società partecipativa* (1981 e poi più volte ristampata, l'ultima nel 2003); *L'uomo e il lavoro nella nuova società* (1983); *Partecipazione e democrazia completa. La nuova via* (2002); e, ultimo ed agile volumetto destinato ad una ampia diffusione poco prima che morisse, *La dottrina sociale della Chiesa: per la salvezza dell'uomo e del pianeta* (2003).

La sua analisi scientifica è rigorosa nel metodo e spesso profetica nelle osservazioni, oggi di speciale attualità. Ad essa si applica quel “non

omnis moriar” (non del tutto morirò), con il quale gli antichi indicavano la perennità dell’opera dei grandi pensatori.

Soprattutto in *La sfida del Duemila* (del 1988) scienza e profezia si intersecano, nel riprendere e perfezionare tesi già svolte o abbozzate in precedenti saggi. Ricordiamone insieme i contenuti. L’uomo occidentale -dice l’Autore- devasta la natura. Ma devasta anche se stesso. Il degrado ambientale deve preoccupare: dagli strappi nel manto di ozono, all’aumento della temperatura terrestre, al mare infetto, alla avanzata dei deserti, alla scomparsa di migliaia di specie viventi. Ma, ancor più grave dell’inquinamento, è la desertificazione dello spirito. La sua origine sta in quel “materialismo edonistico”, che strumentalizza ogni valore e riduce il progresso a una pura proliferazione dei beni di consumo.

Con quella attenzione ai problemi dell’economia che spesso i giuristi, sbagliando, disdegnano, egli sostiene che oggi non sono più i filosofi ad elaborare il pensiero, ma la massa indistinta degli operatori economici. Ad evitare che le energie spirituali si sviscerino nelle leggi degli scambi commerciali, sotterrando o inutilizzando le migliori qualità dell’uomo, egli formula una suggestiva soluzione: la nascita di una coscienza che si opponga alla logica del consumismo permissivo e si impegni nella creazione di concetti sociali ed etici traducibili in azione diretta. I riferimenti possibili di questa soluzione sono: la priorità del lavoro sul capitale, il senso del risparmio, la rinuncia ai beni inutili e immaginari, la partecipazione popolare agli investimenti produttivi, il potenziamento dei beni immateriali rappresentati dal mondo dell’informazione.

In antitesi ad ogni forma di materialismo, Zampetti auspica dunque l’alba di uno “spiritualismo storico”, fondato sulla democrazia partecipativa, vale a dire l’effettivo concorso di tutti i cittadini all’esercizio del potere. Lo spirito, conclude, con questa nuova filosofia deve di nuovo calarsi nella realtà storica e plasmarla dall’interno, così da consentire all’uomo di vincere la sfida del futuro e salvare il mondo dalla catastrofe.

I materiali per una costruzione salvifica della società sono forniti dalla dottrina sociale della Chiesa, applicabile a tutti i Paesi del mondo e a tutti i popoli, anche non cristiani, e destinata a far emergere, se correttamente applicata, un nuovo modello di società e di Stato nel mondo intero. Essi sono: la persona umana, la soggettività della famiglia e della società, il principio di sussidiarietà, il bene comune universale. Grazie ad essi è possibile superare l’insufficienza della democrazia rappresentativa,

integrandola appunto con la democrazia partecipativa: la vera “democrazia della società”, mossa dalla sussidiarietà.

La sua originale teoria della partecipazione ha significativi riconoscimenti di Università straniere. Proprio l'applicazione di essa alla realtà politica di alcuni Paesi latino-americani lo fa considerare per questi stessi Paesi un “padre della Patria”, come ha giustamente ricordato, il giorno delle esequie, il console generale di Bolivia in Italia, Alvaro Del Portillo.

Di qui la nomina a membro dell'Accademia Nazionale di Diritto e Scienze Sociali di Cordoba (Argentina); di qui varie lauree *honoris causa* in Università latino-americane.

Sempre partendo dall'analisi della situazione socio-economica e dello Stato capitalistico attuali, nell'anno internazionale della famiglia (1994) indica un modello di sviluppo, che permetta l'eliminazione dello Stato assistenziale e la creazione di un vero Stato sociale imperniato sulla famiglia proprietaria dei mezzi di produzione, e perciò in grado di far risplendere nella società i valori ibernati dal consumismo. La proposta è che famiglia e società assumano un ruolo determinante e decisivo nell'ambito della nuova concezione dello “Stato delle autonomie”, grazie alla democrazia partecipativa, che istituzionalizza la solidarietà, nonché al ruolo della famiglia, che vivifica il concetto di popolo, dando volto concreto alla sovranità popolare come sovranità del popolo delle famiglie (*La sovranità della famiglia e lo Stato delle autonomie: un nuovo modello di sviluppo* del 1996).

Il riferimento al magistero sociale della Chiesa è, in questo saggio, reso evidente dalla bella citazione di un famoso passo della “Lettera alle famiglie” di Giovanni Paolo II, posto a premessa dell'intera trattazione: “La famiglia è soggetto più di ogni altra istituzione sociale: lo è più della Nazione, dello Stato, più della società e delle Organizzazioni internazionali. Queste società, specialmente le Nazioni, intanto godono di soggettività propria in quanto la ricevono dalle persone e dalle loro famiglie”.

La conoscenza ed insieme fedeltà al magistero della Chiesa e l'apprezzamento in particolare del pensiero di Giovanni Paolo II (che, nella dedica della prima edizione de *La società partecipativa*, è ricordato come l’“iniziatore con la ‘Redemptor hominis’ di una nuova epoca nella storia”) sono le caratteristiche che fanno di Zampetti un convinto e convincente “vir catholicus”, di tale affidabilità da essere nominato, sin dalla sua costituzione nel 1994, Membro ordinario della Pontificia Accademia delle Scienze Sociali e unico italiano componente del Consiglio della

medesima. In essa porta il contributo di una scienza al servizio della Chiesa, come si conviene in questo alto consesso, e porta altresì il contributo di una così convinta fedeltà al magistero petrino in nome della quale talvolta egli, pur mite, osava perfino esprimere una di quelle vibranti indignazioni che solo i giusti possono permettersi.

Nominata anch'io lo scorso anno su sua proposta Accademico Pontificio delle Scienze Sociali, ho potuto riprendere quella consuetudine di rapporti, anche famigliari, che avevamo ai tempi del CSM. Ma, con mio grande dolore, solo per pochi mesi.

Il Signore lo ha chiamato presso di Sé con uno di quei disegni misteriosi, che, benché divini, non riusciamo a comprendere e perciò ci rendono a tratti amara la vita quotidiana.

Credo di potere interpretare il pensiero di tanti suoi estimatori ed amici, se affermo che osiamo tutti sperare che ci protegga dal cielo. La sua devozione che lo aveva spinto a recarsi più volte in luoghi di apparizioni mariane, e a dedicare al mistero di Fatima un interessante volume, *La profezia di Fatima e il crollo del comunismo* (1990), ci porta ad accantonare il nostro dolore umano per la sua troppo improvvisa scomparsa per immaginare che in Cielo ad accoglierlo, insieme alla amatissima mamma, sia stata la Vergine Maria.

The theme which you are presently studying – that of relations between generations – is closely connected to your research on globalization. In earlier times the care of grown children for their parents was taken for granted. The family was the primary place of an inter-generational solidarity. There was the solidarity of marriage itself, in which spouses took each other for better or worse and committed themselves to offer each other lifelong mutual assistance. This solidarity of the married couple soon extended to their children, whose education demanded a strong and lasting bond. This led in turn to solidarity between grown children and their aging parents.

... At present relations between generations are undergoing significant changes as a result of various factors.

In meeting these challenges, every generation and social group has a role to play. Special attention needs to be paid to the respective competencies of the State and the family in the building of an effective solidarity between generations. In full respect for the principle of subsidiarity (cf. *Centesimus Annus*, 48), public authorities must be concerned to acknowledge the effects of an individualism which – as your studies have already shown – can seriously affect relations between different generations. For its part, the family, as the origin and foundation of human society (cf. *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, 11; *Familiaris Consortio*, 42), also has an irreplaceable role in the building of inter-generational solidarity. There is no age when one ceases to be a father or mother; a son or daughter. We have a special responsibility not only towards those to whom we have given the gift of life, but also toward those from whom we have received that gift.

(John Paul II, *Address to the Participants of the Tenth Plenary Session*, 30 April 2004)