

THE PONTIFICAL
ACADEMY OF
SOCIAL SCIENCES

EXTRA SERIES

5

Closed Session



VATICAN CITY
2006

22 November 2005

Closed Session

22 November 2005



VATICAN CITY
2006

GENERAL DISCUSSION

PAULUS ZULU

Thank you very much Professor Schambeck, we now move over to Professor Malinvaud's paper on 'personal reflections on what was achieved and what might remain to be achieved', and then we have an hour for this presentation and I will give Professor Malinvaud 40 minutes and 20 minutes for discussion. Thank you.

EDMOND MALINVAUD

Thank you Mr Chairman.

Dear Colleagues, As you have understood, already when we decided to devote our XI Session to a conceptual analysis, I was aware of the risk that this session led us to deviate from our main task, which is to exhibit those contributions from social sciences that would be the most important for the social teaching of the Church. We might be too attracted by philosophical speculations which indeed are very interesting, especially for the eldest among us who contribute less to the active research in our disciplines. The subject we chose, *The Conceptualization of the Human Person in the Social Sciences* has been very stimulating during this session, while also increasing our knowledge. Therefore the risk to which I alluded is still there. We should be aware of it during this general discussion. I was aware of it when I drafted what I shall say today. I would like now to begin with an overview of the work of this session.

Of course, this overview will be confined to our subject-matter *stricto sensu*, Conceptualization of the Human Person. I noticed that this session allowed some authors and scholars to go beyond the subject, taking the opportunity to talk about scientific questions or social phenomena that were dear to their heart. This is normal, but I will not talk about that.

Concerning philosophy, you probably noticed a certain convergence among speakers to congratulate themselves on the fact that the classical notion of personhood has been revived. This was the main theme of Professor Berti. He was not contradicted by Rocco Buttiglione when he talked about the objective part of John Paul II's phenomenology and later about the important role of subjectivity in the reactions of individuals vis-à-vis this objectivity, as well as in their spiritual opening towards others.

Angelo Scola has chosen not to talk about the ancient roots of modern concepts whereas Minnerath insisted on them. Looking at the future and mentioning the link between Christian anthropology and sociology, Cardinal Scola emphasized the fact that the challenge addressed by modern society to the Church is that the Church has to find a way to develop still more Christian thought on personhood.

Georges Cottier presented his reflections on liberalism and liberal ideology. He explained very well the reasons why he saw some menaces for the human person. The Social state advocated by this ideology, is claimed to be able to satisfy three goals: autonomy of the individual, freedom and equality. But there are no good arguments to show the compatibility among these three notions in an atheistic world.

You probably expect me to now review the conceptualizations in our four disciplines: law, political science, economy, sociology. But another discipline has emerged in our debate: psychology. When I think about it, this seems to have been positive. The economists feel the need to resort to psychology to review the conceptualization of agents and psychology has taken a great place on the time we devoted to sociology. Jon Elster's presentation concerned psychology; his text has shown how it is justified to add to the old distinction between rational behaviour and visceral behaviour; another distinction with three poles: interest, passion and reason.

The place of this reflection in the life of people has been shown magnificently by Margaret Archer who, remaining a sociologist, showed herself to be also a psychologist, a philosopher and a theologian. She has convinced us that the person was a judge of his or her social identity, and had the capacity to influence society's internal discourse.

Going on with sociology, I have noticed that our colleague Zubrzycki presented John Shotter's contribution as inspired by social psychology. I noticed also that the long quotation in epigraph of John Shotter's paper comes from Merleau-Ponty who studied the psychological approach to scientific practices. John Shotter, studying constraints imposed by the social environment on people reflections, concluded that, observing the surrounding society, the individual adjusts his behaviour to his environment.

Harré has suggested replacing the theory of roles by the theory of positioning, examining the system of rights and obligations which defines the norms according to which individuals interact with each other and thus influence the evolution of society. This is a new field of research which attaches upon the identity recognised to each person. Contribution to such a theory would be a task for social psychology and cognitive psychology.

I could go on like that but I won't do it. At this point I have to put an end to the review of the different presentations of this session for lack of time. I must give my apologies to my colleagues who talked about law, political sciences and economics. I will talk briefly about these disciplines and this will enable me to approach afterwards some points which could be further discussed this afternoon.

As for law and political sciences, an overview has already been given by our colleague Herbert Schambeck. I confine myself to mention an impression which I drew from the discussions. In these two fields, historical and cultural differences seem to have a particular influence, even if international law and the promotion of human rights tried to limit the effects of this influence. As for international law, unfortunately we have to notice that its impact encounters so many obstacles that it could even have opposite results to what the original authors in the postwar wanted to achieve, whether they were inspired by the concern for liberty, which Professor Glendon emphasized, or by the respect of human dignity, which was stressed by Professors Kirchhof and Schambeck. As to the weaknesses of international organisations we heard the criticism of Janne Matlary and we appreciate the assessments made by Kirchhof and Skubiszewski.

Here it has been very satisfactory to learn about the different experiences with law and political science in the US, in Britain, in Germany and in Latin countries before examining the Moslem and Buddhist traditions in Asia. We shall remember that conceptualizations of the human person and their implementation into institutions went through different developments in different areas of the world.

I would like to now address a question to all authors of these presentations. When we talk about conceptualizations should we not wonder what are the sources and the explanations of their developments? For instance we could focalize on the different meanings of words used in the past and present political writings, on the difference between the decisions of courts and the implementation of written laws.

Since I talked so much yesterday about economics, I will not come back to it today. I will confine myself to a side commentary about the organization of our exchanges. The study of our discipline was made along a plan going from normative economics, to positive economics and to applied economics. Why is it that we see no echo of such a plan in our discussions about philosophy, law, political sciences, and sociology? The answer may be that a similar plan would not have been useful for the

other disciplines. Why? Perhaps in these other disciplines conceptualization of the person appears as a purely positive subject (incidentally, when saying positive here I am not assuming the positivist ideology which was criticised by Georges Cottier). Isn't it true that reflection and teaching of the Church give a great place to normative morality? Is it not true that this teaching is meant for faithful who are troubled by political decisions in economic and social fields? Is it not true that our contribution to the development of the Social Doctrine should result from confrontation of our positive analysis with the Christian principles? These are all the questions I would like to raise. Maybe they are just rhetorical. I am not so certain about it.

I have to come to the end of the time I decided to devote to my overview, which was certainly too short, too personal, too subjective. I apologize for all that and I would like now to pass over to the issues to be discussed this afternoon. You probably thought about what I said last Friday and about what has been written in note then circulated. I will tell you now what I think about future decision.

First of all, what is the assessment of this present session? For the first time we dealt with a subject which lies somewhat upstream from the substantial concerns we dealt with in the previous sessions. I think the experience has been positive. The presentations have been useful for us, at least for me. These presentations will be interesting for the readers of our *Acta*. They will be interesting also for us when we have to think about the follow-up to the session. I hope that these writings will be useful for those who, in the Church, have to think on how to enrich Christian teaching. After some additional work we should publish something interesting in the series of our *Acta*.

A more delicate question is to know how can the subject-matter of this session be integrated in the program of future works of our Academy. You have probably understood what I think about that: I think that we would be wrong if the *Acta* of this session should be later considered as having marked a turning point in studies of the Academy towards more speculative thinking, somewhat away from the study of the social problems of modern life. Since we know each other well, I gathered that you have different opinions on this point. What I have just been saying does not mean that I would be definitely against a sort of follow-up to this session. For instance it might be thought useful to have further studies in order to better explain some of our present conclusions. But as for the general thread of our future activities, personally I would not ask for

long investigations along the way opened with this session, such as a program lasting for several years like those carried out on globalization, democracy and so on. I take this stand because I feel our mission is basically to keep a profitable dialogue with those who work, much more than we do, in the field. The utility of our discussions would be on the wane if we should decide to devote ourselves exclusively on a philosophical reflection about social sciences.

My October note draws several options for future works. The *first option* would be to leave some time to reflection, leaving to our next session in 2006 all decisions about the follow-up beyond the publishing of our *Acta*. The *second option* would be to try and collect supplementary material, which would be worthy of being known by us and by readers of the proceedings, this without deciding on what to be done later on. I put this option in the list because it is a possibility, but I don't know really where it could lead us. I think that those who were more active for suggesting this option belong to the Italian delegation, which is unfortunately not represented now. Therefore we are missing a considerable part of opinions. The *third option*, would be an internal document of the Academy to remind ourselves of what we have done and what we have learned from the discussion on our present subject. When I am talking about an internal document, I mean that this would not be for publication, but only for our internal use. The *fourth option* would be to prepare a special publication of the Academy. We should then define the exact coverage and the goal of this publication, so that we could make it clear in the near future the sort of book we want to publish. The drafting of the document would involve of course some of those who have made presentations here. If we chose the latter we should talk already now about the goals and the purpose of this possible book.

I would like now to be more precise about my opinion on these four options. First of all, I already said that the second option in my opinion could not offer us much. On the contrary, I quite like option number three, in other words a short document for internal use of the Academy just to memorize what has been done. Probably it is the least attractive option: during the short history of the Academy there have been several calls to build good archives. I am sure they are being built, but I don't think the demand for using them is any great. It is indeed rare during a session to remind, or to hint at, what has been done in previous sessions. As for option number four, in other words the publishing of one document of the Academy, it could be very interesting but of course we need

a certain consensus. A hundred per cent consensus does not exist in the academic world, but we should not underestimate the difficulty. Let us remember what was our experience with the two books *Democracy in Debate and Work and Human Fulfilment*. These are the two reference points we have when we think of a synthetic publication on the conceptualization of the human person.

I would like to recapitulate my proposals. Option number four is very interesting but very difficult. Option number three is possible but less interesting. I see no justification for option two, and maybe at the end of the afternoon we will accept option one, according to which we won't have anything on, until April. Thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Well, since this is now fresh in your minds, shall we now have a discussion on what has just been said?

PAULUS ZULU

Thank you Professor Malinvaud, There are comments regarding your summary and your ideas. We will start with the Chancellor.

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

I am very much in agreement with what has been said. Clearly, I am very much in agreement with what Professor Malinvaud has said but I would like also to subscribe this with what the Holy Father said about the subject of our recent meeting. If we read the Holy Father's text which he pronounced when he honoured us with his visit to the Casina, in my opinion he said some fundamental things about all the matters we have dealt with. Basically, the message of the Holy Father centred on the human person but from the point of view of social sciences he said 'I am particularly pleased that the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences has chosen the Conceptualization of the Human Person in Social Sciences', so first the Holy Father was glad. Then he said 'The human person is at the centre of the whole social order', if so, an Academy that studies social sciences has to maintain at the centre the understanding of the human person. Then there was a wonderful quotation from St Thomas Aquinas: 'The human person signifies what is most perfect in nature'. And then this passage finishes with another statement which is very powerful: 'This anthropological reality is an integral part of Christian thought and responds directly to the attempts to abolish the boundary

between social sciences and natural sciences'. Thus, in the mind of the Holy Father if you abolish the notion of person you abolish this border and all the interpretation of man is on the horizon of natural sciences. He added that 'often' this reductive view is 'proposed in contemporary society'. On the contrary, if we understand correctly the reality of person we can offer 'a profound answer to the questions posed today concerning the status of the human being' also in social sciences. He concluded by saying 'It is very providential that we are discussing the subject of the person while we are paying tribute to John Paul II', so this is providential because John Paul II placed at the centre of his Magisterium the reality of person and we wish to honour him. Consequently the person is also at the centre of the heritage left by John Paul II. Thus Pope Benedict desires that the Academy founded by John Paul II 'is entrusted in a particular way' to conserve and develop this heritage that has the human person at the centre of his Magisterium and in the interpretation of the social sciences. For me this is a very clear and convincing indication given by the new Pope concerning the mission of the Academy, also in relation to this exacting heritage of John Paul II, which we should always maintain as our point of reference and continually reflect upon. Thank you very much.

PAULUS ZULU

Thank you. Could we treat the comments first?

EDMOND MALINVAUD

Actually, I am not one of those who pleaded against choosing that subject for the session. I think to be frank that I am the one who first suggested it. So, I think that is a good thing that we have been able to have a session on that, but what next? The Holy Father has many philosophers around him and he knows of course his profession. If our Academy was created a little more than ten years ago, it was because of a feeling that there was not enough social scientists around, while it would be wise to have some. All right, it was a good thing to have this session; what next is a question for discussion.

PAULUS ZULU

We shall take comments in the following order, Glendon, Archer, Zubrzycki and Llach.

MARY ANN GLENDON

I actually did not ask to be recognized, but since you have recognized me, I would just like to wholeheartedly associate myself with what Professor Malinvaud just said about the importance of our having done this session this time, and also with his reminder that a reason for our existence is to contribute from the social sciences.

MARGARET ARCHER

Well, just to reassure Edmond, his memory is entirely correct. He did indeed choose this topic, with a little support from his friends but this was your idea and I think it was an absolutely excellent one. I thought so at the time, so I take some credit for that, it is excellent because we have had this acknowledgement from the Holy Father that this is useful and we have to be honest with ourselves, with a new Pontificate we are working very much in the dark and have no idea how acceptable this kind of exploration will be, so it is extremely good to have this positive reaction, but having said all these polite but true things, what I really want to say is that out of all the ten, eleven if you count them, sessions that we have had, personally, this is just a personal opinion, I think this has had two characteristics that are outstanding, the quality of the papers per se has been extraordinarily high, apart from a few little wobbles which you signalled, most people did, I think, took their brief very seriously indeed and addressed the topic much better than they ever have on any previous occasion and actually there is a third point, the coherence I think has been a lot greater than again on any previous occasions. We have had very very few papers, even though they may be a long way from one's own discipline that were not well-explained and whose relevance did not become progressively clear in the process of the exposition, and that I think is a mark of a good paper. So, sorry, I don't usually speak, I don't think I ever speak just to give out compliments though these are very very well-deserved. But I think there is something to be derived from this. It may be that, I wish there were more of us here, but maybe that those of us who are here want to express the desire to go further with this as a theme. I don't want to say anymore about that, but even if we decide not to devote another complete session to this theme, there is one suggestion I would like to add to Edmond Malinvaud's four, can I call them your four bullet points? – four possibilities. And the suggestion derives from the nature of the papers, but also from the fact that we have quite a few precedents for doing this. From those papers I have a, personally I have

a great desire to go home and make some of the linkages between them, you can't take them all in just as you hear them for the first time. I think there are many more thematic linkages and cross-disciplinary linkages between the papers than we probably hoped for or realized on the spot. For example, there is one very big theme I would like to pursue through the papers, just out of personal interest, about the durability, question mark, of classical philosophical categories and their capacity to embrace contemporary phenomena and secondly, there seemed to be a surprising consensus amongst us about the inadequacy of enlightenment categories to deal with many, most of the problems that we wanted to address. Thirdly, it is always important to listen to silences. We did not have a single piece of advocacy here for post modernism or the post modern term, that seems to be taken for granted by everybody as being a non-starter or a dead end. And that is very interesting in an Academy of this kind, we choose to sit out the tendency of the day and none of those well-known names were brought up and rehearsed other than to say we won't go down those avenues. I am not going to break this lovely vow of silence by introducing the names now. So, that does the eternal question, where do we stand and, therefore I would just like to float an idea to see whether anybody else shares it and would like to see it happening. And this would be that even if we do not go ahead and decide to follow up with a second plenary session devoted to the concept of the person, which I certainly do not rule out, but even if we decide not to do so. Could we not have one day devoted to the thing we have not been able to do here which is to synthesise some of these common themes. I have just touched on those that I noticed but I am sure there are others that other people were more aware of. And that way, whatever we decide to do with it and particularly if we decide to make a lot more use of the internet for diffusing our products, we will be, capitalising is a dreadful word, we would be taking advantage of this greater coherence that we did have we would show that we had worked upon the great amount of work that individuals have put into this and we would be able to be offering some synthesis, synthetic thoughts and new questions which might be more amenable for being able to reduce, summarise and submit them to the Pope for whatever purposes he finds useful.

JERZY ZUBRZYCKI

Thank you. My thoughts which I tried to summarise in a memorandum for my own benefit do not diverge from much of what has just been

said, particularly from Professor Malinvaud's thinking but I think I am duty bound to explain why I am getting to a conclusion which I shall shortly present. To begin with, one has to assess what happened in the last six days and here I endorse the acknowledgement that Professor Archer has just proposed, we had very good papers, the choice of speakers was excellent without naming names, I recall the Roman Senate doctrine of not being, then the one paper which widely ranged over certain historical issues but never addressed the issue of human personality in that particular discipline, so a good outcome, the experiment of spending the year's work on speculatively philosophical issues has, I think, produced good results and I agree with Margaret Archer that this Academy should have perhaps one day next time to summarise some of those issues and prepare us to go beyond that in more 'applied' area. This was indeed the point made by Professor Malinvaud when he circulated the memorandum to us telling us that we could either go again in this 'applied' area or of course stay with philosophy. I think there is certainly room for both, we could certainly spend a whole week moving into an area and I have some examples from (? inaudible) Copenhagen consensus which present many many pages of paper, kilos and not tonnes investigating whether for example poverty in the world would be greatly reduced by providing in an inexpensive manner mosquito nets to reduce malaria or by reducing the uses to introduction of some micronutrients providing necessary quantities of iron, iodine and so on. I think there is room for that, but it has always been done in a theoretical framework, and that theoretical framework which we have just got in an actual appendix, pending provision and its being made into a document. Where do we go next? I think there are two possible approaches not mutually exclusive. The first approach would be to do the Michael Novak exercise, major review having been said, time consuming and possibly expensive from the Academy's point of view but I would not be very much in favour of it. The other approach, the first approach would be, I called it the Michael Novak approach, the democracy exercise, he spent so much time in putting it together in a very expert fashion and we benefited from it by publishing some of it and by including much of that in the first book on democracy and also there was one distributed yesterday, time consuming and maybe not necessary at this point but the other approach might be more useful. I call it the minimalist approach to go back to basics, to go back to the point of origin of this Academy, to follow and that particular point of origin, was the letter, the Apostolic letter to us calling the

Academy together and telling us and I quote: 'the Church's idea is to further promote what in 1994, he said, the strengthening of the Church's citizenship by perfecting her social doctrine through dialogue with experts in social disciplines'. I think there is plenty of scope for that, certainly within the kind of framework we just tapped on, namely the one (inaudible) exercise that Margaret Archer proposes, and in doing that, in doing this job my preference would be to make sure that the conceptual framework emerging from the thirty or so papers given to us in the last six days as well as discussions and so on would be made available and guide us in our future activities. In doing that, we should be mindful of the fact that it should be basically a moral enquiry into particular areas of concern in the social world, all we are saying is, I think, that these activities by the disciplines as well as in the applied field in the public policy field in these areas require a new humanism that takes into account all aspects of human culture and where human societies and scientists can work together as partners. I think this is largely what John Paul had taught us, both in his first initial documents as well of course in this major document which I found extremely difficult to read, namely *Fides et Ratio*. So the need for a moral enquiry is one which I think we should be well aware of and it has recently been given considerable publicity by a number of prominent speakers, it was particularly urged on us by Amartya Sen a few years ago by James K Wilson in criminology, Robert Beller in sociology and so forth. Finally, in saying all that and endorsing Professor Malinvaud's ideas about possible approaches and without being able frankly at this point of time to decide which of these would be the most approachable, I think that there is a need here for thinking very very carefully and in a frank way about what do we mean by publishing our thoughts. And I want to make a distinction, and I know it will hurt some people in this room, between printing and publishing. We do print our outcomes, our papers, our conclusions but they are not published. By publication I mean distributing equally well-prepared printed papers through commercial, semi-commercial networks so that they become available to people at large. By and large we are still not known out in the wider area of social sciences. I have yet to see any of our volumes reviewed in some of the more prestigious journals of social disciplines. That does not have an end to it because we do not publish this, there is no publishing house. Let me suggest that it might be done, why not put together a small inexpensive publishing enterprise for the two joint Academies, why not appoint a person who once having received printed

material would then prepare a well-edited brochure to be distributed through reputable publishers. Assigning a price of sorts, a low price but there must be money paid for these things. Making sure that these published documents reach prestigious journals, prestigious centres of learning in our discipline. That particular approach in my judgement must be followed through by the Academy and I would urge our distinguished colleagues who are on the Council to take it seriously into account, so let's by all means print our material but it must stay behind not written, not distributed but publication as an enterprise on a very small scale but reaching reputable publishers, reputable sources of learning of that area would in my judgement be a necessary outcome accompanying in a parallel sort of fashion the kind of approach that this Academy would hopefully be on at the end of the decade. Thank you.

JUAN LLACH

First, I do agree that this session from my point of view has been one of the best we have ever had so I congratulate our colleagues that participated in the organisation and particularly Professor Malinvaud. Second, I do agree with our Chancellor. I mean the speech by the Pope yesterday is very short but incredibly meaningful and so we need to take it as a very important orientation for our work. But I would say that our conception of the human being and particularly the idea of the persona is the essence of the social doctrine of the Church but at the same it has been in the past and it will continue to be not only of this session but in the future sessions a reference point. If you look a lot of the pages in a lot of the papers we have considered in other sessions. You will find a lot of references to our conception or different conceptions of the human being and of the person so, in order to eventually do something I would say that also other papers should be taken into account and not only the ones presented to this session. That is why I personally would agree to option two of the ones presented by Professor Malinvaud. First, because I consider that not only the session we are going to have next year at our Intergenerational and Solidarity but perhaps even the following ones about probably questions like subsidiarity or some particular aspects of globalisation will help us to improve our statements about the human dignity, the human person, etc. But in order not to postpone that much, my position would be to combine option two with option three. I mean, to work now on a short document to be prepared at least for internal use and eventually also for external. I think it would be better to combine

option two with option three in order not to have nothing beyond the Acts about this session. And then there is a particular point regarding the instructions to, or not instructions but suggestions to our collaborators including ourselves for the next sessions. I would say that it would have been better to have in the papers presented to this session, at least two parts. First a sort of review of the literature and secondly the personal opinions of the author because in such a way I think from a pedagogic point of view for publication, for diffusion, it could be very very useful to have these two kinds of parts in the papers because sometimes everything is like mixed in a way and I think it could be a good idea thinking even in the next session to think about giving the authors some instructions like these ones. That is all, thank you.

HERBERT SCHAMBECK

Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now talking of decisive topics of the future work of our Academy which is not entirely representative of the Academy because we are 14 Academicians here. Well, we are only what remains and this is very regrettable because those who are not here would I am sure have liked to participate in this discussion. Secondly, I would like to thank our Chairperson Glendon and our Chancellor Sánchez I would like to thank all the members of the secretariat in terms of the preparation of this meeting and Professor Malinvaud should be included too in these thanks because between our Plenary Sessions we always had the feeling of togetherness, that we are in touch with one another because we are constantly informing one another and this is a tremendous feat. I think who is a member of different academies like myself, you realise this is exceptional and it is not just to be taken for granted. I would also like to thank the interpreters, whether we spoke slowly or fast, they always made a great effort to allow us to be understood and this is considerable and I would like to also thank God for this feat so I would like to thank Msgr. Sánchez too, to have organised these wonderful meals and also to the tasks of our Academy.

A series of books written by Cardinal Ratzinger have been published and in these last 12 years I have always expressed a wish for him to take part in our meetings and I am very glad that my wish has been fulfilled by having the successor of Peter in this Academy and his reference to relativism was very impressive. I have always followed Professor then Cardinal Ratzinger and the Pontificate of John Paul II, I think this is a strong guideline for the future. I do wish to warn you of an error, if we

cover certain subject, if this be democracy, the human person, I think these four main disciplines of our actions should be done with the present status of our knowledge but never could we assume that this is clarified once and for all because there will always be further problematics related to democracy, or the person. I have now been sitting in Parliament for the last 30 years and my experience of democracy is such that these publications are exceptional, but I think there are certain aspects of democracy we have not properly yet worked through, especially the practical aspects and government systems, election systems and interest groups of Catholic teaching, also *Quadragesimo Anno*. John Paul II highlighted two aspects that we have not covered yet at all, not even touched upon, the ecumenical side and the economic partnerships. Father Schasching frequently raises these, there are a whole range of series that are tied in with democracy and the personhood based on the tradition of social teaching of the Church and I think this suggestion of Professor Malinvaud should, is certainly noteworthy and I am very thankful that he did point out it be advisable to also look at the literature because we would offer a lot of people within the Academy and also through the Academy these could be published. As to Professor Zubrzycki and the publication I would like to warn you of this, to enter into publication business and it is also thanks to Professor Glendon for having found a publishing house which is not easy because our publications constitute a very valuable, and cherished basis and Professor Glendon also pointed out that we could make ourselves more known than we were in the past, to bring us into contact and dialogue with our colleagues in legal and social affairs. In Austria I can see this very clearly and I can see it in our discussion on European integration and constitution. How many questions there are and I discussed this with a publisher, Darwinism and how many pending issues there are that could be tackled in a coordinated form and for me the presentation by Professor Glendon and the Holy Father are incredibly valuable and I am sure that these publications that have been reflected by *L'Osservatore Romano*, I think these are invaluable contributions. The discussions that have ensued so far would be even more valuable if we embodied them in these publications so then they can appear in black and white. I think we have to look at the response, we have to give an answer to this and this is an invitation to enter into dialogue, into one that goes beyond Christianity.

PAULUS ZULU

Thank you very much Professor Schambeck. I think the discussion this afternoon in a sense is a continuation of this discussion. There is a link and if such members of the Academy still wanted to say something there will be a great opportunity to say that in the afternoon's discussion. Thank you very much to the speakers of the day. I think we can give them applause. Thank you. (All clap).

MARY ANN GLENDON

I wish to thank you all for your participation in this meeting and for your presence here at this concluding session. You are the faithful few. I want to reflect with you about our tasks in the perspective of our present and future activities. What I want to say is a preamble. It is not very easy for a group like ours to hold the parts of our task together: on the one hand we want to have a deep reflection on the social sciences in the light of Catholic Social Thought, that is one thing, at the same time, we want to bring the social sciences to bear on concrete social problems. The question I think we have to keep asking ourselves is: how do we hold those two tasks together and can we do a better job than we did the last time? We always have to try to be improving. Have we done enough in particular to offer the Church the materials that she needs for the development of her social doctrine? That is our distinctive task, that is the way in which we are different from other learned academies and to that end I proposed at the Council meeting, and the Council members all agreed, that every year when we finish our meeting the coordinator of the meeting, whatever kind of report he or she prepares for the membership, will also prepare a short report for the Holy Father himself. Every year from now on, we will report to the Holy Father about what we have done and how it bears on Catholic Social Thought. Now, that is not the kind of report that somebody can write in the middle of the night on the last day of the meeting. So our thought is that whoever is writing that report can gather all the papers and take even two or three months, but that should be a regular feature of our work here. Now, on the specific subject of how we will bring this meeting on the conceptualization of the human person to a conclusion, I have been listening to all of the proposals and I think I have come up with one that combines practically everything that was favoured by Professor Malinvaud and the other speakers, and I will put it out for your general discussion. It would involve four steps. The first step is that all of us who wrote papers will have until February, early

February perhaps, to send a final version of the paper to Professor Malinvaud. I will say personally that I rewrote my paper during the meeting and now that I heard Professor Malinvaud this morning raise the question of why the papers in law and political science were not structured in the useful way that the economic papers were, I think he was right to raise that question and I will do some further rewriting with that in mind. The same thing with Professor Llach's comment; I would like to have another crack at rewriting my paper and I am sure that many of you would, too. So, first step: we will send in the corrected versions of our papers. As a second step, I would propose that Professor Malinvaud, since he is the coordinator of this session, would make a report, a kind of synthetic introduction that would be published with the papers as part of the *Acta*. I will say something more about publication in a moment. As a third step: if any of you here are moved, after hearing the proceedings, to write another paper that would be a reflection on the proceedings, the *Acta* would certainly be open for that. The fourth step concerns Professor Archer's proposal that after we have reflected on this meeting on the Conceptualization of the Human Person, we devote some time at the 2006 meeting in the spring to some further discussion. I would say that it would be difficult to devote a whole day because the 2006 meeting is already very full and we are thinking of adding a short session on the Compendium of Catholic Social Doctrine, but there would certainly be a way to have a round table. Finally, as I mentioned, the outcome of this meeting should be memorialized at least in a report to the Holy Father and through publication in the *Acta*. I think in view of the quality of the papers there is also a chance that we might find a publisher that could give wider circulation to the proceedings. So, those are some thoughts, and I will now throw open the floor for general discussion and I will ask if anybody would like to volunteer to write an additional paper.

KEVIN RYAN

First, I would like to clarify that I am not volunteering to write the paper but to make a comment. This may be an elaboration of points that have already been made about next steps. As you all know, I am the newest of the Academy members and probably have the least grasp of what the mission of the Academy is but I come from a very practical field of education, a very applied field and so I am enormously stimulated by first of all what I would call the 'what' of this meeting and I also want to raise the question of the 'how'. It seems to me that many of us

who have been raised in the Catholic tradition are in a way steeped in a sense of what a unified concept of what the human person is but for someone who has been in education and I know it has been echoed, this idea of a transcendent person with deep dignity is just withering on the vine and while we have, we have sort of brought it to the surface and brushed it off, you know cleaned it up a bit. I just hope we don't leave it there, that is why I applaud, I think there was much head nodding at Margaret Archer's suggestion, we'll call it the 'Archer synthesis', the need for us to just go another big step in bringing all this together in a very very clear statement that could be more widely used, just to reiterate it, I mean whether we are talking about the world of television of, we have seen so much of it in our room of Rupert Murdoch, Professor Zubrzycki's countryman, with his commercial television and all the rest of the commercial television that surrounds the young, that surrounds all of us in the world, of the UN, and other agencies, the world of the universities, this concept of the person being transcended is just withering and sinking, and I think it is really terribly important that we push this much further. Second point is really on the how. I looked at the mission statement of the Academy during lunch and one of our objectives is to promote scientific survey and research and to help and assist institutions and private individuals to execute them. It seems to me that the institution that is most immediate of course is our Church and the leader of the Church and we ought to be giving, I think, a great deal of attention to how we get these ideas across. Alright, we have all enjoyed a certain renewal of what the Church's concept of the human person is, but how is this going to be communicated. We had Mortimer Zuckerman here, one of the great communicators, one of the great orchestrators of getting ideas out. Well, not that he would be the person but we ought to be asking people like that. How do we get this Christian message that seems to be in such great trouble. How do we get it across? So, just one thought, I kept thinking my wife is my great educator and she has told me over and over about this book, about the life of Matteo Ricci, the sixteenth century Jesuit who, and I was going to ask someone if he was a member of the Scientific Academy early on. Well, he ought to be in a way an inspiration to us, he not only studied the world of China which is desperately in need of our concept of the human person but he not only studied it but he came back and he informed the Papacy on what the next steps should be, and I think he ought to be a model to us. So, I thank you Madam Chairman.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Other comments, thoughts? Professor Vymetalík.

BEDŘICH VYMĚTALÍK

For the Pope our decision is very good. I should like to somehow, because if everyone of us comes home and he will be asked what did you make here? So, what will you answer? There are a lot of materials, very good materials but it is necessary to make a short, 2 or 3 pages, a short synthesis. That I feel is very very important and not only to say we discussed about it but to say that we have, what is the Catholic concept of person, what the menaces are in modern time and how to fight against it. I think that is the chief thing, we should be as Academy helpful for the Catholic Social Science, so it could be together with a message for the Pope, there could be some differences but it could be so made. That is my recommendation.

KRZYSZTOF SKUBISZEWSKI

Thank you Madam President. I have asked for the floor before the lunch but in the meantime you have spoken so I can limit myself by saying that I agree with your proposal and particularly I support the suggestion made by Professor Archer. Thank you.

MINA RAMIREZ

I would like to request Professor Archer to be a member of a committee that is doing a second reflection on these papers. It could be another paper, you know, and it was suggested by email you can have this kind of conversation, you know, and then to have that also published in the *Acta*. Then, the other thing is I am very much concerned really about the message of the dignity of the human person from different disciplines. I am thinking of all the schools, Catholic universities, even other universities and (inaudible) human and social development practitioners who are searching for a guide, you know, because I think the concept of the human person brings about not just an assumption on how our work, on which our work could be premised but also approaches to works on human development, education, the approach to people is something that can be premised on the concept of the human person and therefore how to bring about a wider dissemination of these ideas and I don't know whether the PASS would be agreeable that if there are in different countries publishers. I know for example in the Philippines we have a publisher that tries to

reprint with permission, these books that may be useful belonging to the religious congregation. I wonder whether this will be possible.

MARY ANN GLENDON

I know at least one other person has an intervention to make on the subject of publications and I suspect that would be something we would like to take up in the closed session, but let me come back to your first comment and ask Professor Archer whether she would have some interest in trying her hand at another essay, and working with the Council on seeing if we could have a session in the Spring to continue along the lines proposed by Professor Ryan.

MARGARET ARCHER

Yes, I would be delighted to produce some kind of synthesis. Can I just say three things about this? First of all, I know that Professor Malinvaud is going to produce his own synthesis (Prof. Malinvaud interrupts and says, 'for me') for you, yes and I am doing mine for me. This is the main point I want to make, I don't think we should attempt to speak in the name of the Academy. I think we should do our personal bests and sign these essays ourselves because every time we have tried in the past to have a general document the whole process has been a disaster and you end up with such a flat set of banalities that it is not worth having, much better I think, to let, well not a thousand flowers, but many flowers bloom than try to have one bureaucratic object, so, yes I am delighted to try and produce my own synthesis but that is what it will be because there are many disciplines here, particularly law about which I know absolutely nothing. But, I think. I wouldn't dream of speaking for Professor Malinvaud, but my only problem would be the more people who would be willing to offer synthetic essays of this kind the better because it would give us different perspectives, probably from the point of view of different kinds of training. Formation, backgrounds. I don't think we are going to get so many that we will be overwhelmed with what to do with the material. Because the only difficulty I can see with that suggestion is that it does make a bit of a problem about how much time to allocate to the discussion of such essays at the Spring meeting. But maybe you can't have everything.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Professor Llach.

JUAN LLACH

As I said before lunch referring to the possibility of choosing option 3 of the ones proposed by Professor Malinvaud, I am not as sceptical as our colleague Archer regarding common statement or declaration of all of us. I think we have some very recent examples, one is in our last session, our President made a statement that, a substantive statement and I think it was a contribution, I embellished it in Argentina in *Criterio* and then we have the case of the seminar on globalisation and education in which in spite of being people from two different Academies and very different disciplines. Well, there is a declaration that everything is still under study but it is almost written and they are going to receive suggestions for say 15 days or so and they produce the documents so I could not be that sceptical about the possibility of common statement. I don't want to say with all my respect, compete with the Pope, but the Pope gave us here a very short speech but very substantive in content, so I think it is possible.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you. Let me try, for the sake of Professor Malinvaud, to summarise where I think we are. Then I will ask Professor Malinvaud, since he after all was the inspirer and the coordinator of this so fruitful session, how it sounds to him. So, just to summarise, we envision five stages. First, we all revise and correct our papers, let us say by early February. Second, the people who are interested in writing synthetic essays will do so. I know Professor Malinvaud will write an essay that will be the introduction to any publication that we have and I am delighted that Professor Archer is going to do double work here and produce another essay. Anyone else who wants to supplement this volume should feel welcome to do so. So, there will be a period of writing additional essays. Then, third, we come to the 2006 session. I think at this point we just have to leave open just whether and how we might be able to find time in that session. (But I am looking around the room here. Even though this final session is a very important meeting, there are very few people here. I am not going to dwell on it because that would be like the priest who is telling everybody in the Church that they should go to Mass. The message is not going to reach the people who are watching the football game, but nevertheless it is a problem we have to think about. There certainly will have to be some kind of time devoted to personhood at the 2006 meeting.) Then, fourth, I do think everybody agrees that it is important for us to institute a report to the Holy Father, a

short report. I will ask Professor Malinvaud what he thinks about that. Then, the final subject is the question of publication. I think I would suggest that we put that over to our closed meeting where we will have some general discussion on Academy publications. May I ask Professor Malinvaud for his thoughts?

EDMOND MALINVAUD

I can only agree with the clear conclusions you just drew. However, I must frankly say that today I am still far from knowing exactly what will be my synthetic essay or even simply my proposal for the introduction to the *Acta*. At present I suggest that we should think in terms of plurality of texts, each one adapted to its own purpose. I may also ask something very specific: could Margaret write five lines about her proposal, so that we have it in writing?

MARY ANN GLENDON

Just a point of clarification. Are you suggesting that she should try to write that now before the end of this meeting?

EDMOND MALINVAUD

Well, before the end of dinner.

MARY ANN GLENDON

OK, well, is that acceptable to you Margaret?

MARGARET ARCHER

Well, I have my dreams about going shopping, maybe I will dream on.

MARY ANN GLENDON

No shopping for you, no dinner for you, no rest for you Margaret. Let me ask if there are other comments for the general discussion. There will be many things we want to talk about in the closed meeting, but is there anything specifically on the program on the person? Msgr. Schooyans, please.

MICHEL SCHOORYANS

I would like to explain, or to try and understand what has just been said. I think that these are the things, on which I insisted during previous sessions, what I am going to say is the expression of wish which has

not yet been turned into reality. I think there is a problem of communication between us and the Holy Father. There is no communication. I experienced as you probably did as well, spending, ...

MARY ANN GLENDON

Excuse me, I think that you are dealing with the subject matter of our closed session, but we can do that once we have finished the question of the Conceptualization of the Human Person. Does everybody agree? Good.

This is a very serious question and I think it properly belongs in the next session. I think we have gone as far as we can go with our plans for the continuation of our work on the Conceptualization of the Person, except for Margaret, who will have to do a little homework. She is already on the third line. So, I now declare the general discussion closed and I open the Closed Session.

CLOSED SESSION

I hereby open the closed session. Msgr. Schooyans, before we begin with your subject, I have two announcements to make, and one of them concerns you, Msgr. Schooyans. I have in front of me a document dated October 13 2004 telling me that Msgr. Schooyans, our dear Msgr. Schooyans, has been appointed by the Holy Father as *Prelato d'onore di Sua Santità*. (All clap). We are very proud of you, we are very proud that one of our members has been honoured in this way and we think that it just confirms our conviction of the excellent judgement of our new Holy Father.

I have another announcement that I think is not so happy but I have been told that I should make this announcement. Our dear colleague Jerzy Zubrzycki has told me that he has made a firm decision that this will be his last meeting with us as a member of the Academy. Eventually, though, we could have him as an Honorary member once our statutes have been modified following a proposal suggested by Prof. Zacher and approved by the Council. I would just like to reminisce a bit about my first meeting here in 1994. As the first Academicians appointed by the Holy Father, we did not know each other. We had different languages, and different nationalities. And there was this Australian chap with a Polish name who from the very beginning went around and got to know everyone and provided so much good feeling. He spread this good warm feeling wherever he went and he helped us to become the friends that we have been over the years.

I often saw when I was sitting over there next to Judge McNally and Juan Llach and looking across at Jerzy that when we got to a certain point in discussion, his hand would go up and he would make some absolutely stunning point. He has this quality that John Paul II used to have: it always seemed as though those twinkling eyes were looking right at you and so I think we all had this feeling that we were looking at an *esprit voisin*. Jerzy, we have so benefited, so enjoyed having you and Alexandra here with us, you are really a founding member of this Academy and it is largely thanks to you that we have come together as a group that is dedicated both to scholarly excellence and to the kind of friendship that exists among people with similar loves. (All clap).

JERZY ZUBRZYCKI

A simple address, okay, thank you. I have an anathema when it comes to gadgets, I can't even start my TV at home, let alone this more complicated set up. Thank you, thank you, thank you Mary Ann, I too recall our first meeting, this room looked different, it wasn't as well set up as it is now. There were no interpreters, French and English was spoken largely. My French at that time was still non-existent so I relied on someone who sat next to me, I don't remember who. And there were two papers, both dealing with sociology, and the issue I think of inequality. Margaret for the first, followed by Mina and gave a commentary on what was said, that was duly recorded in the proceedings in the *Acta* and I think the point I distinctly made was one to which Mary Ann referred in our correspondence, namely I said something about our preoccupation should be with those intermediate groups that are so important in our society and we returned to that topic some years later. Alexandra, my wife of sixty-two years now, accompanied me to many meetings and this was wonderful for me for we were able to be together. She asked me before I left Canberra a week ago to take with me our visitors book, normally at home, seeking your signatures and your greetings to her when I return, regrettably she couldn't come with me, her health has not been very good, not to speak of financial restraints on a long and expensive travel so please, the book is somewhere there, if you wouldn't mind signing your name, she would be delighted to read them and again associate your names with recollections of great friends and the great time we have had together. Some years ago, we had a short-lived committee, a sub-committee rather of this Academy, which with his typical instinct of what has to be done, Louis Sabourin put together, and I for all my sins was asked to be the Chairman. We met up

on the second landing of the *Domus Sanctae Marthae* planning what later became this Academy's first major conference, major meeting, on developing nations. It went on to be concerned with globalisation and Sabourin asked me to write a forward or a statement about our objective. I wrote that statement, it was published I think in *Acta* 7 from memory, it is titled 'our common humanity' and in that two or three page statement I spelt out the vision of that committee, the committee on developing countries of this Academy, in terms of it being concerned with the moral issue whether people over there, people in abject poverty, people for whom we have to say great things(?), why they really are our friends, why we share with them our common humanity. We in this Council, in this Academy, we are a microcosm of common humanity. My experience is very distinct and very movingly on the second or third meeting when we were accompanied to our usual morning Mass by Kenneth Arrow, and I sat next to him, at the time when we exchanged the sign of peace, Kenneth turned to me and said, Shalom. It was for me a very moving moment (breaks down) I want to acknowledge all of those who gave me their support, Edmond Malinvaud, suffered my interruptions and my constant questions, and letters and so on, and I thank him for that, I thank him for the leadership, his quiet determined leadership. Margaret Archer, we had friends in common and recollection of we both went through at various times as students, graduates, members of staff of the London School of Economics. Nick McNally shared with me and Alexandra many memories of his time in different parts of the world, particularly Africa. I learned a lot about Africa from him and I still do. He and Sarah were able to come and spend some time with us in Canberra last year. Mina Ramirez and Bedřich Vymětalík shared with me many memories of our first early breakfast as *Domus Sanctae Marthae*, we used to be there at 6.40 every morning much to the annoyance of the sister preparing breakfast, we were first, and things were not ready, and she was very annoyed with our taking a few items from other tables to eat when there was nothing on our table. Paulus Zulu became my brother in a very real sense, I learned a lot from him about his family, I regret he is not here today with us, not at this point. Paulus told me a great deal about his family, about his mother, how he buried her as is the custom at the back of his property and how he is trying to cope with the problem of colour, he himself and then now his students. Juan Llach was kind enough to share with me memories and experience of Latin America with his charming wife Magdalena who came to us to Italy to one of the meetings to reacquire her

Italian citizenship. Michel Schooyans in a very real sense was my and Alexandra's spiritual adviser, he was the first to learn of our then forthcoming 60th wedding anniversary, he gave us some sensible, humorous and good advice and I thank him for teaching me so much about my original university topic, namely demography and of course his book about the tragedy of democratic decline in Western countries is still with me as a point of reference. Hanna Suchocka my fellow compatriot and late Ziolkowski were friends and shared a lot being together. The Pope John Paul II had the habit of inviting to his dinner or lunch my colleagues by language groups and I shared that occasion with him and Hanna on two occasions. Last, but not least, Bishop Sánchez who inherited the onerous task of leading this Academy in the administrative sense and in the substantive sense after the not so happy experience of other Chancellors. I thank him and thanks to the staff working with him who make our lives easy, pleasant and are so helpful to us. Simonetta, Alessandra, Aldo, Tullio, Lorenzo, Alessandro the small staff doing so much to help us there in the office at any time, early in the morning and often late at night. So thank you. I am with you and I will pray for you. (All clap).

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you, dear friend, for those words that bring back so many happy memories for all of us. Well, we now turn to the very important subject that Msgr. Schooyans has raised for us: how to improve our communication with the Holy See in general and the Holy Father in particular.

MICHEL SCHOORYANS

It is a question on which I insisted several times I did in previous sessions but I think that the recent election of a new Pope gives us the opportunity to re-examine the best ways to be faithful to one of our vocations, one of the goals of this Academy, of course we have to find a way of dialoguing with, of having a dialogue of having communication with the Pope, maybe we should take some initiatives, we should offer him some services. On reflecting on what Prof. Malinvaud said, the famous five lines to be written by Margaret Archer, I jotted down a few of the subjects which we dealt with recently and which emerged during our discussion. I am going to quote them, Intergenerational relations, Education, Family, Family Policy, Globalisation, the Ageing of Society, Migrations and so on. If I could just suggest three or four lines to the Holy Father, these are more or less the subjects we have dealt with and on which we could submit a

sort of memo for reflections, maybe one or two pages maximum because I remember, Madam President if I am too long you will cut me short, but I remember some working sessions with John Paul II, I remember the first session of this working group I was very proud of my text which was fifteen pages long and on the eve of this meeting with the Pope I said to myself, it is too long, it is far too long, I'll never be able to read it out and therefore I summarised the whole in half a page and it was the half page which was taken as a sort of discussion basis and later on if the Pope was to look at other documents of course he will have the possibility to do that, but we should evoke his attention, the Pope cannot know everything, since he is a very important theologian he is also an excellent moralist but he can't know everything, the same goes for us, and therefore we should help him, and the same way we have to listen to him and we have to ask him what are the problems on which the Pope thinks we could be helpful, you just suggest something very important, it is not only the Holy Father, it is also a question of our relations with other congregations, since we are in a closed session I can be candid and I am rather surprised of the scanty participation of the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace because they could take advantage of our work for the catholic upbringing, we just talked about the spreading of our concept and it is rather peculiar that there is no curiosity even though the Pontifical Council for the Family is missing here. We have just a few examples that I can think of and two members of the Academy, the President and Msgr. Sánchez was always present, either one or both of you could maybe favour this contact with close collaborators of His Holiness. In this sense, I think yesterday the visit of the Holy Father was extremely important because Msgr. Sánchez managed to convene about twenty cardinals and bishops around the Pope and who probably discovered a new dimension in our Academy, a dimension they probably haven't even heard of. I think that this should be cultivated, it should be really cultivated and prolonged, and maybe this is the time to do it. And there is a dual reason because we have a new Pope and we have this very important visit which was the Holy Father's visit to us yesterday. This is my suggestion and I know it is not easy because sometimes the Roman departments are rather closed and self-contained but we might try.

MARY ANN GLENDON

These are very important and useful suggestions. I should report to the group that when the Holy Father visited here he indicated that he would be receptive to a letter from us. Let me just say what he said.-, He

said he would be receptive to a letter from us informing him about our projects and asking for his guidance. So this is encouraging, and I completely agree with your idea that we have to take the initiative and that in combination with that letter we should send reports from time to time. I also agree that these communications ought to be short. At home in the US there is a sort of rule of thumb, two pages for a bishop, one page for a Cardinal. Did you want to intervene again, Monsignor?

MICHEL SCHOONYANS

Following up to what we have seen these days we had around us bishops and during one of our morning celebrations there was Msgr. Foley, who is the person responsible for communications and I wonder whether it wouldn't be interesting to try and establish a more privileged contact with him in order to spread through internet the information about what we are doing, I follow your recommendation, Madam President I sometimes talk about the Academy and talk about all the publications and I am always told either to have never seen that and people are astonished when they see what we have published but now everyone works through internet everything is to be found on internet. The talk of dissemination of this information, I don't know whether Msgr. Foley is competent for that, is responsible for that, I don't know but it would be useful to get into closer contact with him.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Regarding our communications and the general subject of diffusion of our work, we have received a small grant from a private foundation to enable us to have public relations for the Spring 2006 meeting and Archbishop Foley is very happy to help us with that. Before I turn the microphone over to Prof. Schambeck, just let me say that the topic before us is improving communications, but let's not forget that we have big subjects to discuss, one is the 2006 meeting, the other is the subject of ideas for future meetings, and then any new business. So let's keep in mind that we have many subjects to cover.

HERBERT SCHAMBECK

Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is wonderful how comprehensive our talks are in the closed session but it is regrettable that under our high member numbers we are only a handful, we are not really representative sitting in this room today if you think how many of us

were in this room for the Plenary so I do want to mention this. Secondly, it is a very positive thing to have had this contact with the Holy Father and the idea of the PASS was mentioned by the Holy Father two years before it was founded and he has followed our activities without ever having been invited to actually take part in the events, but Card. Ratzinger could have made a presentation so, well in these last years regardless of his, the numerous pieces of literature I think yesterday this was a historical event and I think we were all aware of this. The third point I wish to raise is there are opportunities where we in the Pontifical Council should have debates, since Paul VI, every year there is the Pontifical World Peace Day. I was invited by the Secretary of State to write some comments. At that time the Academy did not exist yet and Nunzio Squicciarini who belongs to Council and he issued some comments and it could be valuable we are now in the month of November and once we return home and we were to know what topic the next World Peace Day sets for itself and I could find out through the Nunciature. The Pontifical World Peace Day is important for the Holy See and for all of us, and in those 10 years when I had the honour of belonging to the Council I frequently mentioned that a Council catechism is being prepared. I asked in the Council why the Pontifical Council for Social Sciences does not have any contact in the preparation for this catechism. Then now only after social catechism has been published, it would be useful if in this Pontifical Council we were also to be concerned with the social catechism. In my paper, in that passage where it was necessary I referred to social catechism, but if you reflect on the range of topics that we have covered in view of this great social catechism, and that Justice and Peace which is chaired by Cardinal Martino and H.E. Crepaldi, that we had actually no participation in that social catechism, it is regrettable and this social catechism is of great importance for the social teachings of the Church. I would like to have an answer to this, because in the ten years of my membership here I have raised this point many a time.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Well, fortunately, here is a question we can answer. We have had enquiries from Justice and Peace about the possibility of having part of our 2006 meeting devoted to precisely the subject of the Compendium of Social Doctrine. In fact, one of the next items on our agenda is the 2006 meeting and we will certainly organise something at that time with the

collaboration of Justice and Peace. As for the history, the history is the history but, starting from now, we certainly will have a joint project underway. Now, Judge McNally wished to be recognised.

NICHOLAS McNALLY

Thank you, Madam Chairman, very briefly, Jerzy Zubrzycki started us on the line of reminiscence and I recall that I have been for 11 years something of a dissident in this organisation. I have not yet moved on to the next step which is terrorism but be warned. I have been reflecting about our future meetings, I don't know if this is the right point but I won't be very long. Anyway, I don't want anything I say to be taken as suggesting that I don't think we have had a marvellous meeting this time, I think it was a good subject, I think we covered it adequately but looking at all the other subjects we have dealt with over the years, I can't help thinking that we are putting a modern meaning on the old phrase, 'fiddling while Rome burns' because the Church is in many ways in crisis particularly in Western Europe and we are playing around with global ideas making our contributions to questions which really are covered in many other fora at which the Catholic point of view is, I should think inevitably reflected to some extent. And I just have the feeling that we should be thinking about the Church's problems and not about the world's problems. I am not sure that we are an appropriate body really to talk about the world's problems. And so I think the next meeting we are having is probably getting closer to what I am thinking about, the question of youth. But I just want to put that perspective on the thoughts that we have for the future, that the Church has faced many problems and I think this group is eminently suitable for discussing those problems and I am not sure we are eminently suitable to discussing work and labour and education and all the other things we talked about so I would like to suggest we try and lay some stress in the future on the difficulties facing the Church and the answers to those difficulties. Thank you.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Thank you. I think that comment is the perfect transition to the subject of the spring meeting and future meetings. And as to the points that Judge McNally raises, I am guessing that they are points that are very close to the heart of our new Pope because before he became Pope he wrote so urgently about the Church in crisis, particularly in Europe. I suggest we now move to the next item on the Agenda, namely the pro-

gram for the 2006 meeting as it was developed by Professor Donati, who has been a wonderful organizer. Professor Ryan has helped Professor Donati turn this program on Intergenerational Solidarity with Youth into a program that will do just what Professor Malinvaud said we ought to do in all of our papers, that is: to set forth things as they are, and then to get to the question of how can we shift the probabilities in a better direction, and in particular, how the Church can be helped to shift the probabilities in this area. I don't know if you all have a copy of the program. If not, I will just briefly describe the format which will begin with a speech by Cardinal Lopez Trujillo, a step toward improving our collaboration with the Council for the Family. He will be followed by our colleague Kenneth Arrow. Ken had written me last year that he thought that he might want to resign from the Academy, but he agreed to take 6 months to think about it. Then, when I told him about this program we were planning for 2006, he decided not to resign, because of his intense interest in the subject of children and the future. So we have very strong opening. I won't go over the program in detail because you can read it, but I do want to mention one innovation which I think will greatly strengthen this kind of program. Pierpaolo prepared for each of the regional reporters a set of guidelines so that all of the papers will be structured in a similar way. The reports on Latin America, Africa, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, North America, all will touch certain key points and those points will not only be descriptive but, thanks to the help from Professor Ryan, they will move into the question of 'what do we do in each of these parts of the world given where things stand now'. Archbishop Diarmuid Martin, our old friend, will come back for a speech on implications for the social teaching of the Church; Msgr. Schooyans is going to speak on implications for the role of the Church in Catholic organisations worldwide. That is my report, and I am happy to answer any questions that people might have about our next meeting. Our next meeting will also include half a day or perhaps one session devoted to the Compendium on Social Doctrine. Thus we will have collaboration with the Council on the Family and collaboration with the Council for Justice and Peace, and I think that among the Cardinals who were here yesterday, there are many who would like to be involved where appropriate with our Academy. Another innovation for this spring is that we are going to ask Archbishop Rylko of the Council for the Laity to locate and send us one young person from each continent to be an observer and to give his or her perspective on the regional reports. So, we are very excit-

ed about this. As mentioned, we will have a little budget for public relations and that will be an experiment. Thanks to Prof. Donati, things seem to be under control. That is how things stand at the moment. I Are there questions?

JUAN LLACH

Only one question, Mary Ann, I am afraid this is a wrong question or otherwise, but my concern is about education. I don't remember exactly what Donati wrote in the guidelines, but if it is not too late, perhaps it is late, I was wondering if he put enough emphasis on education because, I mean, speaking about the youth, we need to emphasize their education.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Professor Ryan can answer your question.

KEVIN RYAN

I am not sure I heard the question exactly but in conversation with Prof. Donati, he seemed very open to recasting and perhaps giving a greater place to the role of transmission of the faith, the education of the young Catholic, very much to the concepts we have been talking about and very much in the spirit of what Nick McNally was referring to, what specific things are being done that represent good practice in the transmission of the faith and what ought to be some suggestions for the Church's agenda going forward. I am not sure whether I am responding to your questions, Professor Llach.

JUAN LLACH

I would say it is part of the answer. I am a bit afraid, particularly regarding the regional reports, you know, normally when you have time until February or March to do your final version perhaps you still have time to suggest to the author to include something more explicit about education, to not speak about education when we are dealing with inter-generational solidarity I think would be a mistake, wouldn't it?

MARY ANN GLENDON

I do not have the guidelines in front of me but my recollection is that the guidelines are quite detailed and I would be astonished if they did not have an entry for education. What Prof. Ryan added to the guidelines was the specific issue of education in the faith, formation in the faith. But

what is being requested includes education in general, all kinds of demographic information, including information about education and health. Since you have raised the question, I will check with Donati to be 100 per cent sure, but I would be astonished if it were not already in there. Do you have any other questions about the 2006 program?

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

I am sorry, but it would be useful to know what would be the work of Prof. Ryan in the preparation of the next meeting, because I understood that the organisers are you, President, and Prof. Donati.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Now, I would never want to contradict a Chancellor but I am looking at the program for North America and here I see, speaker Prof. Kevin Ryan.

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

Yes, President I know that he is in the program as a speaker, but does he also have a part in the organisation?

MARY ANN GLENDON

Prof. Ryan has been informally advising Prof. Donati, but I see you are talking about the constitution of the Intergenerational Solidarity committee. Well, I don't think we have formally settled that, but we can do so, the Council can do so.

Let me now turn to the more complicated questions concerning 2007, which will be here before we know it, and 2008. I would like to tell you about some of the suggestions I received from various members of the Academy. I want to thank all of you who wrote to me with suggestions. I always ask for suggestions and I think this time there were about 7 or 8 people who did write me. Prof. Skubiszewski was one of them and I am grateful for his note. Many of the suggestions had one theme in common, and that was that, since we have now completed a program devoted to the person, it might be useful to follow the categories of Catholic Social thought organised by the notion of subsidiarity and to move from the person in November to the situation of young people in the family and in the world in April and May, and then for 2007 to take up the family as such. Many people were very interested in looking at the family in the context of subsidiarity and we had a long talk on this subject in the Council meeting with the globalisation committee because the globalisa-

tion people, and Juan Llach can speak about this, are very eager to move forward. They felt that this topic, subsidiarity and the family, might provide an excellent framework for a next stage of their work, very much in keeping with the themes that Msgr. Schooyans has developed in his writing on the role of international organisations and the role of the Catholic Church in the world (the way in which it sometimes violates the principle of subsidiarity and the way in which it could potentially reinforce the principle of subsidiarity). That was about as far as the Council got in its meetings this week and that is the principal idea that the Council wants to put forward to the members at this time, so I will ask for comments on that. While you are thinking about this subject, I recognize Prof. Malinvaud and Prof. Llach.

EDMOND MALINVAUD

I am wondering who will be writing a note on the definition of this program for 2007.

MARY ANN GLENDON

We do have a short document, drafted very quickly for the Council on the place of the family in a subsidiarity framework, the EU, the State and the Family, the Church and the Family. This short document could be edited and circulated. I would edit it and add some items that came up in discussion. I have made some supplementary notes, particularly about globalisation, so I was wondering whether Prof. Llach had a comment.

JUAN LLACH

It seems evident that regarding globalisation there is first of all a problem (a), and the problem is that we never came to a synthesis of all the meetings we had on that issue so I think the first obligation of the committee on globalisation should be to complete their homework. I think we need to find a way, I made it myself, I contribute to that but I think we have to make a decision about tuis. It is very necessary to have some sort of synthesis of what we have done up to now. The second point (b) is the following. I think that if the issue to be dealt with is subsidiarity it is very relevant to introduce things that have to do with global issues, the ones you mention because we are living a big confusion about the roles of world organisations, regional blocks or unions, free trade areas, nations, states or provinces, the family, NGOs etc, so I think it is a good framework that of subsidiarity to consider, to try to put some

order about what we know and which are the ideas nowadays under discussion regarding how to deal with the roles of the different organisations. And I would say particularly, with a special emphasis on the poor people, why I say this of the poor people because the reality of families in a lot of countries is that one of the main reasons of their estrangement and eventually their destruction is poverty. It is really very difficult to talk about a family in conditions of extreme poverty, so I should say that the issue of poverty should be there not only to refer to the globalisation and its relation to poverty but also if, third point (c), we include as in the next meeting, or at the next session, regional reports about what is going on really with subsidiarity in different parts of the world, which we know with the family and the civil society in different parts of the world, I think we can enrich the conceptual analysis of the subsidiarity, if we consider it together with the solidarity to the poor, the families, the excluded within a regional analysis which includes the role of the various international organisations. So those are my three points.

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

I have the feeling that since we want to begin this dialogue with the Holy Father, suggested among others by Prof. Msgr. Shooyans, maybe it would be premature to decide on a subject when it is not yet ripe enough. I think we have to mature a sort of subject to be chosen along the line of themes that this Pope emphasizes, and in this sense, rather than submitting just one clearly determined topic, it would be better to ask the Pope to suggest directly a topic or maybe to offer Him a choice of 2 or 3 topics so that He could show his preference for one rather than the other. I think that Professor Archer suggested this procedure during the Council of 17th November. She suggested that, to involve the Holy Father, it could be desirable to submit 2 or 3 subjects, which might be of His interest and so it would be easier then for the Holy Father to choose one from among three.

EDMOND MALINVAUD

I am bit uncomfortable when we discuss among us how to approach the Holy Father in order to obtain guide-lines about our forthcoming programs. It seems to me that we underestimate the difficulties of communication. On our side, in particular we operate under important constraints, among which the limits of our disciplines and of our competence, especially when we are faced with the challenge to articulate the reasons for our own choices or to formulate conclusions. We have

enough information and enough sense to perceive what are the main concerns of the Church and the Holy father. But it belongs to us to find what we, as the Academy, can usefully do year after year. Thus, an open request to the Pope would not justice to the true difficulties. Moreover, any request to His Holiness ought to be seriously argued in writing.

MARY ANN GLENDON

I am not a hundred percent sure that I understood. You would say that rather than giving the Holy Father a menu of 2 or 3 items, you would frame the letter in such a way as to, ...

EDMOND MALINVAUD

Well, I thought a proposal had been made for asking the Holy Father what His preferences were concerning the future programs of the Academy, even before we offer Him a choice between 2 or 3 subjects for the year 2007. Now, if that particular proposal does not belong to the subjects of the present discussion, then what I said is not relevant.

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

To what Prof. Malinvaud said, I would add that we could do one of two things, we could ask the Holy Father what he would like, if he does not answer, we could write a second letter saying that we had three topics that had been thought out and this is why we had chosen this, this and this subject and which would you prefer? So, to enter into a real dialogue, well let me tell you that we would send a first letter that the President mentioned and now we have to decide on a subject and we would be extremely happy if he could suggest that topic. If he doesn't answer and clearly we understand that he is extremely busy, we would send a second letter saying that we have come up with these three subjects, and we have our motivations why we have come up with these three subjects since we have also dealt with them in the past and maybe he be inclined to choose one of those three with the due corrections he may wish to add.

JOSÉ RAGA

This compatibility of two ways brings me to the configuration of a sort of half pregnancy, in which, the results are always bad. What I want to say is that it is not easy to make compatible the two ways mentioned.

Why? Because if we ask him and he does not answer, the minimum interpretation is that the Pope has no interest for what the Academy is doing and then we go on our own way. This is a real risky way, then I would go straight to propose what the Academy is looking for at this moment, as the main topics that are concerning society, that would be 3, 4, or 5 whatever it is and then just presenting to the Holy Father, saying due to the fact that the only reason of the existence of the Academy is to offer some way of thinking and some results from different research, with some materials, etc. These topics we are looking at are of interest to society leaving open the list to any other the Holy Father can consider more interesting than these ones. Then he can select one of the 2,3,4,5 that were submitted or reject all of them; or alternatively, take the option of not reject anyone but add a new one that might be of the highest significance for him.

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

When in dialogue with the Holy Father, you write him a letter and if he does not answer, everybody knows that is because he is very busy and not obliged to correspond. Nobody must interpret His not answering as a lack of interest. In this dialogue it is very common to send a second letter, even if He does not answer the first. In our case we can send a second letter with some proposals in order to go on with this dialogue, if He does not answer to a first letter asking for suggestions. Obviously, it has to be well done, so that the two letters do not contradict each other. On the other hand, it could happen that He answers the first letter directly or indirectly through a collaborator, like he did when coming recently here. I wrote a letter inviting him and everybody was convinced he wouldn't come and he answered me through a collaborator and did come. So it could be that by sending a letter he might suggest a subject. If he does not answer (which I think he will not do because I think he will send an answer through his secretary) then later on, we could suggest we have these two or more topics. This little complicated procedure merely shows our interest in really entering into a dialogue with him. I mean, it does not display any lack of respect from us towards Him or from the Pope towards us. It is a simple problem of proportion in the relation of collaboration and friendship between the Pope and his Academy, especially at the beginning of this relationship. Also in practice, this is the normal way to proceed.

HERBERT SCHAMBECK

President, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you look at the speeches of Benedict XVI since he became Pope and that he held at the College of Cardinals and that lecture that was greatly published that he held at Subiaco, I think we can obtain numerous ideas from those speeches and a lot of our intended work can be inspired by them. I would like to refer to a concept that Mary Ann Glendon mentioned yesterday and which was fully in compliance with what Holy Father Benedict mentioned in one of his talks about relativism, Pope Benedict XVI's talk of the dictate of relativism and recently I have been approached by a number of laity and clergy as to study relativism more closely, in *L'Osservatore Romano* we see there is a publication of Card. Ratzinger's talks and of the speeches he made as Cardinal and there you can see the true source of inspiration as to how we should go about enhancing our dialogue with him. I think in agreement with Msgr. Schooyans, we should take up the subject. I am now on the third round of the Pontifical Council for the Family and in conclusion what Professor Llach said based on the experience of Latin America, I think poverty has a great role to play with regard to the life of the family and the Pontifical Council for the Family and in the publication *Familia et Vita* we can see that a third of marriages end up in divorce and also people who are prosperous are divorced, it is not so much poverty but a certain saturation. I met a man who was invited to an event, there were five couples, he was the only couple that was not divorced and obviously the situation varies very much from country to country but if we look at marriage as in India, there is no social security to the extent we have it, social security is the family and in India I think the family is far more protected than here. I think 3 generations that lived in the same apartment in India and obviously this varies from country to country, there is modern poverty but there is a great danger for those families who are not in a prosperous situation.

MARGARET ARCHER

This is very interesting and something is, I think becoming clear to me that had not before now. Previously, until this particular meeting we have always thought in terms of themes that would last over several Plenary Sessions, three coming to a conclusion at the end of it, and then we have this innovation on the concept of the person and so far I have not heard anyone suggest that we devote a second session to that. I can see reasons for that and reasons against it, that is not what I am saying

this for at the moment, let us just suppose we only have this one session on the concept of the person, it would still have been a very very good session with a very very good output and that made me think, I do like this idea of presenting Pope Benedict with some kind of menu so that we get some kind of feedback. I think we will get that feedback, but what Prof. Schambeck has just said now, I think we can combine with this, because one of the ideas I came to this meeting with, you know trying to think of possibilities ahead was that we could have another of these one off meetings like the one we have just had. One in which we examine *Fides et Ratio* in relation to our different disciplines. Now I am not in any sense married to this idea it was just something to bring with me, I could equally be happy with your idea Professor Schambeck of adding relativism to the menu, because I think this is another one we could do in one year, it would be very easy to do, the relationship between relativistic strands of thinking within our plurality of disciplines and to present a very clear statement about how far it has gone, what the defects of it are, how it effectively, not just marginalises but ephemeralises real problems and turns them into matters of discourse. Again I don't see this is something that would go on for two or three years, it would be a one off production. I think it would be very interesting but it then becomes, if anybody agrees with me, it then becomes a rather difficult logistical problem of planning ahead, 2007, 2008, 2009. I think I would need a piece of paper, or a blackboard, or a computer or something to envisage this, but none of that logistical problem would prevent us from simply adding that to the list of suggestions for topics that we could examine.

MARY ANN GLENDON

What I am getting out of this discussion is that there is one option that nobody favours and that is that we write a letter to the Pope describing only one topic, so then the question comes down to whether we like a two-letter strategy or a one-letter strategy. The two-letter strategy would involve asking the Pope for suggestions and waiting to see what happens and then following up. The Chancellor and I discussed this question of how best to approach the Pope with Cardinal Law who suggested it is probably not a good idea just to send the Pope a letter asking for his suggestions, describing what we do and asking for his suggestions. But I am wondering if we couldn't combine the two strategies in a single letter where we remind him a little bit about ourselves, what we have done, what we are commissioned to do. We ask for his guidance, we

say that we are very eager to have his guidance, and then we say what are the kinds of things we are thinking about. I think that would give him the maximum number of options to react to. And if we describe it as a program for the next several years, we could mention that the subsidiarity topic is one that we are ready to go forward on. Regarding *Fides et Ratio*, I love the idea. I also love the relativism idea which we have already discussed before in Council. Those topics would require finding somebody who was willing to be a coordinator and a lot more planning than we could get together in the next couple of weeks, but I think it would be perfectly alright to mention a range of topics. He is not going to give us an outline, he is just going to give us an expression of what he finds more interesting. Does that make sense?

MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO

Of course it does make sense, but I would say that since the Pope has paid us a great honour by coming here demonstrating his real interest to the Academy. And you, President, had the opportunity of talking to him. I noted that you had a real, a real short but a real dialogue with the Pope. Consequently, a new possibility opens up. I observed that the Pope was really impressed by the interest shown by you and the Academy, through you, in following His orientations. The gospel of today says, on the other hand, 'ask, ask and you will be given'; well let's try asking and we will see what happens and later we can make a second attempt.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Well I certainly defer to the wisdom and experience of our Chancellor in these matters.

JUAN LLACH

I think Mary Ann really that it would be better just to write a very open letter, an open letter, very open, because of the visit and the approach with the Academy, you can say we are considering a,b,c,d and in one way you are conditioning him, I think it would be better, of course the risk is there, Vatican times you know because I suppose you, we don't have an answer for 3 or 6 months what is going to happen and that is the problem, right? But being the Pope I think that it would be good to begin with a very very quick letter the next week I would say, just in order to fight against the Vatican times.

MARY ANN GLENDON

Well, if that is the pleasure of the group? That is what we will do. Judge McNally.

NICHOLAS McNALLY

I am really a bit worried about this, if I were Pope I would say, hell, I pay these guys to come up with ideas and they are coming to me and asking me to come up with ideas. I can't put it more simply than that.

MARY ANN GLENDON

I think the lawyers are in the minority on this! Well, the lawyers and one sociologist in any event. Well, I don't know that we will get any further. Here, this is what I propose, I will draft a letter and send it to Bishop Sánchez and he will hold in his hand the power to issue or not the *nihil obstat* and the imprimatur and he will have the final judgement on the content of the letter. As he knows the Vatican better than the rest of us, I think he will show us the wise and correct way to proceed. I do though have to say one more thing about the program because it takes more than a year to put a good program together, as everybody who has ever organised a conference knows. Are you leaving us, comrade Llach? Well, thank you very much for everything. Thank you for everything, Professor Raga. I think maybe we'll just have to wind up our proceedings, but I must say this as far as the 2007 program is concerned: we can't wait until April 2006 to begin planning it. The globalisation committee really are at a point where they must start coordinating and bringing some kind of direction and conclusions into their work. So, the Chancellor and I will have to work to try to come to some kind of resolution before our spring meeting. There were two hands up here, Professor Ryan.

KEVIN RYAN

Well, I would just like to speak to the Chancellor after to find out why I am not getting paid and Judge McNally is getting paid by the Pope for these meetings, but the question I have is really about inter agency inter Vatican Councils and Academy communication, and perhaps it is too big a subject for now, perhaps you can inform me during the coffee hour.

MARY ANN GLENDON

To finish up and conclude this session, the only other item I have on the Agenda is the question of publications and I know that people have

had some dissatisfaction with the dissemination of our work. I want to assure those who have had concerns in that area that I have noted them and I have specifically noted the question of contact with *Sapientia* press. We will make every effort to constantly improve in this area. I think Prof. Malinvaud wanted to intervene, no? There are of course many things we could discuss but I think we are below a quorum now, I don't see how we can really take any major decision with so few of us here. I will say that I intend to write a letter to all the members of the Academy stressing the importance of attending all of the sessions. This is not the time to go to confession, but all of us at various times in the past 11 years, have been absent on occasion, sometimes for a good reason and sometimes for not so good reasons. But it is really an 'unsolidary' thing to do – to come all the way to Rome at the expense of a Church that (contrary to common belief) does not have great wealth. We come here to work, it is our gift to the Church. If you all approve, and even if you don't approve, I will write a rather strong letter to all of our members reminding them that we have responsibilities in the realm of solidarity. Now, everybody is getting impatient to have the coffee, but there is one other thing that we must do and that is to thank the wonderful patient interpreters who have been here from morning until night. Thank you very much. Since there are so few of us, I will leave it up to each of you to personally thank our wonderful staff. This meeting is adjourned.

I am particularly pleased that the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences has chosen 'the concept of the person in social sciences' as the subject to be examined this year. The human person is at the heart of the whole social order and consequently at the very centre of your field of study. In the words of Saint Thomas Aquinas, the human person 'signifies what is most perfect in nature' (*S.Th.*, I, 29, 3). Human beings are part of nature and, yet, as free subjects who have moral and spiritual values, they transcend nature. This anthropological reality is an integral part of Christian thought, and responds directly to the attempts to abolish the boundary between human sciences and natural sciences, often proposed in contemporary society.

Understood correctly, this reality offers a profound answer to the questions posed today concerning the status of the human being. This is a theme which must continue to be part of the dialogue with science. The Church's teaching is based on the fact that God created man and woman in his own image and likeness and granted them a superior dignity and a shared mission towards the whole of creation (cf. *Gen 1* and *2*).

... It is providential that we are discussing the subject of the person as we pay particular honour to my venerable predecessor, Pope John Paul II. In a way, his undisputed contribution to Christian thought can be understood as a profound meditation on the person. He enriched and expanded the concept in his Encyclicals and other writings. These texts represent a patrimony to be received, collected and assimilated with care, particularly by the Pontifical Academies.

Benedict XVI, *Address to the Members of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences*, 21 November 2005.