

GENERAL DISCUSSION

DR. JUAN GRABOIS: Como estamos terminando, quería hacer una reflexión, una autocrítica colectiva y principalmente a mi mismo, que probablemente haya tenido la responsabilidad de exponer el tema, al principio, y no lo haya hecho de manera del todo correcta. Por qué digo esto? Porque creo, y es mi sensación, de que nos pasa lo que suele suceder y que es una de las causas de los problemas que tenemos, que vamos de arriba para abajo y no nos detuvimos lo suficientemente a analizar y a pensar y a ver la situación, las luchas, los padecimientos reales y concretos de los compañeros excluidos. No hemos tenido tiempo para ver, por ejemplo, las distintas categorías de actividad que se desarrollan en todos los países del mundo, porque no es verdad que los compañeros son desocupados, todos trabajan de algo porque nadie le regala el pan. O trabajan juntando la basura en la calle, o vendiendo cosas en la calle, o trabajan en un taller clandestino, en algún lado trabajan, y no hemos podido analizar con precisión las características de este trabajo. Tampoco hemos podido analizar con precisión las características de la vida en las villas miseria/asentamientos informales. Quedará para otra ocasión ver en profundidad esto, pero la reflexión iba por este lado: la tendencia hegemónica del pensamiento en los últimos años, sobre todo el pensamiento social, es la de tratar de ofrecer recetas e inventar soluciones sin tener un oído en el pueblo, ni en sus luchas reales, ni en su realidad cotidiana. Yo coincido con lo que dijo alguno antes que yo de que acá no va a haber ninguna solución técnica y creo que el mensaje de Francisco hay que leerlo bien y hay que leerlo entero, porque la radicalidad del mensaje no es simplemente una cuestión de distribución del ingreso. Cuando se habla de distribución del ingreso, generalmente se olvida uno de hablar de distribución de la riqueza, que no es lo mismo, porque el ingreso un poquito se distribuye pero la riqueza consolidada no se distribuye nunca. La radicalidad del mensaje de Francisco, en mi opinión, y creo que lo dice con bastante claridad, tiene que ver con un cuestionamiento de la esencia del sistema capitalista en su fase actual y la construcción de paradigmas alternativos. No nos tenemos que asustar con esto que hace la CNN o los sectores concentrados del poder norteamericano de decir que es un Marxista, que es lo que sea... La construcción de un sistema alternativo es una obligación y una deuda que tenemos. Probablemente gran parte de este sistema alternativo ya esté de manera latente entre los sectores populares, que en su lucha cotidiana van construyendo nuevas relaciones de solidaridad y que, muchas veces, desde las superestructuras y los organismos internacionales no se ven.

Yo quiero agregar una última cosita a esto. Creo, cuando Francisco habla de corrupción, que se refiere a un fenómeno mucho más amplio que es la situación de los gobernantes recibiendo una coima, un soborno, de las grandes empresas o de algún sector que se quiere enriquecer a partir de los servicios públicos. Esto existe y es gravísimo y muy doloroso, porque deberían ser los que velan por el bien común. Coincido con João Pedro Stédile que ésta es una característica estructural del capitalismo hoy. Necesitan gobiernos débiles para poder hacer negocios, pero la corrupción no se limita a los gobiernos y de hecho, a veces, se utiliza ese argumento, como me parece que más o menos dijo Prodi, para tratar de deslegitimar el rol del estado en la distribución de servicios públicos. Claro, como la salud pública es corrupta, privaticémosla; claro, como las aerolíneas de bandera son corruptas, privaticémoslas. La corrupción es un elemento fundamental de las empresas que hoy funcionan, en el mundo de las grandes empresas, y la situación de la evasión impositiva, están todos los recursos informáticos, todos los recursos tecnológicos para hacerlo. Obviamente los gobiernos no lo hacen porque efectivamente van a perder su trabajo, si lo hacen, porque el poder real no está hoy en los gobiernos. Lo último, un poco para terminar, es reafirmar esto: leamos entero el mensaje de Francisco, leamos cuando él cita Crisóstomo y dice que no compartir los bienes es robar de los pobres porque los bienes no son nuestros, son de todos. Hay que entender esa radicalidad porque sino, como decía Bolívar – yo soy un latinoamericano, bolivariano, creo en la unidad y en la patria grande – estamos arando en el mar.

MSGR. MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO: Bisognerebbe anche approfondire la soluzione, alla quale più o meno – peccato che non tutti hanno potuto leggere il tuo testo – ha accennato anche João Pedro Stédile, questa rivoluzione di far gestire il potere al popolo, questo è l'ideale ma il problema è come si fa! Naturalmente tutti vogliono questo e poi chi è il popolo, non è solo il popolo degli esclusi, perché qui non possiamo identificare il popolo con gli esclusi, il popolo sono tutti e quindi questo mi sembra che bisogna approfondire un po' di più, perché effettivamente questa crisi di disuguaglianza sta portando via il capitalismo. Il capitalismo si mette in seria crisi con questo, anzi questo tipo di capitalismo della disuguaglianza sta mettendo a repentaglio la democrazia. Forse il Professor Prodi ci può dire qualcosa dalla sua esperienza.

PROF. ROMANO PRODI: Negli studi che si hanno, anche se sono studi non sicuri al 100%, di solito l'aumento delle disuguaglianze precede crisi ancora più forti, perché fa mancare il potere d'acquisto, accumula il capitale in coloro che non acquistano e quindi uno potrebbe anche essere tentato

di dire che solo una crisi profonda ci porterà a riflettere su quello che sta avvenendo. Mi sembra, però, che la crisi l'abbiamo già avuta, di grandi riflessioni non ne abbiamo avute, di altro la scienza economica non è che possa aggiungere molto, insomma. Ripeto, il problema è un problema politico e, pur essendo fanaticamente democratico, vedo i limiti della democrazia di oggi e la necessità di correggerla, perché altrimenti rimedi noi non ne riusciamo ad avere, perché il rimedio di scavalcare la democrazia perché non ci dà una risposta è peggiore di qualsiasi male che noi possiamo immaginare.

PROF. MARYANNE WOLF: I think part of the issue, and I'm going to speak from a micro level, is that we are all speaking about the poor, the destitute, the excluded and I'd rather think that one of the things that one could do is transform the entire discussion and say "all work is the release of human potential". In essence, what I'm saying is that some of our emphases have always been on the negative, instead of the absolute positive that every human being possesses and I think that's inherent in Pope Francis' message, but I actually think, and I'm going back to you, Juan, when you were talking of the multinationals, there's a yearning everywhere, if you look at advertising companies around the world – there's one by Havas – what is their new marketing but how can a corporation get a higher mark on the index of doing good. How can we, in essence, capitalise on that ourselves by really talking about not helping but, in fact, rendering for all of us the potential that exists in every human child. And I will end by saying that, at the very beginning of life, there is such potential that we could release. I don't know what I can do personally, at a state level, but I know there is enormous potential among so many people at doing good for our youth from the very start. I would just end by saying it's my hope that one message here is that we are releasing the human potential of our children for us all.

CARDINAL PETER TURKSON: I suppose I'd like to tag in on that and encourage all who have participated in this way by just observing that what has transpired over here is an attempt to share the message and to diffuse the message that one of the solutions or ways of dealing with the socially excluded is to learn to invest in this human capital. Investment in human capital probably provides one of the best solutions to dealing with this phenomenon of exclusion. I draw attention to this because in 2010 I had the chance of leading the Holy See delegation to the United Nations to discuss the Millennium Development Goals and a lot of the positions that were presented in that connection, especially with a view to realizing the goals, bordered also on controlling population, or became a demographic issue in

the sense that they generated a lot of interest and discussion about birth control policies and anti-natality tendencies and policies as a way of dealing with this, so at a certain point we had to observe that dealing with the excluded and the poor is not by eliminating them but is rather by finding ways of investing in this human capital so you can transform and turn them into profitable use within society.

That's one observation. The other is about inequality. In our discussions we probably would also want to recognise the fact that inequality is not quite the same as diversity and sometimes we need to recognise certain forms of diversity which should not be equated with inequality. Differences and diversities do exist, and whether they are signals of inequality in the sense of all of them not making the same salary, all of them not living the same lifestyle, all of them not having access to the same, we need to, at a certain point, try to make that a distinction. As for the thing about the discussion, I don't want to get into politics with the politicians sitting behind me for fear that I'll get a knock on my head, but it is something that our own dicastery is seriously looking at. The occasion of the celebration, this year, of the 50th anniversary of *Pacem in Terris*, is driving us to look seriously at the issue of politics and indeed to see whether we cannot help our society deal with and reflect on the issue of politics by attempting to provide a small *vademecum*. It's an issue that we want to constitute readily, a kind of a small seminal workbook to discuss, because it appears to be the experience of several communities that they have become a little bit disenchanted with politics and political affairs. If politics cannot succeed in formulating the people towards a goal and a vision, then there are a lot of things that probably are missing and that merit a lot of questioning.

The thing about meritocracy, I would think that a society needs merit and needs to be able to reward merit, otherwise also there is no advancement, so while we need to find a way of rewarding merit and recognising merit where it is, probably we don't have to get to what you were talking about as meritocracy. From the experience that we have because of Professor Tognon and the Italians we have met over here, young university graduates, their problem rather is that advancement here in the Italian society depends on whom you know. If you do not know anybody who can push you, give you a lift, you don't go anywhere, and so it becomes a question of nepotism, probably. So these were a few brief random observations I wanted to make, thanks.

SR. HELEN ALFORD: I would like to just speak up about some of the points that people made about the role of religion and the importance of religion of bringing about the kind of moral change especially Professor

Sachs emphasized, but it came across in all the talks. There are various things I think about this. We had some discussions in the Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace about whether it would be a good idea to have something – this is probably not the right way of saying it – but something like a Catholic World Development Report and you could think about this for other religions as well, you know, what are the religions doing to actually support all these kinds of initiatives, just to get it out there. A lot of it is going on very quietly and very silently and there is a very good sense to that. I know one foundation that probably many of you also know and they like the idea of taking the words of the Scriptures, *the right hand shouldn't know what the left hand is doing*, in other words they want it to be hidden, but the trouble is, of course, you don't then see, or other people don't see, what's going on and they don't make the connections between what the religious communities are doing and all these kinds of issues. So I think there's one thing about making it visible about what these communities are doing. There was a time when Wolfensohn was at the World Bank and we had the *Mind, Heart and Soul* book, and there are a few things like that but I think we could think a bit more about it, especially in this kind of council.

I think, also, if the religions could come together more to work on this issue. I'll just give you one little example. I'm involved with a little project in London, which is mostly run by business people who are Catholics but they are trying to get it to become an interreligious project, the whole idea being that if we're going to have a healthy society we have to have trust between business and the rest of society, and that trust has totally broken down. People have no trust anymore in big business especially, for good reason, especially in the UK with all the bailing out of the banks, and the only way we can do this is that the companies have to hold themselves to a standard which they don't control and they want this standard to come from the moral teachings of the religious traditions, and they want it to be an inter-religious basis although it's starting off from a Catholic line. So, you know, I think this is a sort of way in which the religions can be, if you like, guarantors, or somehow giving the wider population a sense of confidence and credibility, because then we come back to the hope, and we come back to people's willingness to participate, that kind of thing. You talked very rightly, Maryanne, about there being good and evil in all of us, and it's always present there, how could we give people credibility that an institution has not become corrupted because of the evil that's in the people who are in it, that they can actually be part of it, the young people of whom you were talking before, and contribute in a way that's going to help resolve a problem rather than reinforce a problem, because you're not always sure what the outcome

is going to be. You know you want to do something but you're not educated enough, necessarily, but you want to participate, you need to have this sense of trust, that you can trust these people and then you gradually learn in participating. And I think it also does connect a bit with what Professor Buttiglione was saying about dechristianisation, or generally a loss of religious faith as a resource for morality in society, because we just have to face it that historically it has been religion that has been the main source of people's morality. What other body has been carrying forward moral principles in that way? We can think about institutions like schools, maybe some other institutions, but the main provider – and sometimes they did it very badly, I don't want to canonize them – but they just have been, historically. Losing that influence in society does create a gap, it creates a vacuum and it makes us weaker in terms of dealing with these moral questions. I think probably in many ways what we need now is interreligious to move forward but we're just at the beginning of doing that. I'd be interested if anybody else had any views about that.

MSGR. MARCELO SÁNCHEZ SORONDO: Bene, credo che con queste parole bellissime di Sr Alford possiamo concludere. Naturalmente noi volevamo fare una conclusione, uno Statement, ma in fondo ci ha anticipato il Papa col suo documento, perché noi vogliamo offrire al Papa le cose che poi lui ci ha detto adesso, comunque cercheremo di fare qualcosa e lo manderemo a tutti per la loro approvazione.