

Round Table – First Part

Moderator (Prof. Miriam Diez-Bosch):

It is with really great pleasure that we gather this afternoon to reflect on the theme of salvation. Indeed, the question of who or what will save the world is the one that our distinguished speakers will seek to address. We have selected five key areas, and our esteemed guests will offer their insights in this pressing question. We all know that we live in times of turbulence, uncertainty, polarization. Truth itself is increasingly a concept questioned by many, and that is why we need spaces like this. Precious, invaluable, where we can sit together, learn together, and also engage in meaningful discussions. In this remarkable and unique initiative from the Pontifical Council for Life, they have embraced this format, and they're there to ask and to pose a profound and far from trivial question to the speakers. Who will save the world?

I will give you some practical information. The discussion will end at 4:40. We will then have a coffee. At 5 o'clock, we will come back here for a one-hour a discussion. You already have the question form. If you need it, they are here, and you could also solicit that. The language of the speakers is English for both Professor Karikó and Professor Romer, Italian for Professor Amato and Professor Lütz, and Spanish for Cardinal Castillo. We apologize because life is complicated, and we had two speakers that were invited but, for health reasons, Art, Visual Art, Eugenia Balcells cannot be here, and not Cardinal Tolentino for the Pope's health, and also for the Jubilee reasons, but we also thank them a lot. I will introduce our speakers.

We will begin with science. Our professor, Katalin Karikó, she's a biochemist from Hungary. She's the Nobel Prize Laureate for Medicine, 2023. She's a professor at Szeged University and the Perelman School at the Pennsylvania University in the States. And she was awarded the prize for discoveries concerning nucleoside-based modifications that enable the development of effective RNiA by Science against COVID-19. Thank you very much for coming here, Professor.

Economics, Professor Paul Romer is with us. Nobel Prize Laureate for Economics, 2018. He is a professor at Boston College in the United States, where he directs the Center for Economics of Ideas. And he was awarded for

Integrating Technological Innovations with Macroeconomic Analysis. Thank you very much for being here as well.

We have also Manfred Lütz from Germany, psychiatrist, theologian, author, professor. He's noted for integrating, in his writings, medicine and philosophy, arts, humanities, also theology, and he has been director of the Alexian Hospital in Cologne, in Germany, for over 20 years.

For religion, we are delighted to have Cardinal Carlos Castillo Mattasoglio, he is the Archbishop of Lima in Peru. He's also an educator, he's also a sociologist, he's also a university professor, and he has authored books on youth in the church.

And we also have, for politics, our professor, we're waiting for him, and he will arrive, our Professor Giuliano Amato, politician, also at the university, professor of law, former minister several times, and also twice prime minister in Italy, and in this moment he is also co-director of the Center for Justice in the world. So, we have a very interesting panel with us. And the question is not easy, but they have the strength to answer.

So, my first question to the panelists, the first question comes from context. So, from your own perspective, from considering historical background and the current circumstances, who or what can save the world? The word is yours, Professor.

Karikó:

I have to say, I am a scientist, yes, I get an award, I don't have the answer. Maybe the question is simple, but the answer is not what I have. Maybe Professor Romer, you might have who or. So it is not an easy thing. And I have to say, as a scientist. And this is, science is not the truth. Science is seeking the truth, and science is the knowledge, the world around us, where we collect information by observation, experimentation, measurement.

That's what we are doing. And so, in our field, and some other field, in these years, in recent years, it seems like the biggest threat is misinformation and disinformation. And so, if we, I feel that we have to save the world, somehow, we have to do something about what, how we can help the people, when ourselves is also having difficulties, how we could distinguish what is the truth and what is the misinformation. And so, because, you know, the vaccine field,

especially, is threatened by, information that, you know, the vaccine is more dangerous than the virus itself and others. So, I realized that if somebody can save the world, it could be us, each of us.

As a scientist, I talk to fellow scientists that we have to go out and educate the public about science-what the scientists are doing and what the scientific basic questions we are discussing because the knowledge what the average person knows about, let's say, molecular biology and where the scientist in the front is running, the gap is huge and we have to, as today already we heard presentation, we have to use simple language and some analogy, somehow help the public to understand complexity of the immune system and others. Because if we don't do it, then there are self-proclaimed experts who educated themselves on the internet, learned immunology and they have this special Dunning-Kruger effect, that less knowledge, more confidence, they can state things with great confidence. And as we scientists we are questioning things and we are questioning things, you know, whether it is this way or that way, because that's how we think and in a society, the public likes to have straight answer, politician can do that and so they can give the straight answer, might be not good so that we have to help the public to understand what scientists are doing what the science is about and what, you know, the complexity, what kind of problem we can solve. And we understand that in present, the algorithm in the social media is fear, generate fear, hate, and envy. So you will read more on a announcement will generate fear or some anxious envy in you. And in just the simplest way, I can say that if there is an article about broccoli and apple, you don't read anymore because you already know that. But when it says it turns out that it has that and that, you spend more time because you are fearful. And then it is easy for you that "oh, maybe it is not true," but there is so much complex information that they are making the people fearful. They And so they, at the social media, they don't care about the content. They just care about that you spend more time on that page, because they pay after, you know, the advertisement. And so we have to, as a scientist, have to figure out that how to help the people. And explaining to them, on movies, or other ways, you can maybe watch, if it is recorded, the same thing.

Maybe I am speaking in Hungarian and saying that what you should take or what not, because they are editing, A. I. edited everything. And that people cannot believe whether what they see is true or not. So, for me, it seems like it come to, again, that we have to be physically present. And you are here and you

hear me something to say, or you go to the church or temple, and then you listen to who is talking to you. You go to the lecture at the university. You talk to them and they can hear you because now that if you have a picture it can be edited, it is a film it can be changed and it is so difficult for an average person when I myself, you know, we cannot figure out what is the truth or not. So I think the answer could be that everybody can, you know, everybody can do something to save that world.

Moderator:

Thank you very much for this responsibility in each of us. And I pass the word to Professor Romer, economics.

Romer:

Can you remind me how much time? Six minutes? No but six minutes is that the answer? Okay. I have to ask because there are three kinds of economists: those who can count and those who can't and you can tell which kind I am. Let me start by saying that I'm a member more of the tribe of physicists than the tribe of economists. I was an undergraduate student of physics, and I think you get shaped by your undergraduate training. So I very much enjoyed that kind of the updates I got yesterday about the world of physics. It's changed a lot. But I have picked up some of the culture of economics as well. I am a very big believer in science. I think science is the greatest thing that humans have ever invented. And it's worth reminding everybody that it's a pretty recent invention. And, it could go away. We look back on Mesopotamian math and say, well, you know, they had a few centuries, but it just kind of faded out and went away. And science as we know it, as developed in Europe, may suffer that same fate. And I think that would be a true catastrophe. Now. I started working on the topic that I was awarded the prize for and which I identified in the lecture that I gave in Stockholm, which you can find online. This lecture was called 'On the Possibility of Progress'. I was reacting to a climate of the 1970s, which I learned from the very useful lecture by Mr. Have, ten Have, that what we should think of that was an apocalyptic vision of the 1970s, where people were saying there is no possibility, no possible way for us to avoid catastrophe. We will have massive waves of starvation, and you know, hundreds of millions of people will die from famine. We'll run out of fossil fuel, and that will be the end of our economic system by the 1990s. That was the Club of Rome, by the way. Notice they didn't even get the sign right. It's not that we don't have enough fossil fuel.

The real problem is we have way too much fossil fuel. We keep finding more and more of it. And if we keep burning it, we'll cook the whole planet. So these apocalyptic visions sometimes don't even get the sign right.

I looked at the long sweep of human history and said, 'Look, there have been some ups and downs, but people have somewhere on earth found ways to keep moving forward.' And my measure of progress, I tried to be fairly objective about this. You could look at things like the life expectancy. How long did people live? And that has been steadily increasing over time, and actually increasing at a faster and faster rate in the most recent period, precisely because of this discovery of science. So if you look at the last hundred years or two hundred years, there was much more progress than in the thousand years before that. So this process of progress that was speeding up over time ran exactly counter to the dogma in economics, which said, well, there's a finite amount of physical objects on Earth. If there are more people, there will be less of every physical object per person. Less per person will mean less, a lower standard of living. So we're doomed to steadily decreasing standards of living when, in fact, we were seeing that, you know, in a massive way, progress. But in the years since starting in the early 1980s, that I worked on this, I've been watching developments in the United States. I predicted that we would see a huge amount of technological innovation, and we have indeed seen a huge amount of technological innovation, but we have not seen progress in the United States.

If we're going to measure progress, by life expectancy (I can't change my measure when it isn't going my way) and the United States has stopped making progress in terms of more life expectancy. It's even had a small decline in the years before COVID. There are other indications, I think, of a failure of progress as well. The fraction of 25 to 54 year old men who actually have a job, has been going down since the 1990s. It's usually people who have the lowest economic opportunities, the lowest wages. This is not somebody who's rich who's just retiring early and enjoying retirement. So people are killing themselves with these diseases of despair. They're disconnecting. There's something really deeply wrong in the United States, and what that tells you is that technological progress gives us possibilities, but we still have to decide what we do with those possibilities.

If we ask the question, "what will happen if?" science can give us an answer to that. But there are two more questions we have to answer: "Given that, what

ought I to do?” and then, “what ought we do?” And those questions cannot be answered by science. They have to be answered by some system of values. If you think about, say, the discovery of the CFCs, those looked like a promising technology for refrigeration and for fire extinguishing, and they were safe chemicals. They were very valuable. But then science identified that they posed a threat to the survival of the planet. At that point, people had to decide, well, what do we do about it? And at that time, we had a social-political consensus that it would be wrong, morally wrong, to harm the planet, just to maintain a particular line of economic activity. The Reagan administration and a University of Chicago economist took the lead in banning the use of the CFC's, and then getting a treaty worldwide, to get all other countries to agree to ban the CFC's.

Those decisions came out of moral value judgments about right and wrong, and what's so troubling to me is that the value system that supported those decisions has eroded very substantially. If we were to have discovered the problems with CFCs just in the last few years, I doubt that we would actually have been able to ban them in the United States. Our political and social system wouldn't let us do it, and I doubt that we would have a treaty around the world. So in answer to the question, who will solve this problem, it will be people who help us understand how values change and how can we improve values and get more of the values that support progress rather than suffer the kind of period we've gone through in the last several decades where our values have gotten more self-centered, more selfish and more damaging to progress.

Moderator:

Thank you very much, Professor. We were between precision and expansion. That was great in terms of timing. Professor Lütz, this is the word for you. Thank you.

Lütz:

First of all, I would like to emphasize that I stepped in quite suddenly because our Chancellor, Renzo Pegoraro, only called me on Friday and asked me to take over from the great artist, Eugenia Balcells, who had fallen ill. And as I naturally always do everything our Chancellor or our President asks of me, I'm now sitting here surrounded by Nobel Prize winners who I can't hold a candle to.

When people ask about the salvation of the world, as a Catholic and theologian, I could make it easy for myself and answer that for me the savior of the world is our Lord Jesus Christ who saved us through his suffering, death, and resurrection. We cannot save ourselves; ultimately, we can only ask God to save the world. But I'm afraid you won't be satisfied with that. Of course we must use all our knowledge and skills to save the world: science, economics, politics, religion, and also art. As Pope Francis emphasizes in *Laudato Si* we must do everything in our power to prevent the climate catastrophe. We must work for peace among peoples and also in our often divided societies. As it happens, I have recently been working more intensively on the topic of our conference and my latest book on the subject, *The Sense of Life*, argues that the sense of life can literally be seen in great art.

But I'm also involved with art in an even more current sense. I'm not only a Catholic theologian but also a physician specialized in psychiatry and psychotherapy and according to Aristotle, medicine is not a theoretical science but a *techne*, that is, an art. There has long been a dispute about this. Physicians sometimes prefer to see themselves as natural scientists, but in fact, the medical diagnosis is not knowledge in itself, as knowledge in physics and chemistry is, but a purposeful knowledge, a knowledge for the purpose of treating a suffering person. Psychiatry deals with the suffering states of the human soul, and it now seems to me that psychological aspects of the current state of the world suddenly take on paramount importance when it comes to saving us from a catastrophic end of the world. In a world full of autocrats, psychological skills in dealing with such special people are suddenly crucial. Traits that we call narcissistic in their painful version are becoming increasingly common among world leaders. Social media promotes an egocult that can have disastrous consequences when such people gain power.

The high degree of vulnerability of these egomaniacs, the typical envy, and the impulse for revenge can lead to wars and even an apocalyptic catastrophe. The end of the world, which was fantasized in many science fiction films as being more technical or fateful, seems to me today to be threatened more by certain psychological characteristics of those in power. We witnessed last week, but also before that, that the fate of a country or even the fate of the world can now depend on the success or failure of a conversation. This is new. The rule-based order, world order that was established after the catastrophe of the Second

World War and in which we all grew up seems to have been abruptly suspended.

The right of the stronger once again applies and statesmanship must once again deal with the recipes of Niccolo Machiavelli. We will probably have to flatter rulers again in order to save our own people. Suddenly, the strength of a handshake takes on political significance. The seating arrangement, the clothing, the facial expression. Ruthless power politics was basically quite normal in the past. Let us remember that the partitions of Poland 250 years ago were carried out without any moral right, exclusively out of great power interests over the heads of the Poles. Neither the enlightened absolutism of Frederick the Great of Prussia, nor the despotism of Catherine the Great of Russia, nor the deeply Catholic Empress Maria Theresa and her sober-minded son Joseph II took the Polish nation's desire for freedom into consideration.

It is said that although the Austrian monarch wept, she nevertheless took. Of course we can hope for a return to rules-based world order. But it would be fatal to confuse such hopes with reality. In future, therefore, foreign policy will once again have to limit itself to what is feasible, realistically assess its own strength, and unfortunately take greater account of the personal preferences and aversions of those in power. A high price will be paid for psychological inaptitude.

Can art save the world? Certainly not the universe, but perhaps what we experience as our world. I wrote a dialogue book with perhaps the world's most famous living psychotherapist, the now 96-year-old Otto Kernberg. Otto Kernberg is a Viennese Jew, had to experience how the Nazis forced his mother to scrub the sidewalk, was able to flee to Chile with his parents at the last moment before the outbreak of the Second World War, and then went to New York, where he enthusiastically treated the most difficult personality disorders for decades.

He devoted his entire research to the peculiarities of human relationships, and he loved art from the bottom of his heart. I asked him, the great art connoisseur, what was the work of art that touched him the most, and he mentioned the Triumph of Death, the almost apocalyptic painting by Peter Bruegel the Elder in the Prado of Madrid. Kernberg, I quote, 'There you see the columns of death marching, overwhelming everything. In front, very small, you can see a king looking for his crown, which has fallen from his head. You can see a merchant collecting his banknotes. And, very small, in the corner, you can see a loving

couple. They are sitting there very calmly. He is playing the guitar. And she is listening to him. Both are calm.

They know they cannot escape this disaster. But as long as they live, they want to be together. This is, of course, in contrast to this overwhelming army that destroys and ruins everything. This image shows that tragedy, misfortune, destruction, and aggression are unavoidable, but that they can be overcome by bravely standing up for love, for values, for life. You can see a protest that is useless in the long run, but in its exercise has full meaning for real life.” And the same in music. Bob Dylan, Nobel Prize winner, sang: “Oh, the tree of life is growing, Where the spirit never dies, And the bright light of salvation shines in dark and empty skies, Where the cities are on fire with the burning flesh of men just remember that death is not the end.” Thank you.

Moderator:

Thank you very much also for bringing a third Nobel Prize into the conversation, as Bob Dylan, as you said. Thank you very much. Cardinal Castillo, the word is yours.

Castillo:

Thank you, very well. Good afternoon, everyone. The comment we have been invited to make is from our specific experience, and I rather enter into the religious plane and the Church, and I wanted to refer to some aspects that were discussed at the beginning of our meeting last year, specifically in the intervention of William Desmond, who began our meeting remembering Pascal in the famous distinction between the spirit of finesse and the spirit of geometry. And I say this because it seems to me that having received a first-level scientific enlightenment in these previous interventions, we realize that we are not only facing an epochal crisis, as Brodel said, that is, a long-term crisis, but an etheric crisis. It is an age. The age of the Anthropocene is a whole thing in which the epochal crisis that we are living is situated.

There is an epochal crisis, but inside there is an etheric crisis. And that etheric crisis is basically founded in living by warming. To have constituted a way of living at the expense of nature, where everything warms up, and everything warms up by trouble. And precisely this is the issue that Pascal wanted to address. That science was not so metric or geometric that it could lead to the

non-existence of meaning and to the substitution of the meaning of life by geometry, by calculation. And that is why he said that if they could not march together, but always with one very important thing, for Pascal, the spirit of finesse is infinitely superior to the spirit of geometry. And therefore, he rests on it.

That is why, to make science, you need to make hypotheses, you need to postulate principles, but none of what is postulated nor what is hypothesized is demonstrated. What is hypothesized has to be demonstrated, and what is postulated, no. And what is the foundation of science there? To say that those are the principles from which we have to depart. It is intuitive. And that intuition, obviously, has to be always deepened. And this is in the biblical text and has, then, a deep relationship with the religious theme. Because in the biblical text there are several historical moments that are very serious, that Israel went through, that is why it's a historical text, it's a story. And there are different moments in which crisis is experienced. And very strong crises.

And crises that, I would say, I would also like to use the term apocalyptic, not in the sense of a catastrophe, because apocalypse means revelation. And inside a catastrophe, a serious crisis, something interesting is always revealed that can open doors. Where is then the interesting thing? Very well, my predecessor in the Word has said Jesus Christ, dead and resurrected, delivered on the cross for love. But it is very interesting because that is a totally insignificant character, hidden. It is the suffering servant from the Old Testament that was also presented in periods of crisis. As the true solution. And the same thing when Pope Francis tells us that we have to put the accent and the eye and the ear in the popular movements of the base that are emerging but that we do not notice.

And it is very serious that we do not notice this. Because there is in the world a clamor subreptitious in the midst of so much pain and so much death. And it is very important that we do not notice so passionate and so terrifying. Today I read that they have already named those who are leading the world oligarchs. The term 'oligarchy' that was used in the time of the colony in our country. Because it is a set of despots that self-generate as gods. The big problem is then, how can we make everything that is reasoned and worked with all honesty in science can be engaged with a deep openness that allows to resonate with the deepest spirit of clamor that exists in humanity that palms directly with what we could say the religions propose.

Because the religions have always tried to reflect on the depths of life. And evidently, some have invented forms of God as principles of existence. And ours the Christian is revealed, it is the announcement from the other side towards us, from the Father towards us. This finesse is presented in several moments of history and we have to study it. Maybe it would be a very interesting moment to be able to see the Bible in our history and the ecclesial and how it has been collected. But the text that even Corbeal begins the Bible after creation in seven days is Adam and Eve and sin. And that is a crisis, a crisis that is kind of catastrophic. Because they are thrown out of paradise for having eaten what tree?

And there we have a conclusion, even the popes have been wrong; they thought it was the Tree of Life that they ate. And it is clear that in the center of the garden is the Tree of Life. There is a problem: the one who eats is the Tree of Science, good and evil. That is, they eat reasoning. And you all know what happens to us when we eat a point or a comma in any of our languages. We can lose a judgment. We can get a bad grade because eating is also to make something disappear, to make deep reasoning disappear. And eating is to possess, to dominate, to dominate what is good and what is bad. One of the people here insisted that young people today had to know more metaphysics, and that is very important.

You have to go deep into things and one of the most terrible things we have in the church is that we have imitated scientific knowledge or in quotes let's say mechanical teaching faith through slogans and catechisms that have to be repeated, forming parrots or parrots, and not help to deepen, reflect, and above all, to value human life because we all have valuable stories. You, Juan, as a European, always tell anecdotes about concrete people. We should also tell anecdotes about the stories of the peoples, the anecdotes of how our people are what they want, what they are passionate about, because it is hidden there. And in the Bible it is said you are a hidden God, the hidden God that is revealed.

I think that at this moment in this in this in this event that we are doing a very big challenge is and it is how to return to the source of finesse which is wisdom but the wisdom that is known to recognize to dialogue to appreciate to understand and reduce the effort with which some want to take us in this world to the apocalypse as a catastrophe. We can avoid it to the extent that all the churches ecumenically and the Catholic Church in the first place change their

way of evangelizing, and that is done synodally as the Pope has said, and that is irreversible, as much as one wants that tomorrow that the Pope will no longer be that; I do not know they play they play to the sides to see who is going to do

that; it is irreversible if we do not, we follow synodally the life of the world and we accompany it; we will not have resurgence of the conversation the day and democracy, and we will all go to the abyss there; yes it is true it seems to me that it is a challenge and it is a deep call that comes to us from what I call now the campaign hospital which is the Church and which is the room of the Holy Father; the campaign hospital is talking about that let's make a synodal Church, and capable of understanding with finesse with delicacy with That intuition that we have now, we are going to see Dostoyevsky of beauty of the subtle. Let's learn to find a deeper and stronger entrance of science and of everything discovered with what is more deep our faith and the faith of all peoples who always have something to tell us of interesting and beautiful things of the world.

Moderator:

Thank you, thank you very much Your Eminence also for your, this recall to subtle to this finesse and to this mechanism of faith, very interesting concept. Very welcome. To Professor Amato, the word is yours. The, our first question is from our perspective, background.

Amato:

Okay, per l'eróe italiano, no. La politica non salverà il mondo. In questo momento è tra i mali che possono distruggere il mondo. E lo è tanto sul piano internazionale quanto sul piano interno. Se ci riflettete, vi accorgete che i mali del mondo intero, della comunità internazionale e i mali delle nostre società, in fondo, hanno la stessa radice, che è poi quella che colsero per le società il cardinale Ratzinger allora e Jürgen Habermas nella loro famosa conversazione del 2004, quando dovettero constatare che si stavano rompendo i fili comuni che tenevano insieme. Le nostre società erano prevaleate dalle visioni, le aspettative, gli interessi dei singoli; noi siamo abituati ormai a leggere in questa chiave le società, ma è la stessa chiave che ha preso il sopravvento nella comunità internazionale, dove la cooperazione e le organizzazioni multilaterali per la cooperazione hanno perso progressivamente il loro spazio ed è riemersa la sovranità nazionale come espressione della volontà indiscussa e indiscutibile di chi ne era portatore.

Il rispetto delle regole internazionali è ormai l'ultima cosa che interessa gli Stati, i componenti della comunità. Le convenzioni internazionali e i trattati vengono violati. Le decisioni degli organi di giustizia internazionale vengono disattese, ignorate. Progressivamente si è fatto a spazio alla legge del più forte. E questo non è diverso da quello che accade sul fronte interno delle nostre società. È un'analisi che tutti capiamo, davanti alla quale sembriamo impotenti. Solo il forte non è impotente. E allora, che cosa? A questi mali chi può porre rimedio? La medicina ha fatto tante cose per noi e potrà farne ancora. Ma che cosa? La medicina qui è impotente. L'economia, con la crescita, ha liberato milioni e milioni di esseri umani dalla povertà. E altri potrà, con la crescita, liberare dalla povertà.

Ma nulla può contro questi mali, che possono distruggere il prodotto dell'economia in pochi mesi. Quando guardiamo Gaza, vediamo, quanto può la distruzione fatta dall'uomo. Ora, io ho idee molto semplici su questo, che probabilmente passano attraverso, devono passare attraverso la politica, ma le tradurrei così. Sul piano internazionale, occorre ripristinare la forza della cooperazione. La convinzione che andare d'accordo con l'altro, anche se diverso, è più importante che fare la guerra. Sul piano delle politiche interne, c'è qualcosa di simile, ma qualcosa di diverso. Ma qualcosa anche di più. Perché una caratteristica che la politica ha assunto sul piano interno è quella prigioniera di aspettative di singoli o di gruppi di aver perso il futuro. È una politica prigioniera del presente. Io oggi, elettore, protesto contro qualcosa che mi danneggia.

La politica, per non perdere il mio consenso, mi dà ragione. Magari sarebbe bene che mi desse torto, in vista di un futuro in cui, se io perdo qualcosa oggi, tutti guadagneremmo qualcosa. Ma questo è ciò che la politica oggi non sa fare. Da sola, non riuscirà mai a trovare la strada. E qui vi dico due cose, delle quali poi potremo discutere. Abbiamo scritto un libro con Vincenzo Paglia, che è intitolato *Il sogno di Cusano, Cusano's Dream*. Ma abbiamo tradotto solo il titolo. Il libro è in italiano, at the moment. Il libro è in italiano, at the moment. Che parte proprio dal sogno di Cusano, cioè dall'idea che le religioni primo trovino tra loro l'accordo su ciò che le fa essere religioni.

Sono diverse, ma tutte hanno dentro di sé la pace, tutte hanno dentro di sé il riconoscimento dell'altro, benvenuto all'ospite che arriva, chiunque sia, con qualunque religione. Non tutte hanno, come il cristianesimo, l'amore per l'altro,

che è una grande risorsa, una grande risorsa. Ecco, quello che in questo libro diciamo, molto semplicemente, è che le religioni debbono far valere i principi e i valori di cui dispongono perché entrino nuovamente nella politica. La politica da sola non li ritrova. Le religioni, che si interessano della società, hanno come finalità oggi anche quella di influenzare la politica. Non devono creare partiti. Devono comunicare ai credenti ciò che in quanto credenti devono portare in sé anche quando fanno politica. Che è una responsabilità delle religioni ed è una responsabilità di chi fa politica, ricordarsi dei valori della religione che professa in ogni sua azione politica.

Ci sono delle conseguenze di questo, ma ne potremo parlare dopo. Questo di per sé può aiutare a trovare il futuro, ma qui interverrà un'altra cosa molto diversa, del tutto diversa, della quale io sono convinto e che è legata, pensateci, al cambiamento climatico. Il cambiamento climatico incombe sull'umanità ed è un pericolo per la sopravvivenza della specie umana sul pianeta se continua. Se continua senza essere in qualche modo ridotto come le tecnologie anche ci possono permettere di ridurlo. È impressionante conferma di quanto prima vi dicevo, quanto la politica sia sensibile alle proteste presenti e sia pronta ad ascoltare queste più che non il futuro. In questi ultimi mesi le proteste sono cresciute, l'agenda green si è molto ridotta e molto dilazionata. È il presente che sta battendo il futuro.

Chi è che potrà cambiare questo atteggiamento della politica? Le giovani generazioni. Ecco, voi sentite spesso i politici che concludono i loro discorsi con appelli retorici ai giovani. I giovani sono il nostro avvenire, eccetera. Bel discorso. Applauso non significa assolutamente nulla. Io vi sto dicendo una cosa diversa. Io nel 2050 non ci sarò. O sono sensibile ai temi del futuro o se mi interessa il presente a me di quello che succederà nel 2050 non importa niente perché non ci sarò più. I giovani ci saranno. E infatti voi parlate nelle scuole, parlategli di questo, vi accorgete che reagiscono sentono parlare di sé, del proprio futuro, della varrà la pena fare dei figli se il mondo diventerà così. Ecco, sono loro che hanno dentro il cambiamento climatico.

Perché sono loro che sono destinati a vivere gli anni dai quali temiamo il peggio se non saremo capaci di fare un po' di meglio. Ecco un'altra forza importante che si potrà unire. Ma tutto questo dovrà diventare politica se la politica rimane quello che è. Che Dio vi aiuti. Me lo auguro.

Moderator:

Thank you professor also for this appeal to the politics to generate and also to coordinating international cooperation and the role of youth in that. We will start now a second round of questions. Now I would like you to try to relate from your perspective to other disciplines from science, from economy, from politics, from arts, from religion, how an interconnection could be possible, could be done. Professor Karikó, the word is yours.

Karikó:

So you learn who can save the world now or who cannot. Politician cannot. And we can see different ways that what could be, you know, the problem. And, you know, I myself, I can see that one important thing is when we have seen comrade, like a scientist, a fellow scientist, whatever in the world, you know, a fellow scientist. And this is the same for sports, for example. Nobody from sport here right now, but, you know, it doesn't matter what corner of the world somebody is jumping highest, he is the best. And so there is this different field which has this internationality. And so, and in addition, it is important for everybody to have physical health and mental health. We heard about, you know, the suicide and other things.

So, and of course, I find it very important the art, because again, we don't care who painted something, whether it's a performing art or visual art or others. You know, we feel, you know, elated and feel different happiness seeing something. And I wouldn't be really here if I wouldn't have a song when I was very young and learn and inspired me. And when I was down, I was singing that song. So it is very important for these disciplines. And of course, within the science, we have many disciplines, which is very important because, you know, mathematics, economics, everything is part of science. And so that can relate to each other, and these disciplines can help, you know, to work together.

And even politicians, you know, because these could help our problems if we make sure that those who we are electing, those who represent us and not, you know, listening to their speeches and we vote based on that. And I have to say, even those very rich ones who, you know, we are blaming for many things, but there are very rich ones, people that who help you know like Bill Gates help with health and other things and donate his money to good causes. So there are politicians and rich people and all of these who represent different fields you know they can work together. And I have seen good things happening. And so, I feel that all of these disciplines, this can help to get over the crisis.

And as you pointed out, everybody pointed out, you said that maybe we run out of some resources. I feel more about, you know, the misinformation. You mentioned politicians that, you know, doing bad things. So that different crisis we can see that, which might, you know, threaten us. And we have maybe solution for all of them, but definitely banding together and together coming up with ideas. But I myself also feel the individual person. I was a Stoic, I didn't know that, but at that, you know, when I was growing up. And so I always focus on what I can do and not what others should do. So that helped me, and of course, all of us could do and work on it so that what each of us can do something.

And, of course, together we can be a better source. And force. Thank you.

Moderator:

Thank you very much. Also for this recall to work together, Professor Romer. So I think my perceptions line up in an interesting way with yours. My father was a politician. He was a governor in the United States. One of the things you learn from close experience with someone in a political position is how severely constrained they are by the political process. You might think politicians have great freedom to make big changes. In fact, they're very constrained. And what can make a big difference is a shift in the political landscape that comes from a change amongst voters, including a change in their values, what they believe in, and that instead of just telling politicians to do better, I think we should focus on how do we change the values of voters in a way that will encourage the politicians to do better.

So the answer to the question of what should we expect from our colleagues is more practical attention to the dynamics in the change in norms and more recognition that there are some norms that are better than others. For example, norms which put a higher weight on the well-being of everyone in the future. Forward-looking norms, I argue, will create better societies. I think norms that also put more weight on the well-being of others, not just extreme selfishness. Those, too, I think most people would say, I would rather live in a society like that. Now, how do we change norms? I think we don't know, but we should study cases where norms have clearly changed. Historically, one of the most important is norms about slavery. Biologically identical humans at one time believed that slavery was just normal.

Now almost no one believes that slavery is normal. They think it's evil. But how did we make that transition? That one's such a big issue that I think it's difficult to study. Let me give you another. Attitudes towards inflicting pain on animals or other sentient beings. These are changing in what I would argue is a positive direction. More and more people are opposed to just inflicting needless pain on animals around us. And I don't think this is a change that you can attribute to, say, politicians who passed laws that changed behavior, that then changed attitudes. This is some kind of a grassroots phenomenon and part of a general process of movement, I think, towards progress that should encourage us. But we should think about how can we do that in other domains?

Why are we simultaneously seeing more concern about the well-being of other animals around us, but less concern about the well-being of the people around us, which is at least what we see in the United States? Other comparable areas I wish people would study could be, for example, race relations. Race relations is, as you know, a very serious and difficult problem where changing norms has been very hard in the United States. It's interesting because you can see two experiments that operated in parallel. Universities have tried to implement policies that are designed to deal with kind of good race relations. The United States Army felt that it had to do something about race relations starting in about the 1970s because they saw that the Army would inevitably be much more multiracial. Remember, the U. S. Army has its officer origins in the U. S. South, so this was a big change for the Army. The bottom line is the Army has been much more effective at establishing good working relationships. It's the only organization in the United States where black men routinely boss around white men, and it happens without any particular friction or animosity.

Universities have actually been much less effective at dealing with race relations, and you would think the universities were the ones that were more well-intentioned and progressive and wanted to do more on this dimension. So it's a caution that the Army set about doing something based on practicality. It had to work. They had to achieve unit cohesion because otherwise lives would be at risk. So they didn't mess around with somebody's ideas about good intentions.

They wanted to know if it worked. And I don't think we've brought that same kind of hard-nosed perspective onto will this measure actually improve relations between the races to our activities in universities. Things like, for example, affirmative action, which have been used in universities, was not used by the

Army. This has been very counterproductive. It's fomented a real backlash against good race relations, so we have to ask, are our measures working? But we do need, on a topic like vaccines, to think hard about, how do we get back to a system of values where people think what I do is partly determined by what's good for everyone? Especially, there may be other people who can't take vaccines or who are immunocompromised. So it's particularly important for me to get the vaccination because that will help the community as a whole.

How do we get back to that kind of sense of norms? Why have we lost that sense of norms? And the practical dynamics, not the exhortations, but the practical dynamics of this actually works if you're trying to change values in a pro-social way, this is what we need more of. And the implicit answer to my first question, well, who can save us? It's not economists because economists have not paid any attention at all to this question of how do you change a community's values. And I'm curious about the suggestion that you hinted at, that this is part of what religions have done for us historically, and we need to think in a world where religion is not quite as important as it used to be. What are the other organizations that can help us sustain and make progress towards better values?

Moderator:

Thank you. Thank you very much for this more practical attitude to change, and this interdisciplinarity and also the recall for the racism and how to break that. Thank you very much. Professor Amato, again, thank you very much.

Amato:

Well, no, I speak Italian. Two things I'd like to say. One that I didn't say before and that is another resource that some societies possess, mine has it, which is non-profit, which we in Italian identify more as voluntary, which is widespread, but not entirely. It is a great army at the service of others. Today, we are told that we have four million people who spend the time they have at the service of others, and that non-profit organizations have one million employees. So not all of them are volunteers, but four-fifths of them are volunteers.

Five million people. For them, to take care of others and not of themselves is their life, is their personal culture. I don't expect that all Italians are like that, but I think, and I have also written and said it several times to non-profit friends,

that they could improve politics if some of them switched to politics, if they went back to being volunteers. It seems natural for those who do politics to take care not only of themselves and their own votes, but, first of all, of others. There are politicians who do it. There are good people in politics. Nothing is absolute. But the general tone of politics is that I defend my own votes and therefore I defend what my electors say. I learned this in the United States many years ago.

When I attended this, for me, almost incredible experiment, I was at the Congress as a student visiting many decades ago. And a congressman was speaking from the classroom. His staff collected the reactions of his electors to what he said. If they disagreed, he communicated them by earphones in real-time and he immediately changed what he was saying. So, exemplary. Really exemplary. Well, in fact, volunteering is a resource. This is an important point that where it exists can really to change. The second thing I wanted to say is that religions can contribute to not only admitting values, but also finding agreement on values. In the name of the principle, you recognize the other. Because here the argument then, if you want, is developed by Vincenzo because the argument is his. The risk is that religion changes the view in its hubris. It becomes extreme. What happens much more in a society in which one reacts in politics to the voters and therefore instead of educating them to the meeting one exalts them in the clash. This is our position. They are our enemies. And then we never agree. Then politics becomes useless because it does not decide or decides with a lot of unilateralism. The example

of abortion happening in the United States on the interruption of pregnancy is the most evident sign of an incompetent policy and of religions that give up to pregnancy. It was extreme. Roe versus Wade was not compatible with the prevailing cultures of our time, to admit the interruption of pregnancy freely until the 24th 25th week. Until the 24th fetus was not able to dictate a discipline that takes into account the reasons of all. How better we were able to do in Europe. And when the Supreme Court said that there is no federal right to the interruption of pregnancy, extreme laws against the interruption of pregnancy that even led doctors to

say for septicemia. From fetal disease. Here, religion can teach values; can teach respect for life; can teach respect for the other, and the importance

of I have learned through many years of experience that what matters is not necessarily sharing the other, but understanding it. And if we can understand it, the society will become better.

Moderator:

Thank you, professor, for this recall to understanding the other, also for the non-profit as an army of people taking care of the others, and to this service to the politics. Thank you; Professor Lütz, it's your turn for arts.

Lütz:

As already mentioned, psychiatry as a medical discipline is not a theoretical science but an art in the sense of Aristotle. As a physician, it is important to understand the individual patient, to empathize with their suffering and thus to be able to make a serious individual diagnosis. However, for such a diagnosis to be valid, it must be based on science. Diagnostic imaging procedures, precise laboratory tests, and psychological tests are necessary to confirm the diagnosis but they cannot replace it. The sociological context is also important. Man is a social being, a *zoon politicon*; a person's relationships with others are essential for a healthy soul life.

When I organized the first Vatican abuse congress in 2003, together with Cardinal Ratzinger, on behalf of our academy, I invited Bill Marshall, one of the most internationally renowned experts, who had previously told me that he was an atheist because his father was an atheist but he held the church in high esteem. At some point during a lecture, it emerged that a lack of relationships is a risk factor for abuse. And then someone asked whether celibacy was a problem. Bill Marshall responded that this was a misunderstanding and that he assumed that a Catholic priest had an intense relationship with God. In fact, celibacy can hardly be lived happily without a deep and regular relationship with God. For a valid diagnosis, but also 'for' therapy, it is essential to look at the nature of the relationships. Finally, the economic and political situation always plays a role. If unemployment is high in an area, this is a considerable psychological burden. Modern psychiatry is dependent on political support for its patients who are more vulnerable than others. However, compassion for the weak is dwindling everywhere in the face of the glamour of the successful, the ruthlessness of the rich, and the self-absorption of the egocentric. Jürgen Habermas, who was cited Germany's best-known philosopher, yet by his own

admission is religiously unmusical, has been calling for years for saving translations of the Judeo-Christian concept of man as Image of God in order to save the concept of human dignity. Politicians in some countries can still take countermeasures to help people in need and thus prevent the end of a human world. Serious psychiatry and psychotherapy must remain aware, of their limitations. Ultimately, they are merely techniques that can be used to alleviate or end psychological suffering on a scientific basis, no more and no less. If they claimed to also provide people with a sense of life, they would become totalitarian. Mixing psychological techniques and religious goals runs the risk of producing sects and gurus. After all, as in crisis of their lives and the world, people search for the sense of it all. The psychiatrist, Viktor Frankl, placed this longing at the center of his work. Of course, the search for sense is not a specialized psychological concern but the longing of all people. The *Confessions* of St. Augustine of Hippo (we are here in the Augustinianum), the first psychological book of mankind, begin with the exclamation 'My heart is restless until it rests in you, oh God.' In this respect, the search for sense is not a psychological but a deeply religious concern that no human being can completely escape.

Moderator:

Thank you also for bringing Viktor Frankl and his sense and the idea of religion and that psychiatrist is also an art. A very interesting insight. Cardinal Castillo, the word is yours.

Castillo: What does 'religion is a discipline' a reality so it is not a theoretical problem it is a practical problem that is how a religious experience like like the Catholic and others are related to other realities and problems. That is why the idea of volunteers is very well-centered. Volunteers are a huge movement in Italy. We have also benefited, the Peruvians, from many Italians who have come there. And I believe that in a crisis, there are always those signs that have to be picked up, and among them are these types of initiatives that we could say that, despite the fact that we're seeing on a global level that there is a kind of possessiveness against democracy. I believe that everything will be centered in Europe.

If that is seen in Europe, we will hardly have future democracy, because everything will be imperial. In any case, it is interesting. It is interesting that you, in Europe, have widened democracy. To make democracy wider. That it is

not only in matters that are problematic, such as the freedom of abortion, or things like that. That it also has to be tried to be understood. It is not about the Church being there to condemn. The Church is there to dialogue and see what is more advisable, and to say its word as well. And it has to help people to understand things more deeply. Also. According to our vision, but precisely because we want to contribute something, but not to be condemning.

But, for example, all the efforts that are being made today, even to be able to get out of the war, in the case of Ukraine and other countries, is extremely important. Because, for example, the boys who are saying, the boys who are fighting in the name of Ukraine. We here are not for money or for being powerful. We are for dignity. Our struggle is to be dignified. To be recognized as a dignified people. This is very important. Because it means that the aspect of human dignity, which has something divine, is present in the life of Europe. In that sense, I would like to refer to a little thing that is an anecdote, but that can help us. It is a little complicated, but I will try to say it.

We have a procession in Peru, which is the procession of the Lord of the Miracles. I don't know if you have heard of it. Normally, in Lima, in October, two million people come out walking in the city with the crucified Lord. The image of the crucified Lord. The Peruvians have gone to all parts of the world now. Some are in London, others in Rome, others in Milan, etc. In Tokyo. And everyone takes out the procession, and every day is bigger. The Latin Americans from other countries have also joined. And then, it seemed to me, too much weight, already being Archbishop, not to study the phenomenon itself a little more. And there science resorted, there was a theoretical element. But to be able to better interpret what is happening.

And it has happened that, studying, I have discovered a historical thing. I have resorted to history for that. And simultaneously, I have resorted to the daily popular feeling. In the historical question, it turns out that there is a Peruvian researcher who has investigated about 10 or 15 social movements in the past that somehow relate, directly or indirectly, with human dignity through faith. I presented this presentation at the Gregorian University on the 9th. Why? Because there is a very close relationship. If we have a country where there is a huge diversity, and where the colonial sector implemented rules and castes, in such a way that the castes, within the caste, there was always competition, people never appreciated themselves, they despised themselves. For example, in

the black group, there is the black, the chivillo, the sacalagua, the zambo, and the black bembo.

And everyone fights because you are better, I am better, and everyone is black. But it is like that in the Indians, in the Cajamarca, with the puno, there is a general division. And in that division exists the destruction of democracy. Because there is so much division that we cannot agree on the prejudices. There are no racist laws, there are racist customs. What has the procession done throughout history? To unite and not to divide. And everyone before the Lord united. We are all brothers. But I thought that was only a way to celebrate during the month of October, that party. But it turns out that in the last October, the governments that have passed, and the last government, have abandoned security and only govern, and all these last governments, there are seven governments in six years.

If I am six years old, I would have one per year. One and a half per year. Well. These governments today are governed by mafias. The mafia is taking power throughout Latin America. I am not talking about politics anymore. It is the mafia that uses politics. And therefore, the big problem is that they have abandoned even the minimum security. One goes out on the street and says, give me ten soles, or give me a dollar. If I don't give it to you, you are dead. The dead, by extortion, are seven. Seven daily dead, by extortion. Outside of other worlds. And the insecurity is tremendous. So please, be careful if you go to Peru. So, in the preaching, and at the beginning of the first mass, and in the preaching, at the beginning of the mass, I say, let's pray for our dead.

Because it is not possible that there is no security. We are going to pray so that they give us strength so that we can do something together. And I mention the social doctrine of the Church. It says that the popular organization is fundamental. Just like you, the popular organization is voluntary, right? They are basic organizations. It is a human right to organize. And in this case, we have to organize, but very carefully. Not violently. But peacefully. I said it because days before, a head of a commercial organization organized a march, and the marches in the recent times in Lima have been repressed. And that man said, 'we have to do a peaceful march', as the Church says. He did the march and it was a great thing. Huge.

So, I say it like this: if it is a human right, we will see-all this month of October, let's pray so that we have creative initiatives to be able to neutralize violence.

Well, it turns out that the procession begins. They visit the Palacio de Gobierno, as always, the Palacio de los Obispaes, and then they go to the Palacio del Congreso, where all these laws are produced that are killing people. And people, first, slowly, begin to say that they do not enter, that the Lord does not enter the Congress. But softly, with fear. And then, they could not do it because the protocol was there. The Lord enters the Congress and the congressmen come out with their flowers, to worship the Lord.

And all the people begin to shout, to say, to give corrupt, corrupt, to all voices and very strongly, the two billion people. It is not a political matter, it is a matter of dignity, that at that moment was denounced because there are no, there are no exits. So, what is, in the end, what we are putting ourselves in a crisis like what we are living, that when there are no exits and there is people who impose themselves, it is necessary we have to regenerate the social fabric from the base, build solidarity relations, generate dialogues between realities and disciplines, and make it possible for a new form of politics to emerge. This is what the Pope says in the Fratelli Tutti. I believe that this is happening and it is possible.

And it is possible, in addition, by fulfilling our mission. I always say to us that the Church is neither of the right, nor of the left, nor of the center. It is from the bottom. The Church is from the bottom. From the bottom of the human being. And so the Gospel acts on the human bottom and it repercutes in politics, but not directly, as some are saying. That is why they want to take ownership of God, because that is how they have an integralism, a Catholic Ayatollahism. In that sense, this, for example, you see, is how elements of knowledge and elements of experience enter, that intertwine. And I believe that today we are very much in need of this capacity to exchange relations, and perhaps, I do not know if for Europe it is a little more difficult to consider it, but Europeans also have to make popular organizations.

I know that in some parts of France, people in the areas outside Paris, are organizing completely ecological cities. Where they try to, they agree with all the neighbors, so that nothing that is done can harm. For example, it is one thing, from the base. What happens is that, of course, certain historical individualism that has been generated with modernity, takes away from us that capacity. But if we overcome individualism with solidarity, as has also been said in previous meetings, the human being goes towards living in solidarity. It is a community. The common good is fundamental. We are, if I were to say, as

Pope Francis says, this is our time. Precisely when the world shatters, that is the time of unity. And Jesus Christ did it, dying on the cross, marginally, but making it possible for all of us to understand that, looking at what they went through, eternal life was coming. And that is what we are living now too. We can do it. And that is, I believe that this meeting can take us a lot to invent these forms of relationship between everything and everything. Right? Vamos. Gracias.

Moderator:

Thank you also for the recall to work together to make up new things and also to bring the Lord of the Miracles into the example of how people are engaged and react. It is four o'clock and six minutes, and we are entering into the third and last round. And let me allow to go a little bit deeper personally.

Dostoyevsky spoke about beauty saving the world. And I would like to know if you personally think that this is something important, that salvation is something that really attracts you, imports you. How does it resonate with you? And to be saved from what? Or to be saved for what? So we want more in-depth answer here in this round. Thank you very much. Professor Karikó, your turn.

Karikó:

So, I never had any religious upbringing. I had to figure out myself to have some guide. And when I was 16 years old, I read a book by Hans Scheuer about how to handle stress. And I get all of my guidance from this book and to make sure that I saw myself, you know, have myself. So I want to, you know, I will think positively. With any stress, I will learn how to handle. I learn from this that, you know, when I have a serious situation and the average person's reaction would be revenge. I learned from Scheuer, never think about revenge because it escalates. You have to think about to feel gratitude from the same person you were just ready to kick their ass or something, to feel gratitude because then you can calm down.

And so I try to salvage myself, you know, to just follow this guidance and emphasize, you know, that what I learned again, that mental and physical health I have to have. So I exercise. I practice this, you know, stress relief. And I start to believe in myself, which again I learned from Scheuer that, you know, coming from a small town and my parents were just elementary school educated, and I had to believe in myself that, you know, going to an Ivy League

school, I can think about something that they don't. So for me, this salvation, we would say, you know, is coming from a teaching of a book, which actually later I learned, of course, it's Marcus Aurelius. Everything started from here in Italy.

So that it was the Stoic philosophy focusing on what we can do, what we can change. And so that's what I am doing right now: try to help the younger generation when I go out and give lectures and try to tell them and help them. You know, because the most problem is coming that they want others, their parents or their superior, the teachers, they want them to do something. And, you know, I emphasize them that you have to focus on what you can do, and then, you know, it will happen, those things. So, I try to help the young one and also try to help them to, you know, focus on science because they are not interested. It's too complicated for seems to them. And so I do things like helping others, but, you know, I don't have, I wish sometimes, you know, that I would have some religious belief. When my parents passed away, I wish that I could feel or think that they are looking down on me and with me, but I didn't have that. Thank you.

Moderator:

Thank you very much also for revealing that gratitude and not revenge could be the attitude. Thank you very much. Professor Romer.

Romer:

Let me respond first to some of the other comments. It's been a very stimulating experience, both this panel and the entire conference. I think non-profit organizations should be a very important part of this analysis of how norms are shaped. The fact that people participate in a voluntary organization might have some value in terms of the services that they provide, but if we just focus on that, we might miss the other value that they create, which is they help build in those people and in society more generally these somewhat pro-social norms. The United States actually has a terrible record of destroying non-profit organizations that we once had.

We used to have many non-profits in the United States, and I honestly think economists are partly to blame for this. We have pushed a kind of a worldview of selfishness is good, the market will control everything. We never identified any particular value of non-profits compared to for-profits, so when Wall Street

decided to make money by privatizing non-profits, nobody objected. They had the cover of protection from economists. I think we have a long way to go to undo some of the damage we've done. I also think, I hadn't thought about it, but the story of abortion in the United States deserves very careful attention because it's a case of a kind of an appeal to a strong authority, the Supreme Court, that actually produced a very significant backlash in the United States, and it's harmed other parts of our political system.

So I think activists need to learn the lesson here that if you grab a chance to just force your view on other people, you may actually end up losing the war because the backlash that you trigger is even worse than whatever benefits you get by forcing. Now, it's a very complicated dynamic, but as I said, we should study it more and understand it better. I want to come back and talk about the procession in Peru at the end. But in terms of salvation, I think one of the things that science can do for us, and I thought this was very well illustrated in the two presentations by Guido Tonelli and Sarah Johnson, is give us a little bit of a sense of awe about the world in which we live.

And this is not the role of the kind of the expert telling the dumb public to listen and do what we say because we know better. This is more like the guide who says to you, 'this is what I work on, and let me tell you about the really amazing things that we've discovered.' I think science does a particularly good job of helping a society when it's in that mode and also helping by exemplifying what it's like to have a group of people who commit rigorously to the notion of honesty, that to be a part of this community, you have to be honest, and if we catch you lying, we shun you, we kick you out.

I think this is a very important model for the rest of society, and I think it's part of why economies have been successful in the parts of the world where the scientific revolution first took off, Europe, North America, the Anglo offshoots. I think we've road in the economic side on a kind of a culture of a commitment to honesty that actually came from a different source, from the scientific side, and that I think, frankly, the culture of the market is now eroding very, very seriously. But I think there's a sense I want to try and convey here that humans are not perfect. A friend of mine characterizes us as mostly selfish, but a little bit groupish. There are times you can get us to care about a group, and when it's a very broad group, we can do amazing things.

If it becomes a narrow group that's fighting with another group, it really can bring out the very worst in us. So, in anticipating the remarks about the procession, another episode to study are the soccer hooligans, the people who identify with each other because we're all in favor of this team, something so meaningless as a team, but yet they go out and then they fight and engage in really horrible violence against each other in support of their side versus the other. So humans are capable of amazing things. We're capable of awful, awful things. And I think as people trying to push in a positive direction, we have to avoid being scolds, being arrogant, being critical. I think we have to be a little bit patient with humans and help everyone try and see a little bit of the awe.

We have to be willing to accept that sometimes humans will not do as well as they do in other times, and we have to keep our eye on the long run and try and get back as best we can to those good outcomes. I'm going to take a risk here, and it might get me in lots of trouble, but my wife was trying to persuade me to come to Italy, not this trip but another trip. My experience is mostly in France. I spent a year living in France. I know how to speak French. And she said to me, "You know, Paul, Italy is like France in a good mood." And so I think that's actually true. I've experienced that here.

So if we could somehow be kind of the people pushing for progress and moral growth, but do it in a good mood, I think we might actually have more chance of succeeding. And I think it's the bad mood, you know, punitive, dismissive, critical, arrogant mode that gets us, I think, into that trap of abortion. The last thing I wanted to say, just to be consistent, to live up to this idea of the good mood, is to tell you about my second family. We have three girls and a boy, my current wife and I, two Chihuahua, a Pomeranian, and a Terrier. The Terrier is blind. The Pomeranian is deaf. The two Chihuahua have no teeth. So we're kind of running a geriatric facility. It's not really a second family.

The Terrier, because she's blind, will just growl at random because she doesn't know what's going on to protect herself. The Pomeranian doesn't hear her. So the Pomeranian ignores her. So nothing bad happens. They get along great. But the Terrier sometimes growls at the other Chihuahua, and that Chihuahua growls back. The Terrier can't see, doesn't know what's going on, growls even more, and it escalates. And the Terrier has now bitten that Chihuahua two times. I've known that Terrier ever since she was a tiny pup. She slept with me. We saved her as a tiny puppy from some terrible characters. And so I have to love

her, even though she sometimes, as my wife says, is the worst dog she's ever seen. So you have to love them, but you still watch out, you try and keep them from doing the bad things. But yet, you help them try and improve, do better. On the street, when she gets nervous and starting to bark, I pick her up and just hold her up in the air so she can't get into a fight with any other dog. So if we can somehow keep that kind of love for all humans, understand they'll sometimes do a terrible thing like bite another helpless dog. But yet keep, in a positive sense, keep trying to look for the good in us and push us to do better. And I guess the connection to the procession is just that people are much more variable than even the Terrier. People can do amazing things. They can do horrible things. And we have to try to be positive and push for the right kinds of values because that's the only thing that will work. If we get punitive, if we get angry, if we get arrogant, if we get bossy, we won't succeed. And I still think we can do even better. Thank you.

Moderator:

Thank you for that. Thank you also for the humility that you expressed. And we have highlighted this: be patient with humans. I'm a journalist myself. This is a headline. Be patient with humans. Thank you very much.

Romer:

My wife says to me, "Paul, you remember, you're a human too."

Moderator:

You are too. Absolutely. Well, Professor Amato,

Amato:

Well, your question was safety for what? Well, if the problem is the end of the world, question mark, the simplest answer is to save us to be saved. Because in extreme conditions, safety becomes an end. So important that we sleep to say today why such a large part of politics seems to not realize it and be a slave of the interests that clash with the green agenda, to make it short. But once said this, and on this occasion it must be said, perhaps it is the first time in the history of the Homo Sapiens on Earth, and we do not realize it; once said this, how can we not add why everyone is saved, why inequalities that we bring in

our societies and in today's world are not projected also in this process of salvation and end up discarding waste?

Pope Francis was very insistent on the waste. And on this ground you are discarded in reality. And here we go to the other point that is very important. Inequalities are not an abstract concept; inequalities are thousands, millions of human beings that are not able to live the lives of others. This should always be felt as a permanent purpose of public action. To make sure that there are no waste, to make sure that anyone has the capacity to develop them, I am very convinced of the goodness of what my old friend said about the capabilities. The capabilities often unknown to the person who possesses them and yet they are there inside, that can be developed like the capabilities of each other. We Westerners talk more often about talent, hidden talents; in reality, the same concept.

And here comes the contribution of hard disciplines. Today we have medicine, we have technologies, we have economic processes that allow us all this. Today, this is allowed. You are all younger than me, but I'm sure that in the 1960s it was written by those from Frankfurt, Adorno and his whole school, that we could give up the word utopia, because utopia always meant being in the condition to feed all the human beings. It is an utopia, an unrealizable dream. Today, it was written in the 1960s, this is possible. So there is no need for utopia, we just have to organize ourselves. Here we are, we have not done it yet. And here, allow me one last reminder. I mentioned the responsibility that Christianity has in this.

I don't know if everyone realizes, excuse me if I say so, what it means to have embraced that religion in which God became man. It only exists in Christianity, the God made man. The God made man means that in every human being there is the imprint of God. And so, if you recognize yourself in that religion, you cannot not seek that imprint in every human being. Here, it is not the tail of a peacock that I can raise to be a peacock. It is a great responsibility that must be able to play not only in your spiritual exercises, but in your concrete life, in your daily life. That is why we have written a book about religions in the face of a dry policy, we have written.

And for this, the role here of the Christian religion is particularly high.

Moderator:

Thank you very much. Thanks for putting also religions and in particular Christianity at the core of this responsibility and also the words from the Pope, not leaving behind anyone. Thank you very much. Professor Lütz?

Lütz:

Yes. Dostoevsky's words have always touched me deeply. In the face of all the lies and evil in the world, is it possible to sense or even see and experience the truth and the good and the beauty of art? In my view, the decisive difference between artificial intelligence and human beings is that artificial intelligence is not creative at all, whereas human beings, every human being, including the disabled, are always creative. They create sense from the core of their existence, whereas artificial intelligence can only copy.

The highest expression of human creativity, however, is art. In truly great art, we can enter into a genuine relationship with highly creative people from times long past. We can touch the divine. We can sense and even experience what eternal life is. Most medieval people could not read or write, but in the pictures of their churches, the *Biblia pauperum*, the Bible of the poor, they could literally see the sense of their lives. They could see what they believed and in this way feel salvation. It was only later that the enjoyment of art cooled into a bourgeois aesthetic pleasure. But the embers still glow in the great works of great artists. In the book I mentioned at the beginning, *The Sense of Life*, I tried with the help of the art of the city of Rome from its foundation to the present day to make sense visible and salvation tangible.

Salvation from what and for what? From what? Certainly from the fear that arises from the narrowness of our limited life in this world. For what? For eternal life, of course. But what exactly is that? It is not endless life which according to Plato would be the hell of indifferent routines. Eternal life transcends time. It is that which will outlast our lives. Moments of deep love for a person, moments of being moved by art and music. I am seriously convinced that an atheist who looks at Michelangelo's *Pietà* in Peter's Basilica in Rome for several hours with understanding can become a Christian without any texts. At the bottom, he can still sense the Madonna's suffering in the heavy folds of the robe; but the more the view approaches her head, the calmer the folds become, and when he then immerses himself in the face of the Mother of God, he will see that she is smiling, lightly and gracefully.

A mother smiling at the corpse of her son on her lap. This smile can only be understood if this mother truly believes in the resurrection, and when the viewer then sees this beautiful body of Christ, a work of art of almost divine beauty, this Pietà is the only sculpture that Michelangelo was ultimately satisfied with and which he signed, then one can truly see and experience the Incarnation of God. God becomes flesh. Resurrection, Easter, Incarnation of God, Christmas; the rest of Christianity is secondary. Anyone, anyone who has lost a deeply loved one and becomes engrossed in the mysterious smile of this woman must either think she is insane or he can believe that this smile is true. And then he is a Christian.

The smile of Michelangelo's Pietà was created at the same time as the smile of Leonardo da Vinci's Mona Lisa, and yet it is completely different. The Mona Lisa shows the superior smile of a self-assured time. The smile of the Pietà is a redeemed smile, and the delicate, graceful gesture of her left arm invites us all to trust in this redemption. Nowadays, language contributes a lot to the division of society. Those who do not express themselves in a politically correct way are quickly marginalized. Couldn't art help to heal these divisions? After the publication of my book, a Czech journalist wrote to me that Czech society was possibly even more divided than German society. But last year there was an exhibition about the not very important Czech artist of the Baroque time Petr Brandl. People came en masse to see it all over Czech. And strange as it may sound, it had really united society again. Medieval people had a fascinating idea. They knew healing pictures that are images in front of which you could be healed. The Isenheim Altar in Colmar is one of such healing pictures. It originally stood in the Antonine Hospice in Isenheim and all the beds of all the sick were turned towards this moving painting by Matthias Grunewald. And people believed that if you looked at it from morning to night, you could be healed, cured, redeemed. And that also applies to music. I really believe that anyone who listens to the 'Laudato Dominum' from Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, 'Vespere Solemnis de Confessore' experiences eternity that transcends time. That they can agree with the world as a whole. And Heinrich Schipperges, the great physician and philosopher from Heidelberg, said once to be healthy you have to agree with the world as a whole. Thank you.

Moderator:

Thank you very much for these kind words also for the redemption smile of Mary in La Pietà. And we welcome the Cardinal for the last words prior to our coffee.

Castillo: To not take too long I'll say something very briefly. I think that the most important point of the experience of faith is beauty, because it's a gift, a gift for free. And as we have been, in the case of my country, we communicate faith faith by means of the family, the mother, the father, the brothers. The experience of faith in us is very close and has been educating us in appreciation, despite the fact that obviously the families always fight each other. Some say, 'I am Icoñones, I am Castillo,' everyone fights. But there is always that internal cultivation of the identity through human ties. Much more so when one has later been educated, for example, in a school for a long time, and has friends throughout life.

I believe that all those experiences that we humans have, due to the distress of the life system that we are living now, which has in some way, we have to somehow make it a little calmer. I believe that one of the great reforms that we have to make in globalization is to make it a little slower. Why? Because this global system has derived in communication, for an immediate part, and simultaneously in easy money. It is invested according to what we will earn in 500 years. But those who will be born, will be born with a little money. They will be born with a debt. And that is the big problem. So, the option of Jesus, or God, or money, continues to be valid so that there is joy and so that there is beauty.

And that is a fundamental thing, I think it is called mamona, it is called money, Lucas. Jesus taught his disciples to get out of that vicious circle, because the priests of his time were only looking for money. The priests of the Temple of Jerusalem. It was a business, it was a bank. And then he gave them a pseudonym, Oligopistos. That pseudonym means worshipers of the faith of the elite. It does not mean little faith. When you say oligopoly, do you say little business, or is it a business of few? No? When you say oligarchy, you do not say little government. I said government of few. If we say oligopistia, it is not little faith, it is faith of few. The faith of the elite, the faith of the few.

And Jesus says to them, do not worry about what you are going to eat, how you are going to dress. Look at the lilies of the field and the birds of the sky, who are not sewing, nor weaving, nor worried. But God dresses them with all his

beauty and they give us joy. Today, our great problem is the look in which we are educated and we have to overcome it. And I believe that the Church is the place, because also in the Church today there are problems like in the Temple of Jerusalem. There are bad looks towards people who are not of their own race, there are dominions of people, there are Catholic associations that have destroyed people terribly. One of them we have had to investigate and condemn in the diocese of Lima.

And in Peru, with the help of the Holy Father. That is why, and we also see the people to repair those who can be repaired. It is not just about condemning, we have to change the structures. Everything that opposes evangelization and beauty must be changed and improved. That is why our experience of being bishops, above all, is oriented to how beautiful it is to generate beauty in the Church. And then, for example, some complain, but the Cathedral of Lima today is a place of welcome of the provincials who come with their songs and make a more flexible liturgy. But we have to do it, because if not, there is no life in the Church. The Church that welcomes the simple people with their searches, with their affection, with their spirits, with their festivities, is a Church that recognizes the other and is realized as a Church, as a sign of the Lord, just sharing and encouraging. So I think that this great task is our mission, but without a doubt, beauty will save us.

Moderator:

Thank you very much.

(Coffee Break)

End of the first part.