

Brussels 8th September 2009

**MAKING IT PAY TO BE GOOD - INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE,
VIRTUE IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE, THE COMMON GOOD, GLOBAL
GOVERNANCE, AND THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE**

PETER.G.XUEREB

**Professor of European and Comparative law, Jean Monnet Professor of European
Union Law and European Integration, Chairman of the Jean Monnet European Centre
of Excellence, University of Malta.**

Introduction - Towards Global Ethics, Institutions and Rule of Law

I am deeply honoured to have been invited to address this conference in this 20th anniversary year for the Jean Monnet Programme. My Centre and department have profited immensely and are still benefiting from our association with the Programme and through it with so many colleagues from other Member States, neighbouring states in the Mediterranean, and beyond. Our projects have tracked Malta's progress towards membership of the Union, the Union's Mediterranean policy as it evolved, the development of the European Union itself through the various stages from Maastricht through Amsterdam, Nice, the Constitutional Treaty and the Lisbon Treaty; the experience of Malta as a small but committed Member State of the European Union over the first five years of membership in the Union, and all this against the background of globalisation and its political, economic, social and moral implications.

These activities have led to international collaborative research and high profile conferences. Many of these were aimed at the general public and at civil society in particular. Indeed our Civil Society Project, embarked upon by the European Documentation and Research Centre as a Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence in 2004 and concluded in July of this year, is a classic case of what can be done when academics get together with NGO experts to address current issues and debates of European, national and even global salience. However, there was an added dimension, namely the purpose of actually seeking to contribute to the European debate and to the formulation of policy even, we hoped, at European Union level. We have endeavoured to anticipate trends, and may even have ended up setting one or two, who knows? The list of titles of books produced by the study indicates the range of issues covered by the Project. They are:

1. Anti-Discrimination, Inclusion and Equality in Malta
2. The Family, Law, Religion and Society in the EU and Malta

3. Business Ethics and Religious Values in the EU and Malta: For a Moral Level Playing Field
4. The 'Good' Company: Business Ethics in the EU and Malta
5. The Fight Against Poverty
6. Malta in the EU: Five Years On and Looking To the Future

I list them here in order to show that, with the support of the Jean Monnet Project, we have, for example, been writing and talking about the perils and harm of short-termism in many spheres of life (and particularly in the economic and managerial spheres) and its deleterious effects on social cohesion and even on long-term economic stability; and we were doing this a full two years and longer before the advent of the financial crisis that has brought so much to a halt over the last two years; and we were writing and talking about the fight against poverty two years before the European Year of the Fight against Poverty. The same can be said of our work on the Mediterranean, and that on the various European treaty reform proposals. The Commission's support has enabled us to take an active role in highlighting for a Maltese and wider audience what often end up at the time of publication of our reports as the current issues of the day but which start off as an early appreciation of underlying dilemmas of a political, social and moral nature.

We have by no means been alone in this. When I look at what our colleagues throughout Europe are doing and have done by dint of the Jean Monnet Programme, I see that our experience has been far from unique. Indeed, it more probably reflects the norm. Our own experience in other projects where we have not been the co-ordinator has certainly been the same, as in the case of our collaborative work with Professor Papisca of the University of Padua on Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship, to which we were very proud to contribute from the perspective of the Mediterranean, coordinating from our part the work of academics from Mediterranean Member and non-Member States.

I was initially asked to speak about migration, euro-med relations and intercultural dialogue; but also to do so within the general theme of the future of the Jean Monnet Programme and the future of the European Union and its key policy choices. I have written elsewhere on migration and will do so again. But I thought it would be remiss of me to let this occasion pass by without focusing on the broader issues that encapsulate the single issues. I therefore focus on what I see as the key challenges for us all at this point in our history, and on the contribution that we as academics may yet make to the evolution of Europe in the World. The answer to the questions: "what is the future of Europe, and what role for Europe in the world?" cannot be answered, in my view, by looking inwards.

We can only begin to know the answer by first asking: "*What kind of a World do we want?*" Europe can then take the shape that will work in and for that world. But we need to "think global" first. And to the answer to this question, two points are central: first, there can be no

answer worth anything without real intercultural dialogue not least about Values and Virtue that feeds into consensus at global level, and secondly, Europe has a degree of experience with intergovernmental and deeper co-operation between sovereign and increasingly non-homogeneous states and their peoples that surely can be brought to the forum of dialogue about the future shape of our world, including the instruments and techniques of dialogue and decision-making at global level, and therefore about that of our Europe.

I emphasise the word “experience”. I myself have used the word ‘model’ in the past. This has been open to misinterpretation; to an interpretation that was never intended. The Union, the Europeans, have no ambition to expand to take over the globe (I think!). Nor can we imagine that our values/systems/techniques can be taken wholesale and transplanted. What we have is a chequered experience of seeking always - even when, as in recent times, we seem to be stumbling and falling back - to somehow keep the dynamic of further co-operation moving forward – with a large measure of success in these terms. What we can offer for consideration are the whole complex of experiences, good or bad, as they seem to us or have seemed at times, and some key elements of the way we work together, for thought and study and possible application in the global context – a context that cries out for some new framework for deeper co-operation and joint endeavour. I will therefore focus on Intercultural Dialogue and take a global as well as European perspective, rather than stopping on migration and euro-med relations as such. We can only succeed even in these spheres through dialogue at the global level. My key phrases are therefore Dialogue, Values and the European experience of ‘part-global’ governance.

Towards a new international order

I will highlight, then, some of the key insights to emerge from the project work that we have done, and add some others. I will try to get across some main ideas that in my view remain of key importance in addressing the greatest challenge that faces us today as Europeans and global citizens, and one that we share on equal terms of interest with our fellow world citizens - the construction of a new global order based on justice and intergenerational solidarity or, as it has been put, “a new order of relations in the world”, a true international community characterised by shared responsibility for the “universal common good” while safe in each other’s cultural achievements and differences. To this end I will propose a research and policy agenda on which some of us have started to work, but which in my view needs to take centre stage for the participants in this joint endeavour will be very many. I see it as not only falling within, but also as the culmination of the work thus far done, in European Integration Studies, and I hope that this will come up again in the following sessions of this conference. I shall lead into this via the issue of migration.

Migration

I start by referring to migration, and even illegal immigration, as it is a theme of this session and also a major concern for us and for other Members of the Union, but I do so only as a “peg” on which to hang my larger theme. Malta, my country, need not be associated only

with the immigration question. My view is that we should prefer to be associated with a general approach to common challenges – one rooted in solidarity, intercultural dialogue and human values that have a reach beyond (but include) the challenges of immigration and the integration of migrants. So what I say on this wider canvas is of relevance also in the context of migration policy.

On the specific issue of migration and the Mediterranean, the migratory pressures that come from poverty and war with their many causes - including climate change, state failure, wholesale breaches of human rights, and so on - translate into significant challenges for the Union and especially for the Member states on the front line. This not only in terms of controlling the influx of illegal immigrants whether at the borders or by a constructive European overseas development policy and a sensitive common immigration policy. For all Member States face the challenge of the “integration” of ethnic and racial and religious minorities. *But what precisely do we mean by “integration” in a context of human freedom? We need to focus deeply on this question.* The Union, and the Jean Monnet Programme, can take the lead in clarifying and developing Public International Law, European Law and national laws in the entire area of migration, asylum and refugee law, and then immigration and integration policies can be evolved that operate in full respect of human rights as re-interpreted in the new context of our century. The Maltese government for one is struggling to find the right formula; we see the ugly face of racism and discrimination mixing with occasional incidents of mainly peaceful but sometimes violent protests from detainees awaiting determination of their status while living in miserable conditions, but also in circumstances where official documentation and true personal histories are often hard to come by.

Our studies show that we all, in Europe as elsewhere, need to review the substance and sense of obligation towards, and of solidarity with, those people who find themselves in distress for reasons not of their making, and that this implies reviewing the legal and political instruments available to us at international, regional and national level.

I now wish to broaden the canvas by developing the idea that we can start, or at least contribute to, a global dialogue about what is good for all and how to achieve it as a common project.

The Need to Work towards a Common Understanding of the Common Good

It seems to me that what is required of us ALL at the present time is that we make a genuine and new commitment to the clarification of the philosophy of the Common Good in global, and then European, terms. I see this as *the key question* to be addressed by us all at this stage in our common history. *What do we mean by the Common Good? What is it in any particular context?*

I would argue, again, that we have to *think globally in the first place*, and that from this all else should and will follow, including for us a clearer view of the Union's role in the world, as well as in its internal policy-making, and this across a whole host of areas from energy to security to trade and aid to state and human rights, translating into a coherent set of new long-, medium-, and short-term policy objectives rooted in a new 'deal' on state and human rights. Without a new and clear sense of the Common Good we will stumble from quick fix to late quick fix. On the other hand, focusing on the common good means focusing on *Values to be observed at national, European and global level, with institutions and policies adapted, if not newly-designed, for and directed towards that Common Good.*

And so, to *Dialogue*. It seems to me that we can get to the point of *knowing the Common Good* only with proper dialogue about Values. And this dialogue must evidently be intercultural. For this purpose, as several are doing, *the academic community could work on and through such concepts as the "common heritage of mankind" and the concept of "common goods", and other related concepts that will enable us to focus on preserving and sharing our scarce planetary resources, reducing and then eliminating the waste of resources and human potential that are currently absorbed in keeping a precarious power balance* instead of their being channelled into the alleviation of poverty, misery and injustice in constructive ways in a spirit of solidarity, and then prosperity and thereby security and justice for all. As I will say shortly, in my view *a new or renewed global architecture is clearly needed for these purposes*. Europe has been there before with the European Coal and Steel Treaty and the (less operative) Euratom Treaty, and more recent Energy Treaty initiatives, and several EC Treaty and EU Treaty revisions as demanded mainly by enlargement - *experiences that offer up a complex of concepts and elements* which can also be utilised in designing a new global institutional architecture, for the purpose, inter alia, of the peaceful sustainable production, development and use of all forms of energy as only one example. But first, allow me to say some more about Values.

Virtue in the Global (and European) Public Sphere – Global Ethics and the Dialogue-about-Values Approach

Our projects at the University of Malta have been about civil society confronting 'the system' by facing the latter with its experience of values in action. They have been at least in part about eliminating double standards, about being true to values. Of course, this means the rule of law and democracy and the observance of human rights. But it also means renewed dialogue about their content and about social and moral Values. For example, some of our project work in Malta shows that what many see as a creeping moral relativism or amorality is then countered by an equal and opposite call for the safeguarding of traditional values identified with the official and still prevalent religion (Roman Catholicism). This applies particularly in the sphere of family values.

I mention this particular aspect because other, non-European non-Christian societies face the same dilemma. Traditional family values are close to the hearts of the people; yet many are the calls for recognition of rights, equality and justice for those who find themselves outside the 'norm' - homosexuals, unwed mothers, separated couples wanting to start new lives and families yet having no access to divorce under Maltese law, transsexuals – and on a wider canvas traditions appear threatened by migration and immigration leading to fear and mistreatment of immigrants, female immigrants, female black immigrants, female black illegal immigrants with children. It is in such contexts that dialogue and understanding are so important and that ideas such as “integration” or “multiple discrimination”, and rules that advance “integration”, prohibit improper conduct, and remedy harm need to be further studied and developed.

What this also means is that in Malta and across Europe, as also outside it, a whole *new human rights discourse as linked to values is taking place*. Often, in the West this has taken place in terms that exclude religion, although I think that this too is changing. Yet, seen from a traditional cultural and religious perspective outside the core of Europe a liberal humanist relativist discourse is the language of social turmoil if not sedition. Suddenly (or less so), for societies unused to relativism or cultural pluralism, the very foundations of society seem to be rocking: the definition of ‘marriage’ is up for discussion; the definition of ‘the family’ is up for discussion; and within Europe as elsewhere the definition of good capitalism’, ‘good management’, ‘good government’, indeed it seems the definition of ‘Good’ itself – as accepted by most of us over the last few decades - is up for discussion. This in itself is not new in human history perhaps, but such soul-searching always poses a challenge to each generation. And as for any new challenge, a counter-reaction is experienced to any reaction. From the perspective of the liberal (neo-liberal?) relativist humanist in Europe, any challenge to accepted ‘European values’ of pluralism and individual right and the economic and social progress that accompanied their evolution, and any call to dialogue about values, is then seen as a call to admit to a failure that is not felt by many, and the instinct is to dig in one’s heels and reject the motion that “western” values and notions of human rights, proclaimed as universal, are being put ‘up for discussion’.

So, for example, on the whole, the Maltese would argue that there is much in our family way of life that is worth preserving and indeed sharing. However, many of the same would also say that a new justice must be made available to those who are different. Often, the problem is that there is a lacuna in the rules that needs to be filled; but how to do this in a way that can be universally acknowledged and respected? The same dilemma is at the root of much, if not all, societal, including political, disquiet in other societies around the world, including those seen as posing the gravest military and terrorist threats to one another. We can try to come up with solutions individually as nations or as regional blocks, and these solutions may satisfy us in those spheres at least temporarily, but will these create yet new sources of misunderstanding, tension or worse between us and those beyond those particular spheres that we inhabit? For Malta, membership of the Union has meant an openness in debate previously impossible to imagine and hard to generate in Maltese society. In truth, that which

has simmered beneath the surface for many years has emerged to test the very fabric of our society. Yet it is clear that even in areas such as family life and values, where the Union has no express Treaty competence, the reality is that no area of life is untouched even if only tangentially by the activities of the institutions of the Union. The same is true of the wider world beyond Europe's borders. And globalisation means that this phenomenon is true for every nation and society on this earth.

Therefore, no one is happy; for everybody's fundamental societal underpinnings are "up for discussion". Yet, they are! And increasingly so in the global as well as the regional and the national spheres. Surely, these must be discussed in the open and with full respect for difference if we are to create a better international order.

On a broader canvas, let us ask: How universally moral is it: to set up and use systems for the non-payment of one's dues to society; to pillage or pollute the environment that is everyone's heritage; to lure youngsters into self-damaging behaviour; to exploit the weak, the desperate and the vulnerable; to hold back the development of other nations who are perceived as potential competitors; to withhold needed resources including medicinals from those in need of them for their health and even survival; to put people's lives or health at risk in numerous ways, often in the name of progress and scientific advancement; to keep women and children and others in servitude; to permit millions to go without access to basic human necessities; to put profit before caution in the face of possible harm? I could go on. These are among the many moral dilemmas that face us all and that call for a principled response to the complex considerations at play. And it is increasingly clear that it is the international community that must needs address them. It seems to me that we must all 'evolve' (perhaps there is a better word?) together before our differences pull as any further apart. Only a major historic effort of real dialogue about Virtue in the Public Sphere, while valuing and respecting our differences, holds out the hope for the creation of a new Common Understanding around Values, one that will work to reduce tension and heighten justice in the world. It seems to me that what we must search out is not uniformity in all cases, but a new explicit basic common understanding of virtue in all contexts.

Virtue and the Socio-Economic, Business and Finance Model – an Example

We have come to accept that when it comes to values below the level of core human rights (sometimes even there!) there is often no one, fixed, Union 'view' on each and every issue, so that when it came to dialoguing with neighbours and the wider world we could not take 'one view' on an issue to any regional or global dialogue forum. And if there were, the presentation of it would need to be sensitive and correct. However, perhaps, we can identify broadly accepted viewpoints in particular contexts. For example, as it was put in March in the University of Padua by Luc Van den Brande, President of the Committee of the Regions,

“Our model is not a model of concentration of wealth, but a model of solidarity, equal opportunities, cooperation and partnership”. More broadly, it is an example - an experience - of flexible multi-level or multi-sphere cooperation. But it is also an example of a construct that tends inherently towards ultimate enforceability and the rule of law - of a sense of ‘bindingness’ - of commitment to what has been agreed. Our great challenge as human beings is to create the trust - through the construction of workable institutions and processes - that will allow such order to prevail beyond our particular sphere(s).

The fact remains that, although there has been much convergence if not integration, there is no one view on all things in Europe, but indeed still lack of consensus, for example, over any one economic or managerial or social model. Of course, there is room always for divergence but, utilising all our knowledge and experience and those of our fellow citizens of the world, *can we not come closer to a core basic common ethical understanding of what is right and what is wrong in terms of the common good?*

We must first agree that Values – ‘virtue’ as it is often referred to in business ethics, taking us beyond the ‘value of profit-making’ - should permeate our trade and our commerce; recent events are indeed spurring us in this direction. But can we then fail to also address together some of the harder issues about which we have for too long agreed to disagree, with the result that ethical considerations have perhaps given way to ‘market realities’ *sans* ethics? For agreeing on core values means taking a hard look at our national models, and the ways in which our own convictions and institutions prevent us from working a common understanding of virtue into our economic activity. Surely we cannot accept on the one hand that trade and commerce are not ends in themselves, and that justice and human rights demand the pursuit of wealth in a proper manner and then its proper use, without on the other hand also facing and resolving questions of social justice in the production and distribution of wealth created and generated by a market supported by the efforts and resources of all. And this will mean looking with an open mind at one another’s ‘models’, and again at our own.

Subsidiarity, a principle often interpreted and employed in the EU context in order to keep social political discourse at national level, seems today to be pointing us in the direction of requiring action *at the EU level*, and it certainly seems to me to point to the need for discussion and consensus on a number of issues *at global level if we are to create a level moral playing field at global level*, in other words *if the aim is to ‘make it pay to be good’ at global level*. Such a moral playing field must be universal or it will not work, for if not universal the playing field will not be level – and it will pay to be bad when others are trying to be good. And it will not pay to be good when others can be bad; indeed that would be market-place suicide. This is the real lesson of the market failures that we have suffered: greed is infectious and will spread if unchecked. This goes beyond concluding that while markets must be allowed to operate state, regional and even global bodies must be allowed to regulate in new ways; for it means *re-organising our ideas of ‘good’ market operation* not only in technical terms but especially in virtue (ethical) terms, and dialoguing about this in order that appropriate rules be put in place at all relevant levels (or spheres).

In this challenging context, academics have noted the changes required of their disciplines. None more so in recent times than our economist colleagues. But similar ‘doctrinal crises’ have presented themselves to international relations specialists, to political scientists, to social anthropologists, to moral theologians, to management and business scientists, to scientists in general, and even to law professors. Key debates have been coming to a head: Constitutionalism or not? Regulation or self-regulation, or no regulation, de-regulation or re-regulation? Free market or social market? Freedom of religion or freedom from religion? And so on. *And through all this, the underlying question: are supposed alternatives such as these false antagonists? Is the matter not so complex that we need to be able to employ a mix of strategies and tools, and the appropriate mix at the appropriate time and in the appropriate context? So, when is the appropriate time for what; what makes the right mix for which context?* Some writers in the economics field use the phrase “complexity economics” to signify the complexity of the arguments and the fact that no one idea or theory can provide a full explanation and basis for action, unless it be perhaps a super-theory that gives due play to each relevant theoretical standpoint. If this is a new awakening to a truth in economics, are we not all guilty, to some degree, of mono-disciplinarity, and worse, within that mono-disciplinarity, of mono-theory? *Call what is needed ‘complexity studies’, call it “cross-disciplinary-complexity studies”’. But even these notions may not encapsulate the fullness of the idea. For underpinning all these efforts must also be the overriding preoccupation with Values Dialogue with a view to identifying the Common Good – which all disciplines should ideally serve.*

Again then, *what is the Common Good as far as the business world is concerned?* We now hear of some American MBA students devising “the oath of the MBA graduate” to take full account of Corporate Governance and Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility. It has been left to our students to declare that which should have formed not only the basis of vague and voluntary, sometimes self-serving, codes of practice but also served as principles underpinning the legitimacy or otherwise of actions and omissions of company boards, general meetings, credit institutions, financial services regulators, governments, international organisations of the highest moral and legal global authority for which some form of accountability should have been in place. The American MBA students’ effort is symptomatic of the desire to commit to culture shift, of a newfound sense of responsibility going beyond short-termism and certainly beyond over-riding self-interest (enlightened or not). As many of you will be aware, even have argued, and as our studies also show and argue, this is not a culture shift of whose need we all have suddenly become aware. Academia and civil society have not been lacking in proponents of the need to rethink the prevailing corporate culture; but these fought an uphill struggle in the face of seemingly unending profit and economic growth. It is a culture shift that takes its root in justice, while being forced upon us through necessity and the wisdom of hindsight - but is no less welcome for all that. Perhaps we should admit as much, and use this new wisdom as a basis for closer co-operation with our partners across the world. As I see it, then, the task ahead of us all, academics included, is to find the way forward by building on the truly “good” examples of pursuit of

the Common Good – as well as the personal or private good - in the economic, trade, financial and business spheres, and by working to make this a global reality. This leads me to my next point, on the institutional and decision-making dimensions.

Articulating and Pursuing the Common Good: the Institutional and Decision-making Dimensions

I am sure that we have all detected a change in hearts and minds over recent months. Men and women the world over are shouting, saying or whispering that they will not tolerate the rich-poor divide, greed and exploitation, corruption and double standards, acts of hegemony and power dominance, any longer. They are particularly sickened and angered by what strikes them as the operation of double standards.

This public feeling, this vivid consciousness, must find expression through appropriate institutions at global level. While perhaps the immediate need is for a forum working short-to medium term to begin to articulate the common good in dialogue, it increasingly appears clear that mere tinkering with the major international institutions that we know will not suffice.

A historic change is with us of the same magnitude as the renaissance, the enlightenment, and the post-second world war bringing-together of the various lessons of the past to create the organisations, the institutions and the international order that we have known for the last sixty-five years. These, it seems, no longer serve. We need a quantum leap on the scale and depth of those historic movements now.

We learn daily of the full extent of hunger, poverty, violence and injustice and tyranny of all kinds, yet feel defeated by the sheer scale and complexity of the challenges. We look for the international order that should mount or facilitate adequate responses, and find this lacking. The citizen has daily reminders of the smallness and fragility of the planet, of the precariousness of human existence, of the fragility of prosperity and wealth, of the haphazard and unjust inequalities that both divide rich and poor nations while being present also in the former, of the elusiveness of peace and security; and, in the face of all this, sees only, as it seemed until more hopeful recent signs from across the Atlantic, power plays and posturing, instead of genuine co-operative institutions that are empowered to take the preventive or remedial action that no one community or state or group of states can take. We need effective regional and global institutions. However large or small our own nation states, *we all need global solutions at least as much as we need to strive for national and regional ones. Indeed, increasingly, it will be at global level that the solution must be found.*

Back home in Europe, the stage is set for the next stage in the evolution of European political, economic and social integration. If it happens, it will be contested as well as applauded. The same if it does not. So it has always been as the Communities grew in

membership over the years. The last sixty years have shown what can be done and also – just as usefully - what cannot be done (or at least not in the way first attempted). Yet *our experiences in Europe must surely be relevant to a world that is crying out for a new international order. The successes, the failures, the ‘non-linear’ evolution of the Union and its institutions and the relations of these with the Member States and their citizens - who yet are also Union ‘citizens’ – all this, surely, can provide lessons and almost certainly some possible elements for consideration by those entrusted with developing a new international order. My argument is that we need to consider seriously, all of us together, whether the international order can develop as such on the basis of values, tools, instruments and institutions of a kind that the European experience has shown to be workable among sovereign states and peoples. But also that we need to ally future developments to real inter-cultural dialogue about values.*

The elements

The Equality of all ‘Members’; the principle of subsidiarity (to be applied at all levels from local to global); Citizen Representation and Civil Society dialogue; decision-making centred around cohesion (the pursuit of the common good together) allied to real and justiciable procedural and substantive solidarity and instruments of cohesion, yet with all necessary and proportionate flexibility and differentiation (including the use of soft law such as typified by the open method of co-ordination, regulated enhanced cooperation); the ultimate bindingness in principle of legitimately taken ‘majority’ decisions arrived at in dialogue; the direct effect of clear and unambiguous norms; judicial review: so, the rule of law on the basis of general principles of law; institutions to match. *These and other elements of the European experience could transform for the better governance at world level, based as they are on fair, equal and solidary processes.* Fair rules based on the equality of nations and peoples and individuals (but allowing for majority decision-making) must be agreed *dialogically*, but with a view to their being followed and ultimately enforced. Our studies on the fight against poverty, on business ethics, on international trade, on overseas development aid, on external relations and sustainable development in all its aspects, all point to this conclusion and I have argued this way also in connection with Euro-Med and wider co-operation (and therefore expressed the hope for some rapid evolution in this sense of the *Union for the Mediterranean* construct).

The “Vision”

Allow me to repeat the vision. The international order would be rendered more orderly, it would be rendered more fair, it would be rendered wholly inclusive *if all players, major and minor, were brought together to devise new institutions, and affirm the values and adopt the general principles that will point these institutions towards the Common Good. Equals producing a new international (global) order.*

Of course, such an initiative cannot be driven or pursued unilaterally by the EU. And similar experiences exist elsewhere! And in any case, the European elements are only some of the elements that could find their way into the ultimate result of serious joint effort. However, whoever takes the lead, it must be clear from the outset that this has to be a joint global project.

Lest I be thought ambivalent, let me declare (in case this remains unclear) that I am, in the end, an admirer of what has been done in the name of the EU. There are those even among us who are not such great admirers, and there are those who see the European Project itself as pervaded by unjustified hyperbole, as driven by an unstated or understated political agenda that no one understands, as lacking democratic credentials and so on. We are by now familiar with all these traits and with these arguments (but arguments for what?) and they must be kept in mind always. The EU Project is a unique phenomenon. Even within Europe it remains a contested one. Federalists, ‘crypto-federalists’, or neo-functionalists and others all take different views, and it is facile – and no doubt incorrect - to argue that the Treaties as such can provide the world with a set ‘model’. But all will agree, I believe, that there are certain key elements which can give the desired results with the correct approach and with goodwill, with trust - an essential commodity which these elements can themselves foster among the participants. *The Union has gone from a grouping of six mostly homogeneous states, to a grouping of over thirty sovereign and significantly less homogeneous states. This experience can afford us real clues as to what a ‘global’ grouping with a peace and prosperity ethos might look like.* The fact remains that the EU is not a state. It will never replicate ‘the State’. The relevance of the European experience comes from this fact, and also from the fact that even less can we be after creating ‘statehood’ at world level. And need we say that the EU has no agenda to take over the world? The angst that one often sees in Europe about the “failure” to turn the Union into a federal state is for others in Europe totally misplaced, and replaced by admiration at the engagement of a differentiating flexibility that nevertheless does not undermine basic commitment or steady progress in cohesion, solidarity and mutual assistance.

Hope and Academia – The Jean Monnet Programme

What is suggested here is a research and policy agenda - to be undertaken with all urgency - that will explore the possible application at global and lower levels of the key principles and dynamics, all the key elements, in the European experience (plus some others), with no preconceptions and in full dialogue and cooperation and alongside other sources – in a truly global intellectual, political and moral initiative.

The news of hope? The Jean Monnet Programme has already proven its ability to produce multi-theory and cross-disciplinary insights into what is required in terms of future methodologies and future research within and – most crucially - *across* all disciplines. It has shown how the academic world can play its part in fashioning the free and new thinking that

will produce the new multi-level international order, an *order* through the whole of human existence for all peoples and all human persons. There is much to be done.

It seems clear to me that if flexibility remains key in the realm of practical day-to-day politics, it is Values, agreed values, that will give real *order* to the way in which we, the citizens of the world, approach our common challenges and opportunities. And these Values need to be articulated through dialogue on every plane and at every level. There is incontrovertible evidence that the core values that lay at the basis of the great movements of the past are largely subscribed to across the globe *at the level of the citizenry*. However, there is also the reality and certainly the perception of inadequacy of articulation in normative terms, or of lip service in so many contexts even to core values. Such must be corrected. Secondly, while it is essentially a secular European and international order that we have and that must be rebuilt, this most certainly cannot happen in a value-free or value-dismissive context. There is therefore the crucial pressing need to engage in full and honest dialogue about the place of Virtue, values and the valuing of difference of which I have spoken to you today – and this across the entire field of policy and human activity.

Hence my plea, namely that work on the ethical and intercultural dimensions to academic work in the humanities, in law, in economics, in political science, in international relations, in so many fields, be stepped up as a matter of priority. Values, including moral values and ethics, not least those inspired and taught by the main religions, must be the subject of deep study and account.

I repeat one fundamental point. The main religions are far more than after-life and heaven and hell and so on. He who sees them in this way misses the point. They are about values to be practised in this life - between individuals, in society, in government, in international relations, in international governance; they propose a set of social values that promote justice, peace and order – the ideals (and goals) that all of us speak of, and lament the absence of, day after day. To debunk religions, to dismiss them as dangerous or at best useless, is to debunk a primary source of the values that can source the virtuous international order that we in fact seek.

Challenge is always the best intellectual stimulus. And what great challenge faces us! We should remember that the idea of a University is based on the idea that knowledge is one. No branch or element of human cognition can be excluded if the truth is to be found. The modern ‘multiversities’ do not follow this ideal. True universities, singly but especially if working together through cross-disciplinarity and cross-culturalism, hold the key to a fuller understanding of the unity of knowledge, and of the truth. Diversity working for Unity is what is required above all else in academia at the present time.

I see the Jean Monnet Programme as a leader in this great endeavour. I am pleased to be able to say this, and with this to mark my personal sense of enthusiasm and celebration on the occasion of this anniversary of the Jean Monnet Programme. And I express my own awe and gratitude for the dedicated and inspired service and remarkable achievements of all those in

the Institutions, especially in the Commission, who have made so much possible over the last twenty years. I thank in a special way those whom I have known personally and in relation to whom words simply fail: Mme. Jacqueline Lastenouse, M. Luciano di Fonzo, Mme. Bernaldo de Quiros, M. Youri Devouyst.

It has been an honour for me to address this gathering and I thank you for your attention.