

Data di pubblicazione: 13 ottobre 2024

ROBERTA SANTORO*

*Overcoming conflicts and the need for dialogue: the prospects of
peace*

ABSTRACT: The new contemporary social, political and legal scenarios are characterized by unpredictable and epochal historical events, destined to generate radical changes and rapid transformations, with positive and negative aspects. The European space, through the enlargement processes, has had to take note of the importance of the differences between peoples, nations and states, which it has welcomed, making them its own and valid, transforming them into the complex of rights and obligations that bind the Member States of the European Union (in this sense the *acquis communautaire* has value). However, in light of the facts, these differences have often led to many problems in the life of the Union. These are differences in cultural, economic, social, legal and religious

* Professore associato di Diritto ecclesiastico e canonico nel Dipartimento di Scienze Politiche dell'Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro.

heritages, which specify the different paths taken over the course of history by individual national communities and which lead to obvious and consequential problems of social and interreligious cohabitation.

KEYWORDS: Conflicts; dialogue; peace

SUMMARY: 1. Differences, rights and globalization: the new frontiers of European cohabitation. - 2. Conflict, identity and fundamental rights in the European multicultural society. - 3. Religious pluralism and democratic participation: new paradigms for social integration in Europe. - 4. Religion, human rights and dialogue: as a tool for legal coexistence. - 5. The right to peace as a legal asset

1. The new contemporary social, political and legal scenarios are characterized by unpredictable and epochal historical events, destined to generate radical changes and rapid transformations, with positive and negative aspects. The European space, through the enlargement processes, has had to take note of the importance of the differences between peoples, nations and states, which it has welcomed, making them its own and valid, transforming them into the complex of rights and obligations that bind the Member States of the European Union (in this sense the *acquis communautaire* has value). However, in light of the facts, these differences have often led to many problems in the life of the Union. These are differences in cultural, economic, social, legal and religious

heritages, which specify the different paths taken over the course of history by individual national communities and which lead to obvious and consequential problems of social and interreligious cohabitation.¹ The change brought about by these phenomena has introduced into the new European system different “visions of life” with their own history and complexity, which claim the exaltation of their peculiar differences. All this in the general collective perception has produced a culture of indistinctness, in which the boundaries between right and wrong, between an “inside” and an “outside”, between what is permitted and what is not, seem to disappear. These cultural characteristics reflect the complexity of contemporary societies and have favored the emergence of different forms of sovereignty – political, social, economic and legal – each bearing its own idea of development, progress and autonomy. All these changes have intersected with a growing globalization, which far from understanding the events, has constituted only a simple representation of an economic space. Globalization, through the demolition of traditional borders, has had a direct influence on the West, transforming it and generating social and political challenges that the populations have

¹ Cfr. P. LOGROSCINO, *Spazi macroterritoriali e coesione. Premesse di comparazione costituzionale*, Pensa, San Cesario-Lecce, 2008, 15 ss. The Author attempts to compare the “centre” and “periphery” of constitutional modernity, addressing the issues of integration and cohesion in macro-territorial political spaces, with particular reference to the European Union “the integrationist challenge it faces, due to the profound differences that mark the territories over which it already extends ... The new forms in which many economic phenomena manifest themselves but, more generally, a broad spectrum of social relations, especially due to the availability of new tools resulting from technological evolution, induce widespread transition phenomena in legal systems”.

immediately perceived in a tangible way. From the very beginning, there has been a growing interrelation between nations, and at the same time all societies have been exposed to new forms of insecurity and inequality; the disintegration of the normative, economic and cultural barriers of the legal systems has facilitated global exchange, but has also contributed to the growth of inequalities, to the loss of identity and control by local communities.

Legal systems have found themselves and are finding themselves having to deal with complex issues related to sovereignty, the management of migratory flows, the protection of fundamental and social rights in an increasingly interdependent context, inevitably leading to a critical reflection on the new methods of governance to be applied and on the need to balance openness and social protection to address emerging challenges.

2. Participation in the inevitable and necessary process of globalization within the current European experience has contributed to giving a different relevance to multiculturalism, a phenomenon that has redesigned its own characteristics by mixing the dynamics marked by the first enlargement processes with elements introduced by the growing migratory flows. In this sense, multiculturalism, in these articulated manifestations, necessarily represents the new face of coexistence, «which is added to the consolidated values on which the work of building the community and the European Union is carried out, among which pluralism is one of the most

consolidated. It is therefore necessary to seek a new overall balance of coexistence in the societies and relations between the States of the enlarged Europe, which cannot ignore the multicultural context, which characterizes European development»². In this perspective, it is important to recognize that multiculturalism, together with pluralism, represents a consolidated value in European and Western culture, constituting a distinctive element of democratic societies. Pluralism, accepted in European law as a fundamental characteristic of societies in which shared values coexist, and multiculturalism, in a globalized context, require mutual acceptance of different cultures under conditions of equality. This reality raises the need to identify new interpretative categories to understand social phenomena and define the rules of coexistence³.

² G. DAMMACCO, *Law and coexistence or the freedom to be equal*, in G. DAMMACCO, B. SITEK, O. CABAJ (eds.), *Weak and defenceless in the European multicultural society, Proceedings of the VI International Conference on Human Rights* (Lecce, 29-30 May 2006), Olsztyn-Bari, 2008, 32 ss.

³ In this perspective, multiculturalism does not come to be in contrast or in a conflicting position with the concept of pluralism, but it certainly presents some peculiarities. Pluralism, accepted in European law as a characteristic of the society within which there exist common fundamental values, requires a mutual acceptance of cultures in a context of homogeneity, in which there are shared interpretative categories. Pluralism, therefore, orders the differences of the same vision of life, allows the coexistence of all those diversities that grow on the same social, political, cultural and economic context. It represents a system of differences built on a common system and accepted as characterizing social coexistence.

Multiculturalism, on the other hand, is a coexistence of global cultural systems that are very different from each other because they are based on different terrain; for this very reason, it responds to distinct interpretative categories, on a multi-ethnic and multi-religious basis.

And precisely the complexity of these social phenomena, characterized by globalization, multiculturalism and pluralism, requires the ordering of different visions of life and the promotion of the coexistence of all the diversities that emerge within the same social, political, cultural and economic context.

Globalization, the widespread diffusion of the Internet, multiculturalism and the new economy have contributed to creating new needs and the need for a new vision of relations between peoples. The characteristics of the phenomena indicated above, however, have also favored an increase in conflictual relations, since diversity is not limited to a purely cultural level, but involves multiple dimensions.

In multicultural interactions, these differences are even more pronounced, since cultural distances are added to individual specificities, making relationships more complex and, at times, more difficult to manage.

But, which conflict are we referring to? Often, in everyday language, conflict is assimilated to war and violence. But, we must not forget that there is also an element of growth within social conflicts, which are based on the emergence of differences, as a place where each person claims to exist in the intersubjective and intercommunal relationship, as an opportunity to become aware of one's own point of view, to try to affirm one's being in the world by giving meaning to existential reality.

Difference characterizes all interpersonal relationships. It is from the encounter (and also from the clash) of differences that conflict can arise,

and it is in conflict (and through it) that it is possible to meet the other in his diversity, contributing to building a shared experience.

Conflict arises and is nourished within every significant human relationship, involving the individual in every aspect, physical and psychological. For these reasons, usually, the conflict is therefore negatively connoted. Certainly, it can be said that the events of the end of the twentieth century have led to an upheaval of the rules on which to build cohabitation, which seemed not to change, making any prediction about the future uncertain. Above all, this is the most important fact, a phenomenon of mutual dependence between events and situations has been highlighted, which has put into crisis the system of values, which had been built in the international community as fundamental to consolidate peaceful coexistence, "exposing new problems of freedom and human rights, new paths of freedom along which the human person goes on claiming the centrality of his existence with respect to the conflicts that arise"⁴.

The value of the human person and fundamental human rights have fallen into crisis and situations in which religious freedom has been compromised have also increased in every part of the world. Human rights and the right to religious freedom are the sign of the existence or fall of civilization.

⁴ G. DAMMACCO, *Diritti umani e fattore religioso nel sistema multiculturale euromediterraneo*, Bari, 2000, 12.

We cannot ignore the social and institutional imbalances that are induced by the coexistence of different cultures (that is, different and sometimes opposite ways of conceiving life), which can also lead to the destabilization of the system, creating gaps in which forms of state destabilization can enter (as occurs with different forms of revolution) or social destabilization (as occurs with terrorism). Not infrequently, religion is used to justify violations of human rights and the abuse of political power. However, we cannot forget the growth of interreligious dialogue also to counter this improper use of religion.

3. Another aspect characterizes social conflict in multicultural contexts: it presents itself as a conflict between existential models and visions of life, which base their essential characteristics on religion. Therefore, belonging to a religious community and to the theological content of religion is not always the result of a conscious choice of theological content, but is still the result of a personal choice of path, which corresponds to the role of religion in contemporary society.

Our current social context is strongly characterized by pluralism and multiculturalism, phenomena that are the product of a globalization made even more penetrating by the weakness of borders, accentuated by growing migratory flows of people and social groups belonging to different cultures.

The religious phenomenon, within civil society and in the institutional relationship with the State, constitutes one of the elements that

characterizes the continuous evolution of a system in perpetual transition. After the fall of the bipolar system, which has highlighted, among other things, the crisis and the limits of ideologies, considered as a sort of protective shield of closed societies, it seems that it is difficult to find a globally valid stability structure. This happens due to the widespread penetration of elements of diversity within societies, which characterizes intersubjective relationships as previously mentioned. Furthermore, it should not be underestimated that the coexistence of different groups and communities also affects the change of the democratic model and the very concept of the rule of law. Above all, in secularized societies, the different forms of religious community are perceived as intermediary factors between social communities, between individuals and the State, between different visions of life, influencing their behavior. The different forms of religious belonging have a new impact on the constitution of personal identity, on the interpretation of the social bond and on the search for the common good. All this translates into expectations of freedom, in concrete requests to fully live the right to freedom and religious freedom, requests to which institutions do not seem to be able to respond promptly. In this panorama, the migratory phenomenon, with all the problems connected to it, plays a role of central importance, making it, due to the particular intensity and the ways in which it manifests itself, increasingly complex, as well as dramatic, especially by putting States and institutions in front of the need to find adequate answers, considering that these

answers concern not only certain geographical areas, but must also be global in scale.

Multiculturalism is the description of a phenomenon, but the description alone does not help to solve the problems of cohabitation, which, through interculturality, must take the legal form that is best suited to meeting needs. Diversity, recorded and described as social multiculturalism, must be governed, recognizing that it constitutes a value in itself that must become an element of improvement and an added value for the development of society, which must convey conflicts, eliminate social, cultural, religious boundaries and favor the integration process. The recognition of otherness and of different traditional and religious heritages (typical of different communities that cohabit by historical and political destiny in the same territory) becomes an essential political act, for a Europe in search of rules to guide the coexistence between different subjects and the reconciliation between the rights of individuals and the law of individual societies.

Recognizing the value of otherness and of different traditional heritages, belonging to different communities, by historical and political destiny in the same territory is a challenge. From a personal point of view, the need for public visibility of religious experience is related to the need for certainties, regardless of the degree of participation.

While in the past the representative institution of religion tended to exercise its own power in the externalization of its positions, supporting it with the dutiful need to protect the faithful, today it is the faithful who

demand with greater critical sense the intervention of the institution and invoke the strong presence of a religion, demanding public visibility as they feel more protected in the path of search for their global (spiritual) identity. This new form of religious subjectivism (or spiritual individualism) presents a content apparently contrasting with its conceptual definition, as it does not exclude (indeed it includes) the institutional dimension of religion in the transmission of identities, which are first of all religious. The essence of religions (especially Christian ones) consists in their profoundly spiritual character, which gives sense and meaning to reality, in which the human person historically designs his own life and relationships with others.

To promote the coexistence of multiple visions of life and multiple religious affiliations, it is necessary to seek convergence and sharing towards a minimum core of principles and rules, which can form the basis for a common coexistence.

Among these principles, in the current context the legal principle of equality assumes relevance, contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in other international Charters and especially in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (CDFUE). It is therefore necessary to identify a shared common basis that makes it possible to pursue the construction of new systems of coexistence. Other principles concern the rights of freedom (essential guarantees for the protection of the human person), the principle of solidarity (as protection of group interests), the right to religious freedom, particularly attacked in

different socio-cultural contexts. In essence, the shared principles and rules specifically concern the human person. The OSCE also recognizes that "Human rights and fundamental freedoms, the rule of law and democratic institutions constitute the foundation of peace and security and make a decisive contribution to conflict prevention within a concept of comprehensive security...". The conflict between existential models and visions of life that are based on different religious values (which refer to different confessional systems) must not be ignored due to its social relevance and its implications for the legal discipline of democratic participation and intersubjective relations within state systems. It is also important that civil society considers the importance of confessional systems, which constitute the ontological and existential point of reference for believers, both citizens and non-citizens. Belonging to a religious community also helps to understand the value of the bond of belonging to a civil community. Therefore, we can affirm that there is a relationship (more or less strong) between religious belonging and belonging to civil society, which outlines the position of the person and establishes his right to democratic participation, both in the life of the city and «in a broader national context, in which often the absence of constitutional points of reference attributes greater value to places in which belonging is expressed with a tension and a dynamic of high participation».

4. The different relevance of religious belonging and its way of connecting with the right of citizenship draws a new scenario (social, political,

economic, legal), in which we must seek the very foundation of the right to equality. In light of this, the scenario that opened up in the aftermath of the Euro-Mediterranean Inter-Ministerial Conference in Barcelona in 1995 let us imagine that a zone of dialogue, exchange and cooperation could be created in the Mediterranean, aimed at peace, stability and prosperity through the strengthening of democracy and respect for human rights. Certainly, both the Conference and the Final Declaration, despite the limitations that derive from the formula adopted, constitute an important moment in the process of pacification and development between the shores of the Mediterranean, even if the Barcelona Conference had abstractly indicated respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the protection of freedom of conscience and religion, respect for diversity and pluralism, dialogue and respect between cultures and religions, cooperation between social parties, for a partnership of peace and stability, but history dramatically posed the concreteness of the problems. In this context, the path of the Barcelona Declaration, although scaled down, could still be a valid path to create dialogue and cooperation. Barcelona intended to set in motion a very complex process, using a technique of approach to the problem of security and stability, which, despite presenting evident limitations (starting with the scaled down legal value of the acts produced), had its innovative strength in indicating common objectives, achievable through a dialogic involvement of different levels, achieved by the synergic activity of two different, but not extraneous, institutions.

At the same time, for the first time in a multilateral act, a Euro-Mediterranean space was identified, a common “Mediterranean region”, composed of a “North” and a “South” and a “West” and an “East”. These decisions indicated a way to try to compose the centuries-old conflict between Europe and the Mediterranean, but one could also say West and East, that is, between two distinct “spaces”, made different by typical elements of different civilizations and by peoples often in conflict. Unfortunately, the exuberance of power of Western countries has thwarted these beautiful prospects. It is worth remembering these events even if they have not left a solid legacy, because they demonstrate that it is possible to build new models of cohabitation for the benefit of the development of peoples. On the contrary, the efforts to build the European Union have been positive, giving completion to the Treaty of Amsterdam of 1997, in which the geographical borders of Europe are defined. Borders are not eliminated, but it can be said that they can be considered as “bridges” to overcome divisions (political, social and religious), differences (of culture, of traditions, of religion), gaps (economic, political, of development) to «discover the essence of its current life, of its visible balance». In any case, one point of the work program prepared following the Barcelona Declaration of 1995 appears to have produced effects, namely the indication of interreligious dialogue as an instrument of social, cultural and human partnership, contained in part IV of the Document. The specific purpose of the dialogue «between the religions present in the

Euro-Mediterranean region» is to promote mutual tolerance and basic cooperation, first of all by eliminating prejudice, ignorance and fanaticism. The dialogue between religions is considered as an internal element in the dynamics of intercultural exchanges between the countries on the shores of the Mediterranean and in this context it occupies a prominent place not only with reference to the three great revealed religions (Judaism, Christianity, Islam), but especially because of the observation that «the Mediterranean, beyond its current political divisions, is identified with three cultural communities, three civilizations of great vitality and extension, three peculiar ways of thinking». Therefore, dialogue between religions becomes a necessary tool for the achievement of peaceful coexistence between different societies, linked by a destiny of cohabitation. Intercultural and interreligious dialogue arises as a need of a region, which feels in a particularly conflictual way the contradiction existing between the processes of globalization (which together with economic well-being also lead to homogenization and cultural flattening) and the need for identity, which induces the various socio-legal systems to emphasize the process of self-certification as an experience of exclusivity and of elimination of communication. Furthermore, religious belonging, especially in the Mediterranean, constitutes an irreplaceable element of social identity, also due to the ontological sense of unity that religion and its cultural translation bring with them, so that conflicts between societies are often supported by religious diversity. Two important papal encyclicals, *Pacem in terris* by John XXIII and *Mater*

et magistra by Paul VI, the conciliar document on dialogue between religions, *Nostra aetate*, constitutes at the same time the terminal point of a theological renewal in the way of understanding the Church in its relationship with other religions and the starting point of a season of meetings, which mark the stages of the journey of rapprochement with Islam and Judaism. To build a democratic and inclusive society, it is fundamental to adopt policies and practices that carry forward the instrument of intercultural dialogue, respect for diversity and the creation of a shared sense of belonging. This new approach is essential to address the challenges arising from growing cultural plurality and to guarantee harmonious coexistence. Pluralism can be understood as a system in which different worldviews coexist on a common accepted basis, representing a distinctive element of democratic societies⁵. All these distinctive elements also require interpretative tools of coexistence that derive from a multi-ethnic and multi-religious basis, promoting an intercultural dialogue⁶ that fosters mutual understanding and respect for

⁵ Cfr. According to the Treccani Encyclopedia, pluralism expresses the concept of multiplicity and is opposed to monism, to unity. Multiculturalism, on the other hand, refers to the coexistence of multiple cultures within the same country, maintaining separate identities and living together peacefully. As highlighted in the Treccani Encyclopedia, the term designates the coexistence of multiple cultures within the same country.

⁶ Intercultural dialogue has long been a principle supported by the European Union and its institutions. The year 2008 was designated the “European Year of Intercultural Dialogue” (EYID) by the European Parliament and the EU Member States. It was intended to draw the attention of people in Europe to the importance of dialogue between different cultures and despite diversity. In this regard, see Cfr. J. CASANOVA, *Beyond secularisation. Religions reconquering the public sphere*, Bologna 2000; P. CONSORTI,

differences. As underlined by the Council of Europe, intercultural dialogue is an open and respectful exchange of views based on mutual understanding between individuals and groups that have different linguistic, cultural, ethnic and religious origins and heritages. The construction of a democratic and inclusive society requires the adoption of policies and practices that enhance pluralism and multiculturalism, promoting intercultural dialogue and social cohesion. These peculiar antithetical elements require that the interpretative tools of coexistence must draw on a multi-ethnic and multi-religious basis⁷. The case law of the European Court of Human Rights has itself addressed issues relating to intercultural dialogue within European societies, recognising the importance of protecting ethnic and national minorities, developing a case law on conflicts between majority and minority groups, underlining the need to guarantee the enjoyment of rights and freedoms without discrimination, as provided for by Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights⁸. What does dialogue mean? To dialogue, it is necessary

Conflicts, mediation and intercultural law, Pisa 2013; M. RICCA, *Beyond Babel. Codes for an intercultural democracy*, Bari, 2008.

⁷ «...since the multiculturalism we are talking about tends not only to record diversity, but also to govern it as a value in itself, looking at social dynamics, represented as critical manifestations of a society that understands itself in its evolutionary dimension...the multicultural society (which is different from the multiethnic society) must be able to prepare those tools necessary to ensure widespread development, the growth of the country, mutual enrichment and the balance of cohabitation interests». G. DAMMACCO, *Multiculturalism and multireligiosity: law and governance of differences*, in R. SANTORO (ed.), *Religious phenomenon and dynamics of multiculturalism*, Bari, 2018, 112.

⁸ Cfr. G. RAIMONDI, *Multiculturalism in the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights*, in *Questione e giustizia*, n. 1, 2017, 159 ss.

to know the depth and richness of differences. However, prejudices, ignorance and fanaticisms still exist, often consolidated by economic and power interests that are contrary to peaceful coexistence and cooperation. It has been observed that, due to the sense of belonging to an absolute and indispensable value, «in the modern world religion is a central force..., which motivates and mobilises people», both in the direction of the emergence of conflicts and in that of peace. But there is no doubt that the lack of dialogue between religions and societies fosters conflict and places peace at serious risk. Just as there is no doubt that there are significant interests of “strong powers” to hinder dialogue and the encounter between religions. We must become aware that the construction of peaceful coexistence requires not only a laborious commitment of peoples, nations, states, individuals, but also involves economic sacrifices that are considered as damages, a loss of wealth by groups that have organized themselves to economically exploit conflicts to obtain advantages. It must be noted with favour that interreligious dialogue goes through moments of shared commitment with respect to the most relevant social problems. However, peace is still conceived as the opposite of violence and not yet as a “good” that has social, moral, ethical, legal and economic content. Peace as the absence of violence (negative peace) constitutes only the prerequisite for building a sustainable peace (positive peace). The commitment of religions in the search for and construction of peace means building a new humanism. History describes a growing propensity to cultivate interreligious dialogue as a privileged place for the

search for peace (it is enough to mention the historic meeting in Assisi in 1986, from which the annual meetings of the Community of Sant'Egidio were born, and the three ecumenical assemblies of the European Churches: Basel, Graz, Sibiu 2007).

5. Peace, as a shared good, is not in itself suitable for the elimination of conflict and violence, but by presenting itself as an alternative, it addresses and transforms them. However, it must be considered that peace, precisely because violence cannot be eliminated, also constitutes a process that promotes change, marked by intermediate stages that can build historical and personal contexts of emancipation and liberation. Peace, therefore, is at the same time a “path” and a “good”, not without a dimension of relativism: the peace that can be built is not the absolute good, but that which can be built in concrete terms. The common commitment to peace concerns first of all the good of the human person, that is, the protection and safeguarding of his rights. However, the existence of an element of relativism also means that there can be different visions of rights, of the rights of the person, of the function of violence and the role of conflicts, and of peace itself. The task of religions is to identify and pursue instruments of dialogue and sharing, searching within their theological heritage, to converge on shared objectives. It should be noted that the process of building peace between religions is parallel to that implemented within Europe, which has progressively built the principles and legal rules to regulate the process of peace and security. Just think of Articles 2 and

6 of the Treaty of Amsterdam on the European Union, which define the common objectives to be pursued and the values on which to base the common European coexistence. They underline the importance of the final objective, that is, to achieve a coexistence of peace and security, promoting the development of peoples and their well-being. Peace, as a common and shared objective, was placed at the basis of many international initiatives (such as the UN, the European Community, the OSCE, the Euro-Mediterranean partnership), and required (and still requires) the obligation to assume within the various international forums the definition of consequent mandatory legal rules and constraints. The changes observed in international relations, especially after September 11, 2001, and the conflicts that resulted from it, confirm the need to identify safe rules that protect peace as a legal asset. There is no doubt, however, that the “system of rules”, which constitute the legal principles that inspire the right to peace, to security and to the coexistence of different experiences, must necessarily have a supra-state dimension. From the dialogue between religions emerges the need to give peace a new dimension that involves not only cultural dynamics and social commitment, but also what is proper to religions, that is, prayer, since praying for peace means believing that it is a free gift from God. This truth was forcefully expressed by Pope John Paul II in the following words: "The coming together of so many religious leaders to pray is in itself an invitation to the world today to become aware that there is another dimension of peace and another way of promoting it, which is not the

result of negotiations, political compromises or economic bargaining. But the result of prayer, which, despite the diversity of religions, expresses a relationship with a supreme power that surpasses our human capacities alone." (*Address to the Representatives of the different Churches and Ecclesial Communities and of other Religions, Assisi, 27 October 1986*)⁹.

Culture and religions are expected to face new challenges, as it is necessary to rebuild a climate of mutual trust, institutional and social loyalty, full respect for diversity, so as to place at the basis of every action the Mediterranean identity, made up of differences that perceive the dimension of fraternity both as a relational element and as an ethical and legal principle. Religions, as Pope Francis suggests in the encyclical *Fratelli tutti* (nn. 272–287), must place themselves at the service of fraternity in the world, drawing on their own specific identity. This is the challenge of the new humanism which consists in the protection and the search for truth and freedom, through the protection of the human person (of his rights and the satisfaction of his needs, at least the primary ones), considered as a non-self-referential subject, but as someone who “hungers and thirsts

⁹ Paraphrasing the words of Father G. Testa, a Consolata missionary, founder of the University of Forgiveness – we must not forgive the very serious acts of violence that are committed every day in the world; much less can we forgive on behalf of others the suffering of the victims and their pain. It is right that the victims express their pain and that society understands it, makes it its own and participates in it. It is therefore necessary to work on this pain, transform the anger and channel it into something else, to prevent it from guiding the actions of individuals and entire societies. Living under the emotional control of anger, in fact, means directing one’s thoughts towards a desire for revenge that will never be satiated.

for being” and is committed to the “conquest of freedom” in every area of his existence¹⁰.

¹⁰ J. MARITAIN, *Integral Humanism*, Borla, 2002, 7 s. «In fact, man aspires to reach human fullness, and this is the true meaning of humanism, but he cannot reach it except in a supernatural relationship with God. Maritain distinguishes two types of aspirations to personality in the human person: «Some aspirations of the person are “connatural” to man. They concern the human person insofar as he possesses a specific determined nature. Other aspirations are “transnatural” aspirations that refer to the human person insofar as he is a person, and participates, according to his imperfect degree, in the transcendental perfection of the personality» (J. MARITAIN, *From Bergson to Thomas Aquinas*, Milan, 1980, 136).

Man has the right to see the aspirations connatural to the human person satisfied as a human person, to the realization of himself as a man; but this, even if exuberant, self-realization does not leave him satisfied because there is in him a transnatural aspiration to overcome the precarious limits of his humanity».