



INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH & POLICY STRATEGY  
( INERPOST )

Ms. Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo  
President "Comite des Sages"



Athens, November 28, 1997

Dear Mrs. Pintasilgo,

The Institute for Research and Policy Strategy, having completed two successful conferences on "Implementing Social Rights in Europe", in Athens on January 16th and 17th, 1997 and in Thessaloniki on September 13th, provided the opportunity to promote an effective dialogue for the implementation of social rights and for strengthening the European identity.

In order to continue in our effort in promoting social rights in Europe we intend to publish the proceedings of both conferences. Please, find enclosed a transcript of your contribution at the Conference in Athens. It would be greatly appreciated if it is returned to us with your corrections by the end of December, 1997.

Your presence and input on issues raised contributed to the success of the Conference. We would like to thank you for what the Conference accomplished and look forward to your input in the future.

With great respect,

Vivian Dragona  
Director



πρώτα με τη κ. Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo, την οποία έχουμε την τιμή να έχουμε ομιλήτρια.

Η κ. Pintasilgo είναι πρώην Πρωθυπουργός της Πορτογαλίας. Και είναι Πρόεδρος της "Επιτροπής των Σοφών" που συνέταξε αυτό το σχέδιο. Την παρακαλώ πολύ να λάβει το λόγο. Μας τιμάει πολύ η παρουσία της και θα ακούσετε πόσο ενδιαφέρων ομιλήτης είναι.

**MARIA DE LOURDES PINTASILGO (Chairman of the "Comite des Sages" and former Prime Minister of Portugal:** Madam Chairman, excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, first of all, when I heard our Chairman say that this is the Committee of Sages, I have to say that all the sages laugh about themselves, and so we are trying to keep the expression in the original French, Comite des Sages, because if we translate it in our own languages it's really rather funny.

**CHAIRMAN:** Modesty is a quality of persons of real value. Λέω ότι η μετριοφροσύνη είναι μια ιδιότητα των ανθρώπων με πραγματική αξία. Και αυτά που είπε είναι βέβαια απόρροια μετριοφροσύνης.

**MARIA DE LOURDES PINTASILGO:** Let me say first of all that I'm delighted to be here among a Greek audience, where I find old friends and where I have the honour to be speaking before several Ministers, and to be so reassured with the official position of Greece. And I was wondering, having talked with my own government about the same question, if the small countries shouldn't really be a force of intervention and pressure and lobby within the IGC. I wanted to say it at the end, but your speech led me to say it at the beginning.

I think that we cannot just let things go and the opportunity pass by us, without us really taking the possibility of using what is our deep convictions in order to make Europe that moral force in the world. In a recent interview, former President Delors said about Europe "We have progressed, but the world has changed quicker than ourselves." And I do think that it is really this which is at



stake. And I will try to address the two things coinciding in some regard with what the Minister has just said.

However, whatever we may paint the beginning of the European Union with the cultural traits, in fact we are the result of many years that were known finally as the Common Market. I can agree that the market may be cultural, but it is a common market, the word we have worked with endlessly. My own country, when it has put in Brussels the request to join the European Community, was still speaking about a common market. And before becoming myself involved in the government I was very firmly against only a concept of market, because I saw that Europe was built on something that was very common.

And, as I said yesterday to my friend Louka Katseli, who by the way is one of the most extraordinary women in Europe nowadays, of the next generation after me, therefore a lot is still to come in her career, I would say that looking at that cooperation I thought, well, you have the impression that you lived all your life with that, that from childhood onwards this is yours, and not only Greek.

And the same can be said about so many elements, and so many aspects of our cities, of our landscapes, throughout the whole continent.

But after this concept of Common Market, when we started speaking more about the Communities - and I underline the fact that we always spoke in the plural and the plural indeed contained a very strong market element. Then came the European Monetary System, with Giscard and Schmidt, and then the Single Market in the '80s as the driving force that Delors brought to the Commission, and as a concrete implementation of the free circulation of merchandise, of goods, of services, of capital, and at the end of people.

And, of course, as time went by it was also a point for countries like mine and I think like yours that the European Com-



munities also represented a democratic ideal. Somehow that market had something to do with democracy, but at that time we couldn't see very clearly how to link the two. We just wanted to join and reinforce our new or restore democracies with belonging to that group.

But what happened afterwards? And here I am a bit critical. Year after year, new aspects of the Treaty of Rome were emphasised, protocols were established. When again consensus was not reached, special conditions were spelled out, exceptions were accepted, and these led to something called the Treaty of Maastricht. But in fact, as we I think discovered together in the Comite des Sages, it is the combination of 15 legal documents of very different weight and nature. And before you find Article 38.B you have to go back and forth a lot of times because you don't know exactly what you are referring to.

So these contradictions, the confusion, the deficiency: I tested it with a group of friends in my country who have been in government. We were five people, and I asked "Well, we are now in the revision of the Treaty of Maastricht. Do you agree with it?" And the four of them were for, they said yes. "What aspect particularly? Where do you find the social right?" And then, in spite of the fact that they have been Ministers, they were not aware that the Treaty of Maastricht is not a treaty. It is a conglomeration of several documents.

So that's why we have a kind of literacy proposal in our Comite des Sages, which is to make one document, articulated, logic and in the right sequence, called the Treaty of the European Union, in order for all of us to be able to refer to it in a language that everybody understands. You may think that this is very elementary, and yet it has not been done. What we have is a continuous reference to other articles in such protocol, or in something that is not really contained in a logic sequence in the Treaty. I don't want to call it a treaty, though; it is this mer a boire.





that there were several things that we wanted to change.

We think - and that's the main line of our report - that the time has arrived for a fresh start, which has its foundation in the fact that the 15 countries don't need to do anything new. The social rights we are claiming are social rights that are inscribed in our Constitutions, and that all of us have ratified in the two international documents that are the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but equally the International Covenant on Political and Civil Rights and the International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights.

So our question is: If we have agreed upon that in the wide scene of the whole world, why can't we agreed about that when we are just 15 around the table? What is this kind of schizophrenia that we have? What are afraid of? And how do we want the other countries in the world to respect, as we are saying all the time and preaching all the time in the Committee of Human Rights in Geneva that they have to respect the human rights and so on and so on, why, when we come together as 15, are we not able to say "Yes, we have signed. We are accountable to the world for that." But we are accountable to each other for that as well.

It is as easy as that, is taking into account and reinforcing what we have already decided internationally. And I think this is very important, and I have discovered again - and you will excuse me, Minister - that some politicians don't see it that way. There is a reason for that. There are hundreds of international organisations. We sign things here, things there. Here is one ambassador, there is another ambassador; they don't interpret things in the same way. And it's a tremendous confusion, because we have globalisation, but we don't have yet a global way of managing globalisation. And therefore we take very often positions that are in contradiction with others that we have taken already in other fora.



As our dear Chairman reminded us, even as recently as the '93 United Nations Conference on Human Rights, we agreed again. But, more than that, in '95 in the Summit on Social Development our heads of government or of state have all committed themselves solemnly to abide by the central role of the social rights. What about that? What is the meaning of that signature that has been put under a very strong and very firm declaration? I think that, if we want to have some influence in the world, we cannot forget the commitments we have already taken.

That is why - I am speaking too much, but I will come quickly to the end - the main proposal, the core of the proposals of the Comité des Sages is to include already in the present revision of the Treaty the embryo of a Bill of Rights. At least you spoke about one chapter, Minister. If you could agree that it will be something that we say that we want here to include something that makes of all of us together a political unity and makes all of us equal... (microphone problems) civil and social rights.

## Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

Of course it's necessary to have long negotiations, but at least the indication that the process is going to start is very important.

By doing so, we are doing something about democracy and citizenship. And that is the ultimate goal of our dream, that all of us may concur, with our national specificities, with our so different cultures, with our tradition and vision, to the building of a unified Europe, and reminding ourselves always that civil and social rights are interdependent and indivisible. You cannot say, wait a moment. Now we have first freedom of this and that, and then we come to housing, jobs, and so on. No, they are really indivisible. And therefore we have to do both at the same time.

And this is what we are doing now, in these two days here. And we are starting the first phase. In a way the ball is roll-

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro





and activities. We have also, as the Minister said, to reshape our welfare state, not at all to have a uniform, harmonised system, but in a way that respects the fundamental right of every human being to be part of a society and therefore to receive from that society the responsibility and care that he or she deserves because he or she is a human being.

And third we have also to see the dimensions of the social rights in our time.

And, last but not least, we have to see that we are going to enlarge ourselves with a part of Europe - let us be clear about that - that had social rights of a different nature from ours, with a different history. But when you have visited the former Communist states when they were still Communist, and when you visit them now, you see that something has been lost. And my question is: What do we have to offer? And what we have to offer, we can only do it in dialogue with the countries which have overthrown the Communist regime.

So, finally, what we will do with all that. You may ask, is this a realistic outlook, or is it just this old lady speaking and saying well, she has a dream and well. We all have a right to have a dream. Yes, I have a dream. And the dream is that in the world that is going so global but where we find so many problems, that we all may grow, not only in the dimension of freedom, in a liberal sense, that is; my freedom ends where the freedom of the other begins. But, with some of the philosophers of our time, we have to begin with a philosophy of responsibility, of care for the others. And it is that responsibility that makes all of us brothers and sisters in a philosophical and not moralistic way. In that way we build Europe and we contribute to peace in the world. Thank you.

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΟΣ:** Ευχαριστούμε πάρα πολύ την Πρόεδρο της "Επιτροπής Σοφών" για όσα μας είπε. Χαιρόμαστε πάρα πολύ που είναι Πρόεδρος και πιστεύω



βάση όχι το αξίωμα της ανθρώπινης αξιοπρέπειας, αλλά την ιθαγένεια.

Την κατοχή ιθαγένειας δηλαδή κράτους-μέλους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η δε νέα ευρωπαϊκή ιθαγένεια που με χαρά και πανηγυρικά ανακοίνωσαν οι Ευρωπαίοι το 1992, δεν ήταν καμία διαφορετική ποιότητα παρά το άθροισμα των ως τότε ιθαγενειών των κρατών-μελών.

Θέλω να ρωτήσω αν το Δίκτυο το ΣΟΣ Ρατσισμός, αξιοποιεί ως τώρα τα νομικά κεκτημένα της νομολογίας του Δικαστηρίου των Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων που ακριβώς επειδή είχε ως βάση την ανθρώπινη αξιοπρέπεια, και άρα ξεφεύγει από το δίλημμα του υπηκόου και αναφέρεται στον κάτοικο κράτους-μέλους του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης είναι χρήσιμη στη δράση σας τόσο ως ΜΚΟ όσο και ως ομάδα πίεσης στην κατεύθυνση λήψης αποφάσεων. Σας ευχαριστώ.

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΟΣ:** Δε θέλω να στετησω το λόγο και από την κυρία που είναι όμως η τελευταία.

**ΚΑΠΑΖΟΓΛΟΥ (Από το Νομό Ξάνθης):** Θα ήθελα να ρωτήσω το Πρόγραμμα της Θράκης για τους παλινοστούντες τί γίνεται; Εκεί έχει γίνει ένας τραγέλαφος έχω την εντύπωση γιατί άκουγα επί χρόνια ότι εγκαθίστανται, ότι είναι πολύ ευχαριστημένοι κλπ.

Αλλά οι ίδιοι οι παλινοστούντες καταρχήν λένε ότι δε βρίσκουν εργασία, οι συνθήκες διαβίωσης δεν είναι ικανοποιητικές. Ποιος είναι τελικά το πρόγραμμα και η εθνική πολιτική για αυτό το θέμα της Θράκης; Ευχαριστώ.

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΟΣ:** Έχει ζητήσει το λόγο η κ. Pintasilgo.

**MARIA DE LOURDES PINTASILGO:** C'est juste un petit commentaire que Madame m'a suggere. Dans notre rapport nous n'avons pas pris une position nette, parce que nous sommes devant les accords qui montrent deja de facon tres nette qu'il y a de politiques differentes dans l'ensemble de l'Union Europeenne.

Cependant, je me permets de faire une petite reflexion qui est celle-ci: Au lendemain de la deuxieme guerre mondiale l'Europe s'est remise de ses decombres avec le Plan Marshall qui a engage 2,5% du PNB des Etats Unis. Bien sur ca a eu aussi de repercussions positives aux Etats Unis, il ne faut pas le cacher; mais c'est vrai que l'Europe c'est reconstruit grace a cette aide.

Depuis plus de 30 ans les Nations Unies demandent aux pays industrialises, et en particulier en notre continent, d'aider les pays en developpement. C'est possible. D'abord c'etait 1% de leur PNB, maintenant c'est 0,7% de leur PNB. Il n'y a que la Hollande et la Suede qui ont atteint ce pourcentage. Tous les autres pays, et en plus le votre et le mien sont bien au-dessous de cette aide aux pays qui sont en etat de sous-developpement ou dont le developpement c'est ecroule, comme c'est le cas des pays de l'Europe Centrale et de l'Europe de l'Est.

Je pense que la il y a une premiere reflexion, comme Madame disait tous a l'heure, l'immigre vient parce que son pays n'est pas suffisamment aide a mettre debout les structures necessaires. En ayant un peu regarde ce qui arrive aux pays de l'Europe Centrale et en particulier en Union Sovietique, c'est evident que tous les gens qui quittent l'Union Sovietique apres la chute du Mur de Berlin, ils l'ont vu tomper d'un cote mais pas de l'autre. C'est a dire ils viennent d'un regime ou il y avait un droit universel a la sante et a l'education vers des regimes ou ce droit n'est pas universel, comme on vient de le dire. Donc nous avons quelque chose a avoir de ce cote la.

Ceci dit, actuellement nous avons deux types d'orientation dans les pays de l'Union Europeenne, un type qui valorise des communautes specifiques - c'est le cas des pays Scandinaves - et en integrant en meme temps lantement, on peut dire que chaque immigré dans les pays Scandinaves est presque suivi jour par jour dans son cheminement de residence et de travail et le pays qui

cultive davantage l'assimilation ou l'integration. Les deux problemes sont tres differents et il faut mettre sur table les donnees des uns et des autres pour voir a quoi on peut aboutir.

Et la il faut une veritable etude et une concertation, pas un consensus mais une concertation pour voir comment on peut reconcilier ces differents points de vue.

Je crois que finalement, meme quand vous dites que ici en Grece il y a 90% d'Orthodoxes et 10% des autres, je pense que vous touchez aussi du doigt un probleme cle de toute l'Europe, c'est la difference entre l'etat laique que nous avons construit et qui est caracteristique de nos pays et la vision theocratique de la societe qui naturellement voit les choses d'une facon completement differente. La il faut, comme les propos d'experts l'ont dit depuis quelques annees, il nous faut une etude tres poussee pour voir comment on peut concilier cette theocratie a l'interieur de ce que nous ne voulons pas quitter, qui est en effet l'etat laique et donc la separation de l'eglise et de l'etat. Merci.

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΟΣ:** Θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω όλους όσους έκαναν ερωτήσεις ή παρατηρήσεις και να ζητήσω συγνώμη από εκείνους που δεν πρόλαβαν να κάνουν αν και θα το ήθελαν. Και θα παρακαλέσω τους 3 ομιλητές μέσα σε 2-3 λεπτά το πολύ να απαντήσουν επιγραμματικά στα σημεία που νομίζουν. Είναι φανερό ότι δεν μπορούν να απαντηθούν ή να σχολιαστούν όλα.

**Κ.ΚΑΣΣΙΜΑΤΗ:** Ο κύριος που μίλησε για το πρόγραμμα στέγασης στη θράκη. Σαφέστατα το πρόγραμμα της εξυπηρέτησης 5.300 οικογενειών δε λύνει το βασικό πρόβλημα μια και είπαμε ότι ανέρχονται σε 70.000 άτομα περίπου.

Επομένως υπάρχει εντονότατο πρόβλημα κατοικίας. Και είναι χαρακτηριστικό ένα σημείο ότι το πρόβλημα του σπιτιού ήταν το βασικό πρόβλημα των Ποντίων σε όλες τις ευκαιρίες που τους δόθηκαν να μιλήσουν για προβλήματα.