

HOLY SEE PRESS OFFICE
OFICINA DE PRENSA DE LA SANTA SEDE



BUREAU DE PRESSE DU SAINT-SIEGE
PRESSEAMT DES HEILIGEN STUHLS

BOLLETTINO

SALA STAMPA DELLA SANTA SEDE

N. 0641

Venerdì 29.09.2017

Pubblicazione: Immediata

Sommario:

- ◆ **Le Udienze**
- ◆ **Le Lettere Credenziali dell'Ambasciatore del Ghana presso la Santa Sede**
- ◆ **Rinunce e nomine**
- ◆ **Intervento del Segretario per i Rapporti con gli Stati alla 72 ma Sessione dell'Assemblea Generale dell'Onu sulla "responsabilità di proteggere"**
- ◆ **Avviso di Conferenza Stampa**
- ◆ **Meeting point sul Congresso globale "Child Dignity in the Digital World"**

◆ **Le Udienze**

Il Santo Padre Francesco ha ricevuto questa mattina in Udienza:

- S.E. il Signor Joseph Kojo Akudibillah, Ambasciatore del Ghana presso la Santa Sede, in occasione della presentazione delle Lettere Credenziali;

- Em.mo Jorge Liberato Urosa Savino, Arcivescovo di Caracas (Venezuela);

- S.E. Mons. Martin Krebs, Arcivescovo tit. di Taborenta, Nunzio Apostolico in Nuova Zelanda, Fiji, Isole Cook, Isole Marshall, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Samoa, Stati Federati di Micronesia, Vanuatu, Tonga; Delegato Apostolico nell'Oceano Pacifico.

Il Papa riceve questa mattina in Udienza:

- Partecipanti alla Plenaria del Pontificio Consiglio per la Promozione della Nuova Evangelizzazione.

[01418-IT.01]

◆ Le Lettere Credenziali dell'Ambasciatore del Ghana presso la Santa Sede

Alle ore 10 di questa mattina, il Santo Padre Francesco ha ricevuto in Udienza S.E. il Sig. Joseph Kojo Akudibillah, Ambasciatore del Ghana presso la Santa Sede, in occasione della presentazione delle Lettere Credenziali.

Riportiamo di seguito i cenni biografici essenziali del nuovo Ambasciatore:

S.E. il Sig. Joseph Kojo Akudibillah
Ambasciatore del Ghana presso la Santa Sede

È nato il 21 gennaio 1948 a Konongo-Odumasi.

È sposato ed ha quattro figli.

Si è diplomato in Scienze Infermieristiche.

Ha riscoperto, tra gli altri, i seguenti incarichi: Infermiere Capo nel *Bawku Hospital*, a Bawku, in Ghana (1978-1998); Vice Direttore del Servizio infermieristico, *Bawku Rural Eye Program*, UER (1998-2000); Coordinatore Nazionale per la Valutazione del Tracoma, Ministero della Salute (1998-1999); Coordinatore Nazionale per il Program Nazionale di Controllo del Tracoma, Ministero della Salute (2000); Membro indipendente del Parlamento (MP) per il *Garu-Tempene (Constituency of the Parliament of Ghana)* (2001-2004); Membro della Comunità Economica degli Stati dell'Africa Occidentale (ECOWAS) del Parlamento (2002-2003); Vice Ministro della Difesa sotto l'Amministrazione del Presidente Kuffour (2003-2004); Amministratore Delegato della Budsum Co. Ltd Bawku, Regione Superiore Est (dal 2004 ed oggi); Direttore Esecutivo *Kropo Charity Hospital Kumasi*, Regione di Ashanti (dal 2004 ad oggi).

Lingue straniere conosciute: Inglese, Kusaal Twi, Mampruli, Hausa e Mori.

[01419-IT.01]

◆ Rinunce e nomine

Rinuncia dell'Arcivescovo Metropolita di Lecce (Italia) e nomina del successore

Rinuncia del Vescovo di Gubbio (Italia) e nomina del successore

Rinuncia del Vescovo di Mondovì (Italia) e nomina del successore

Nomina di Ausiliare dell'Arcidiocesi di Vilnius (Lituania)

Rinuncia dell'Arcivescovo Metropolita di Lecce (Italia) e nomina del successore

Il Santo Padre Francesco ha accettato la rinuncia al governo pastorale dell'arcidiocesi metropolitana di Lecce (Italia), presentata da S.E. Mons. Domenico Umberto D'Ambrosio.

Il Papa ha nominato Arcivescovo Metropolita di Lecce (Italia) S.E. Mons. Michele Seccia, trasferendolo dalla sede vescovile di Teramo-Atri.

S.E. Mons. Michele Seccia

S.E. Mons. Michele Seccia è nato a Barletta, in provincia di Bari, nell'arcidiocesi di Trani-Barletta-Bisceglie, il 6 giugno 1951. Ha compiuto gli studi nel Seminario diocesano di Bisceglie ed in quello Regionale di Molfetta.

Ha ottenuto il Baccalaureato in Filosofia e Teologia presso la Pontificia Università Gregoriana, la Licenza in Teologia Morale presso l'"*Alfonsianum*" e la Laurea in Filosofia presso l'Università Statale "*La Sapienza*" di Roma.

È stato ordinato sacerdote il 26 novembre 1977 per l'arcidiocesi di Trani-Barletta-Bisceglie.

Dopo l'ordinazione sacerdotale ha ricoperto i seguenti incarichi: dal 1977 al 1985 è stato Viceparroco, e poi dal 1985 al 1992 Parroco, della parrocchia "*Spirito Santo*"; dal 1979 al 1982 è stato Direttore dell'Ufficio Catechistico; dal 1978 è stato pure Docente di Teologia Morale all'Istituto Superiore di Scienze Religiose e Insegnante di Religione al Liceo Statale, e di Filosofia e Pedagogia all'Istituto Magistrale. Dal 1987 al 1997 è stato Vicario Generale dell'arcidiocesi di Trani-Barletta-Bisceglie.

Eletto alla sede di San Severo il 20 giugno 1997, ha ricevuto l'ordinazione episcopale l'8 settembre successivo.

In quel tempo ha ricoperto anche l'incarico di Segretario della Conferenza Episcopale Regionale. In seno alla Conferenza Episcopale Italiana è stato Membro della Commissione Episcopale per l'Educazione Cattolica, la Scuola e l'Università.

Il 24 giugno 2006 è stato trasferito alla sede abruzzese di Teramo-Atri.

[01421-IT.01]

Rinuncia del Vescovo di Gubbio (Italia) e nomina del successore

Il Santo Padre ha accettato la rinuncia al governo pastorale della diocesi di Gubbio (Italia), presentata da S.E. Mons. Mario Ceccobelli.

Il Papa ha nominato Vescovo della diocesi di Gubbio (Italia), il Rev.do Luciano Paolucci Bedini, del clero dell'arcidiocesi metropolitana di Ancona-Osino, finora Rettore del Pontificio Seminario Regionale "Pio XI", di Ancona.

Rev.do Luciano Paolucci Bedini

Il Rev.do Luciano Paolucci Bedini è nato a Jesi, provincia di Ancona e diocesi di Jesi, il 30 agosto 1968. A 21 anni è entrato nel Pontificio Seminario Regionale marchigiano "Pio XI" di Fano (PU) e presso l'Istituto Teologico Marchigiano dove ha conseguito il Baccellierato in Teologia.

Il 30 settembre 1995 è stato ordinato sacerdote dall'Arcivescovo di Ancona-Osimo, incardinandosi nella medesima arcidiocesi.

Dopo l'Ordinazione ha esercitato il ministero pastorale come Viceparroco, frequentando la Pontificia Università Salesiana, in Roma dal 1996 al 1999, ottenendo la Licenza in Teologia.

Ha svolto i seguenti incarichi pastorali: Vicario parrocchiale a San Paolo Apostolo in Ancona dal 1995 al 2004; Direttore Ufficio Catechistico Diocesano dal 1999 al 2011; Docente di Catechetica e di Teologia Pastorale all'Istituto di Scienze Religiose di Ancona dal 2001 al 2011; Direttore dell'Ufficio Catechistico Regionale dal 2003 al 2010; Vice Rettore del Pontificio Seminario Regionale "Pio XI" di Ancona dal 2004 al 2010; Assistente Ecclesiastico Regionale dell'AGESCI dal 2005 al 2010, e dal 2010 è Rettore del Pontificio Seminario Regionale di Ancona e Membro della Commissione Presbiterale Regionale.

È autore di pubblicazioni di carattere catechetico.

[01422-IT.01]

Rinuncia del Vescovo di Mondovì (Italia) e nomina del successore

Il Santo Padre Francesco ha accettato la rinuncia al governo pastorale della diocesi di Mondovì (Italia), presentata da S.E. Mons. Luciano Pacomio.

Il Papa ha nominato Vescovo della diocesi di Mondovì (Italia), il Rev.do Egidio Miragoli, del clero della diocesi di Lodi, finora Parroco della parrocchia di *Santa Francesca Cabrini*, in Lodi, Giudice del tribunale Ecclesiastico Regionale Lombardo e Docente di Diritto Canonico.

Rev.do Egidio Miragoli

Il Rev.do. Egidio Miragoli è nato a Gradella di Pandino il 20 luglio 1955.

È stato alunno del Seminario Diocesano di Lodi. Ha frequentato la Pontificia Università Gregoriana, dove ha conseguito il Dottorato in Diritto Canonico. È esperto del Sacramento della Penitenza.

È stato ordinato Sacerdote il 23 giugno 1979, incardinandosi nella diocesi di Lodi.

Ha ricoperto i seguenti incarichi: Segretario particolare di S.E. Mons. Magnani, emerito di Treviso, e di S.E. Mons. Capuzzi, emerito di Lodi, dal 1982 al 1994; Collaboratore pastorale a San Fereolo; Direttore dello Studio Teologico del Seminario vescovile dal 1988 al 1994; Difensore del vincolo del Tribunale Diocesano dal 1985 al 2003; Promotore di Giustizia dal 1988 al 2003; Direttore dell'Istituto Sacerdotale Maria Santissima Immacolata e San Pio X dal 1990 al 2004; Docente di Diritto Canonico negli Studi Teologici Riuniti dei Seminari di Crema-Cremona-Lodi-Vigevano dal 1982.

Dal 1994 è Parroco di Santa Francesca Cabrini in Lodi; dal 2006 è Vicario foraneo per la città di Lodi e dal 2007 è Giudice del Tribunale Ecclesiastico Regionale Lombardo.

È tra i fondatori e Membro del Consiglio di redazione della rivista *Quaderni di Diritto Ecclesiale*, sulla quale ha pubblicato diversi contributi e "Il Sacramento della Penitenza" nel 2015.

[01423-IT.01]

Nomina di Ausiliare dell'Arcidiocesi di Vilnius (Lituania)

Il Santo Padre Francesco ha nominato Vescovo Ausiliare dell'arcidiocesi di Vilnius (Lituania) il Rev.do Darius Trijonis del clero della diocesi di Telšiai, attualmente Amministratore parrocchiale della Cattedrale di Telšiai, assegnandogli la sede titolare vescovile di Fissiana.

Rev.do Darius Trijonis

Il Rev.do Darius Trijonis è nato a Telšiai, città episcopale, il 21 aprile 1973. Dopo la scuola media superiore a

Telšiai ha frequentato il Seminario diocesano dal 1991 al 1996.

È stato ordinato sacerdote il 18 maggio 1997 per la diocesi di Telšiai. Dal 1997 al 1999 ha studiato a Roma ed ha ottenuto la Licenza in Teologia presso la Pontificia Università Lateranense. Al suo ritorno da Roma ha ricoperto fino al 2002 l'incarico di Prefetto e Docente del Seminario diocesano.

Dal 2002 al 2006 ha studiato presso l'Istituto Superiore di Teologia Morale, Accademia Alfonsiana, e ha conseguito il Dottorato in Teologia Morale. Nel 2005 è stato anche Vicerettore e docente del Seminario fino al 2007. Per l'anno 2006 è stato anche Docente di Catechistica presso l'Università di Klaipėda. Dal 2007 al 2008 ha ricoperto l'incarico di Prefetto agli Studi del Seminario diocesano. Nel 2008 è stato nominato Parroco della Santa Famiglia di Plikai. Nel 2010 fino al 2015 è stato Sotto-Segretario della Conferenza Episcopale della Lituania. Infine nel 2015 è stato nominato Amministratore della Cattedrale di Telšiai.

[01424-IT.01]

◆ **Intervento del Segretario per i Rapporti con gli Stati alla 72^{ma} Sessione dell'Assemblea Generale dell'Onu sulla "responsabilità di proteggere"**

Pubblichiamo di seguito l'intervento che il Segretario per i Rapporti con gli Stati, S.E. Mons. Paul R. Gallagher, ha pronunciato lo scorso 25 settembre presso la sede delle Nazioni Unite a New York, nell'ambito della 72^{ma} Sessione dell'Assemblea Generale dell'Onu, sul tema: *The responsibility of Religious Leaders regarding the responsibility to protect*.

Intervento di S.E. Mons. Paul R. Gallagher

In general terms, and before the recent international juridical debate, one can say that the *responsibility to protect* is one of the primary objectives of the State and Criminal Law. From the time of the ancient Mesopotamic civilisations, the history of criminal law can be summarised in its effort to ensure cohesion and social order and to protect persons and property, at the very least, certain social groups. Therefore, we can say that the *responsibility to protect* began when social order was maintained no longer by the private vendetta of the clan or the tribe but as a responsibility of Authority. A fundamental and historic turning point in the development of the *responsibility to protect* within every State was the constitutionalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, particularly with the *Declaration of Independence of the United States of America*, on 4 July 1776, and the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* by France's National Constituent Assembly on 26 August 1789. Both of these Declarations established the equality of citizens before the law, from which would develop certain fundamental principles which are the hallmarks of criminal law today, namely, the principle of the legality of penalties and sanctions: *nullum crimen, nulla poena sine praevia lege poenali*. At the level of political theory and constitutional law, the primary responsibility of the State to protect public order, social harmony and the life and security of persons and their families as well as their property, is today an indisputable and absolute principle accepted by everyone. The performance of this task, moreover, is the fundamental basis for the legitimacy of governments, and a good part of constitutional mechanisms have as their objective to prevent governments from disregarding these principles.

After the Second World War, the major juridical principles that imposed on national governments the obligation to *protect* the public order and the life and dignity of persons also became the basic principles of the international order. In particular, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948, is nothing other than making explicit the objectives contained in the second introductory paragraph of the Charter of the United Nations: *"to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small...."* Thus, in addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations on 2 October 1979, Pope John Paul II (now Pope St. John Paul II for Catholics) described the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as *"a milestone on the*

long and difficult path of the human race.”

However, it is well known that when we speak of the *responsibility to protect* in the current international debate, we refer to concepts that are more precise and more limited than those concerning the primary responsibility of the State to respect human rights and to protect public order, social harmony and the security of persons and their families and their property. The 60th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations set forth three pillars on which rest the international concept of the *responsibility to protect*. These are: (1) States have a responsibility to protect populations under their jurisdiction from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity; (2) The international community has a responsibility to help states to fulfil their responsibility to protect; (3) When a state is ‘manifestly failing’ to protect its own populations then the international community has a responsibility to protect and may take collective action in a timely manner, even to the point of using force as a last resort.[1]

The first element of the principle of the *responsibility to protect* is self-evident and accepted by everyone. Protection from genocide, from war crimes, from ethnic cleansing and from crimes against humanity, is nothing other than a re-statement of the most important parts of the fundamental obligation of Governments to protect public order, social harmony and the life and security of the person. Moreover, a Government that would consent to such crimes would lose all ethical legitimacy or, in the case that it was unable to prevent them, it would prove itself to have failed absolutely as a Government.

The second and third elements of the international definition of the *responsibility to protect*, instead, raise some important international issues. Firstly, there is a difficulty in reconciling the International Community’s obligation to protect with the principle of non-interference, as ratified by Article 2.7 of the Charter of the United Nations, and secondly, there is not yet an international legal text that authorises the use of collective force above and beyond the cases or circumstances that are set forth in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. A juridical formulation of the principle would require, at the very least, a reform of Article 39 to include among the various circumstances which would authorise an intervention of the Security Council also those crimes to which the concept of *responsibility to protect* refers to. There would also need to be a reform or, at least, an authoritative interpretation of Article 2.7, to define the competence of the United Nations concerning those crimes that fall within the ambit of the *responsibility to protect*. On the other hand, the decision of a State to assume to itself the right to intervene militarily in another State, on the pretext of applying the principle of *responsibility to protect*, would setback all the achievements of the twentieth century in developing international law, by going back to an international juridical culture of the times before the Congress of Vienna of 1815. Such an intervention, then, would obtain nothing other than the undermining of the *responsibility to protect* or, at the very least, raise serious reservations about it.

At this point, considering the difficulties of an international juridical formulation of the principle of the *responsibility to protect*, which are not easily overcome, religious leaders, in the exercise of their mission, and without going beyond the limits of their competence, can greatly facilitate the understanding and the just application of the principle. Indeed, religious leaders can help society understand that the concept of the *responsibility to protect* is also a corollary of the fundamental truths and values of all religions and that, on the contrary, the crimes for which the principle of the *responsibility to protect* would be invoked are a negation of every true religious sentiment. Indeed, all of the world’s great religions affirm the ethical principle of reciprocity, either negatively, “do not do unto others what you would not done to yourself”, or positively, “do unto others what you would want done for you”. From this fundamental ethical principle one can deduce also the obligation of all to respect the life of others and that of governments to protect their citizens.

Addressing religious leaders of the various religious communities that live side-by-side in Azerbaijan, during the interreligious meeting which closed his visit to that country last year, Pope Francis stated that “religions, which help to discern the good and put it into practice through deeds, prayer and diligent cultivation of the inner life, are called to build a culture of encounter and peace, based on patience, understanding, and humble, tangible steps. This is the way a humane society is best served.”[2] Religions which affirm both the existence of a Creator God and the transcendence of every human person, also agree about an essential human dignity, which is shared by all, and about the existence of certain laws of justice which are anterior to all human normative formulations. Likewise, true religious sentiment rejects any form of violent imposition. Moreover, as Pope Francis, quoting

Dostoevsky, stated in the same address, *“If God does not exist then everything is permissible”*.^[3]

Human rights, the great principles of humanitarian law and, in particular, the total rejection of the crimes of genocide and ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity are part of an universal juridical patrimony, shared by all, and which are also anterior to their legal definition and to the allocation of competences among the various organs of the nation State and between it and the international community. Between this juridical patrimony and true religious ideas there is an inseparable connection, because faith in God who is Creator and Father also leads to the recognition of the unity of human beings and of universal fraternity. It is the responsibility of religious leaders, as part of their mission, to promote the recognition of that universal juridical patrimony, which can also be called natural law, and of the obligations that are derived from it.

A general overview of the history of the genesis and development of international law can help us to understand the importance of the responsibility of religious leaders. Article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Vienna, 23 May 1969) stipulates that *“a treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law (jus cogens). For the purposes of the present Convention, a peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.”*

Even if within academic circles and within the same Commission of International Law there has been, and continues to be, much discussion on the meaning of the expression *jus cogens* and on the existence or not of imperative norms that cannot be derogated from by any treaty, simple common sense teaches us about the existence of such norms. It is enough to think of the absurdity and of the coarse illegitimacy of a treaty that would legitimise genocide and ethnic cleansing, even if such a hypothetical treaty were to be signed and ratified by all the members of the international community. True religious faith, thus, serves to do no more than to strengthen common sense.

Recently, the Commission for International Law presented the Report of its 69th annual session, which will be debated during the current 72nd session of the General Assembly of the United Nations from 23 October next. Item 7 of the Agenda of the Commission^[4].....*Peremptory norms of general international law (jus cogens)* – concern in a particular way the current debate, inasmuch as the provisional conclusion N° 2 [3.(2)], in fact, recognises the existence of *peremptory norms of general international law (jus cogens)* [which] *reflect and protect fundamental values of the international community, are hierarchically superior to other rules of international law and universally applicable.*

In his first report on *jus cogens* the Special Rapporteur Professor Dire Tladi, quoting Professor Eric Suy (a former Under-Secretary General and Legal Counsellor of the United Nations)^[5] stated that *“the term jus cogens could be found “in no text prior to the nineteenth century” [but] the idea of a superior law, from which no derogation was permitted “runs like a thread through the whole theory and philosophy of law,”* and he recalled in a particular way the theologians and jurists of the Salamanca school of the fifteenth century and Grotius and Wolff in the following century.^[6] It was not by chance that these ‘Fathers’ of international law were also theologians or, at least, men of faith who had a deep knowledge and familiarity with theology, philosophy and history. Pope Benedict XVI, in speaking about them, affirmed that they had perceived the reality of human rights long before they were solemnly formulated and, in a certain way they had already foreseen the *responsibility to protect*.^[7]

The most vile crimes of the twentieth century, on the other hand, happened at a time when the idea of God and universal fraternity, characteristics of the great religions, had been replaced by ideologies of racial or national superiority and class struggle. As Pope Francis said during his visit to Tirana in September 2014: *“When, in the name of an ideology, there is an attempt to remove God from society, it ends up adoring idols, and very soon men and women lose their way, their dignity is trampled and their rights violated. You know well how much pain comes from the denial of freedom of conscience and of religious freedom, and how from such a wound comes a humanity that is impoverished because it lacks hope and ideals to guide it.”*^[8]

Twenty-one years earlier, also in Tirana, Pope John Paul II spoke about religious freedom and the correct understanding of religion: *“religious freedom [...] is not only a precious gift from the Lord for those who have the grace of faith: it is a gift for each person, because it is the basic guarantee of every other expression of freedom [...]. Only faith reminds us that, if we have one Creator, we are therefore all brothers and sisters. Religious freedom is thus a bulwark against all forms of totalitarianism and contributes decisively to human fraternity.”*[9]

Thus, drawing from the words of Popes John Paul II and Francis, true religion *“shuns the temptation to intolerance and sectarianism, and promotes attitudes of respect and constructive dialogue.”*[10] And as Pope Francis added, *“as believers we must be particularly vigilant so that, in living out with conviction our religious and ethical code, we may always express the mystery we intend to honour. This means that all those forms which present a distorted use of religion, must be firmly refuted as false since they are unworthy of God or humanity. Authentic religion is a source of peace and not of violence! No one must use the name of God to commit violence! To kill in the name of God is a grave sacrilege. To discriminate in the name of God is inhuman.”*[11]

It is, thus, an obligation and a task of religious leaders to create *“a shared space [...] an atmosphere of respect and cooperation that must be built with everyone’s participation, even those who have no religious convictions... that regards every man and woman, even those of different religious traditions, not as rivals, less still enemies, but rather as brothers and sisters. When a person is secure of his or her own beliefs, there is no need to impose or put pressure on others: there is a conviction that truth has its own power of attraction. Deep down, we are all pilgrims on this earth, and on this pilgrim journey, as we yearn for truth and eternity, we do not live autonomous and self-sufficient individual lives; the same applies to religious, cultural and national communities. We need each other, and are entrusted to each other’s care. Each religious tradition, from within, must be able to take account of others.”*[12]

If international norms, and law in general, were to depend solely on the will of States, or worse still, on the *de facto* exercise of power, without recognising the existence of higher principles that cannot be derogated from, it would be impossible to advance the implementation of the principle of the *responsibility to protect*, particularly its third element, the intervention of the international community. True religious faith, instead, offers a clear complementary and alternative path. On the one hand, recognising the transcendent nature of the human person and living the golden rule of charity and all of its consequences, in each and every circumstance, there would be no crimes that would justify the intervention of the international community. On the other hand, even if these crimes were, nevertheless, to occur, a faith that does not lead to the disrespect of others, that brings about dialogue, faith and the search for consensus, would facilitate entrusting the solution of such grave situations to an organised international community. A profound reflection on the nature of faith and on its consequences can be something good for the international community, for the implementation of humanitarian law and for the promotion of human rights and also for the extreme situation when it would be necessary to implement internationally the *responsibility to protect*. Thus, the great role that religious leaders can play regarding the *responsibility to protect* is to ensure that religions are lived in such a way that genocides, war crimes, ethnic cleansings or crimes against humanity never happen.

[1] Cfr. A/RES/60/1. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly – World Summit Outcome, NN. 138-139.

[2] Pope Francis, Interreligious Meeting with the Sheikh and with the Representatives of the Different Religious Communities of the Country, “Heydar Aliyev” Mosque, Baku, Azerbaijan, 2 October 2016.

[3] Fyodor Dostoyevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, XI, 4.8.9. Cited by Pope Francis during the same meeting at Baku.

[4] Preparatory Document of the 72nd Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations A/CN.4/SR.3382, 25 August 2015.

[5] Eric Suy is a well known international jurist. Professor of the Catholic University of Leuven. Legal Counsel and Under-Secretary General during the time of Secretary General U Thant (1961-1971) and later Director of the United Nations Office in Geneva. He was also associated with the beginning of the Holy See’s presence at New York and Geneva.

[6] Cfr. UN General Assembly, A/CN.4/683, 8 March 2016, NN. 20-21 and notes.

[7] Cfr. Pope Benedict XVI, *Address to the General Assembly of the United Nations*, 18 April 2008. The Pope on

that occasion cited in particular the Dominican friar and theologian, Francisco de Vitoria.

[8] Pope Francis, Meeting with the Leaders of other religions and other Christian denominations, Catholic University of Our Lady of Good Counsel, Tirana, 21 September 2014.

[9] Pope St. John Paul II, *Message to the Albanian Nation*, 25 April 1993.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Pope Francis, *Meeting with the Leaders of other religions and other Christian denominations*, Catholic University of Our Lady of Good Counsel, Tirana, 21 September 2014.

[12] Ibid.

[01426-IT.01]

◆ Avviso di Conferenza Stampa

Si informano i giornalisti accreditati che **lunedì 2 ottobre 2017**, alle **ore 11.00**, presso la Sala Stampa della Santa Sede, in Via della Conciliazione 54, avrà luogo una **Conferenza Stampa per la presentazione dell'Assemblea Generale della Pontificia Accademia per la Vita (PAV)**, sul tema « **Accompagnare la vita. Nuove responsabilità nell'era tecnologica** », che si terrà nell'Aula Nuova del Sinodo, in Vaticano, dal 5 al 7 ottobre.

Interverranno:

- **S.E. Mons. Vincenzo Paglia**, Presidente della Pontificia Accademia per la Vita;

- **Mons. Renzo Pegoraro**, Cancelliere della Pontificia Accademia per la Vita;

- **Dott.ssa Bernardette Tobin**, Direttrice del *Plunkett Centre for Ethics at Australian Catholic University*.

[01416-IT.01]

◆ Meeting point sul Congresso globale "Child Dignity in the Digital World"

Alle ore 13.00 di oggi, presso la Sala Stampa della Santa Sede, si è tenuto un "Meeting point" con i giornalisti per presentare il primo Congresso globale "Child Dignity in the Digital World" – "La dignità del minore nel mondo digitale", organizzato dal *Centre for Child Protection* presso la Pontificia Università Gregoriana, a Roma, dal 3 al 6 ottobre 2017, e che sarà dedicato ai rischi e alle sfide del web per i minori.

Erano disponibili per interviste il Presidente del *Centre for Child Protection* della Pontificia Università Gregoriana, P. Hans Zollner S.I.; e il fondatore e Presidente di SOS Telefono Azzurro, Prof. Ernesto Caffo.

[01410-IT.01]

[B0641-XX.01]

